

is this controversy that "... has tended to isolate the Prologue from the legends." He denies concern for the Prologue as an "aesthetic entity," aiming at a description of its function, and wishes to "... examine the Prologue for such clues as it may give us as to Chaucer's purposes in the legends themselves, in the project as a whole." (p. 12). After a sort of aside that notes the Prologue is not devoid of "conventional furniture," that is, "... the reference to books, the typically Chaucerian figure of the comically placed narrator, the talk of love and the God of Love, and the dream itself." ^{comend?} Frank observes that the Prologue "... is a prelude to an open raid on the literature of the past." He dispels the notion of some critics that the Legend is "... daisies, daisies, daisies all the way," and points out that "... in Chaucer's day the reworking of classical material was in some part an act of piety, for it was an act of preservation and propagation." There is "... no intention to create an encyclopedic work of reference like Boccaccio's. And yet he knew he was serving as a transmitter of the past, even if his method was only to 'reherce of al hir lyf the grete.'" (pp. 12-14). Here two pages later Frank has yet to come to any conclusions on the Prologues function or purpose, but notes the plea to the reader, that is present at the beginning of any Chaucerian work of any considerable length, "... to follow him (Chaucer) in what he as a writer of stories is about to do suggest(s) sincerity of intention and an awareness of innovation."

Fragment

a pos
no p-u

His denial of interest in the Prologue as an "aesthetic entity" proves to be untrue, and in the next fifteen pages becomes quite involved with aesthetic criticism although it is tempered with the pragmatic. We get out first hint that Frank believes some of Chaucer's character adaptation are warped in this statement.

merly
needs
a subject

our?

colon