

Sp

of the Legend of Good Women, and is irrefutably prominent. This dominance of a small section of Chaucerian criticism is due in part to the length of his critical work. Even if we used one chapter of his book, "Chaucer in 1386," as a basis of comparison with the other critics, Frank remains the best in presenting a comprehensive and comparatively objective view of Chaucer as an artist, and of his work. Although Gardner is limited in his subject matter his criticism is also objective, and has a stylistic clarity second to Frank. He is a bit tiring in his nearly word for word comparison of the two prologues, but his basic empirical possibility and thoroughness are informative. Preston on the other hand incorporates a shallow effeteness in his approach to Dido. He is working as a traditional critic, and perhaps his being taken out of a larger context causes the erratic shallow effect, that possibly does not do justice to a man who obviously knows how to write criticism. The other three writers are off on tangents that simply do not lend themselves to understanding of Chaucer, and in two cases can make no pretense to be good criticism. R.E. Lewis' essay is full of brilliant ideas on Chaucer's aesthetic cosmology, and would be a seminal source for criticism of Chaucer's overall philosophy, but he simply does not address the Legend. Blake is a critical spelling expert <sup>who</sup> ~~that~~ is tied to a critical method that can only grasp a miniscule part of Chaucer's method. It is even possible that he was the victim of a poor doctrinal thesis suggestion, or a new critic trying his art on a small <sup>untouched</sup>, for obvious reasons, facet of criticism. Overbeck's feminist bombast is past reckoning with as good criticism, until she calms down in the second half of her essay ( or my note taking effort tires of her emphasis). Her appeal <sup>is</sup> too obviously aimed at only half of a possible reading



X

↑