

the fact that the Legend is a mystery begging for some explanation." (p. 116) Frank starts his case against Chaucer's boredom by noting that there is evidence that Chaucer was interested in the idea of the Legend "...for several years," citing several references in Chaucer's earlier works that show interest in female love martyrs. "In view of these facts, the suggestion by Root and Tatlock (early 20th century) that Chaucer began to weary of his project before he had even finished with the Prologue will not stand up," and is "...inherently ridiculous. A writer does not go on with a project ~~he~~ he tires of it before he begins, he abandons it." (p. 118) Frank also feels that Chaucer's new narrative brevity is in most cases mistaken as evidence of boredom. The legends are brief, says Frank, because the Legend ⁽¹⁷⁾ "... required by the project's nature" and because of "...the great bulk of material Chaucer was intending to quarry from" (p. 119), Frank goes into explanations of the "abbreviatio" and "occupatio" again, and also repeats his comments on tone, comic elements, and the vague overall hints of the mocking and parody. Frank's last common sense refutation of the charges of weariness and boredom hinges on the unfinished nature of the Legend. He notes the House of Fame, and the Canterbury Tales (Squire's and Cook's tales) are unfinished also, and feels if the boredom is based on the unfinished nature of the Legend of Good Women, then Chaucer must be bored in the other works also.

We now come to the critical essays that I consider loose ends in comparison to Frank's all encompassing vision. At first feeling I might not have enough source material for this review and evaluation of recent criticism of the Legend of Good Women, I looked at some works that used the Legend as a complementary source, or evidence, in critical essays that deal with overall views of Chaucer's morality, philosophy, or artistic nature. One example of such an essay is

Lyphkin