

"What did Chaucer mean by 'Of the wreched engendrynge of Mankynde,'" by Robert Enzer Lewis (4). Enzer takes off on a line from the Legend and we hear nothing of it again, in his essay, except as a passing reference. He talks about everything else under the medieval sun, but the work from which his title comes. It is not criticism of the Legend, but of Chaucer as a moralist, philosopher, and thinker of the Middle Ages, and contains nothing about the art of the Legend. Another essay from Chaucer Review by N.F. Blake, "Chaucer and the Alliterative Romances (5)," takes a language and diction approach to address the Legend of Good Women. I personally do not care for this type of criticism ^{because such} as essays written in this methodology say little about the art of the work to anyone but those interested in semantics and spelling. Blake gives us a little history of alliteration, and then concentrates on one passage from the Legend (635-48), about which he has to say, "The vocabulary of the passage from the Legend of Good Women exhibits most of the same features (that he was cryptically discussing). The majority of words are simple Chaucerian ones: trompe, shoute, shete, peyen, sette on, sunne, grysely, grete, gonne, hurtelen, polar, preseth, poureth, slidere/" (p. 168). We get the feeling that Blake either knows nothing about Chaucer, or so much about diction that his discussion is way over our heads. There is a question if Chaucer was imitating "alliterative romances," and Blake says no, pointing out that it was used all over the country at the time in ~~the~~ ^{non} published works in court (as if he had first hand information). "Alliteration ^{lw} as a recognized embellishment in poetry, and if it was also a mode of composition which was only just being superseded it is natural that it should also be used by writers in the new style. The alliteration makes the rythmn of some lines stronger and more insistent; but such lines are not inconsistent with the tone of the rest of the poems

