HOCCLEVE'S 'LETTER OF CUPID' AND THE 'QUARREL' OVER THE *ROMAN DE LA ROSE*

IT IS not in the spirit of launching a Hoccleve 'revival' that I would invite a re-examination of Hoccleve's 'Letter of Cupid'. But poems are historical as well as literary documents, and while no amount of 're-examination' is likely to transform Hoccleve into a major poet on the basis of the 'Letter', a close look at that piece can perhaps reveal him as a clever and articulate witness to the literary fortunes of a greater poet and a greater poem, and give some valuable indications of English court taste at the beginning of the fifteenth century. For it seems to me very probable that Hoccleve's 'Letter of Cupid' is a scholarly Chaucerian's response to the so-called 'Quarrel' over the *Roman de la Rose*.

The 'Letter of Cupid' is conspicuous among Hoccleve's poems both for its early date and for its subject matter. Written in 1402, when Hoccleve was still a youngish man of about thirty-five, it is by several years the earliest of his dated poems; it was probably his first public work. In fact, it is also one of the best written of his shorter pieces—largely, doubtless, because it seldom departs from its elegant French source, which (as has long been known) was Christine de Pisan's 'L'Epistre au dieu d'Amours'. 'In 1402, Hoccleve wrote his Letter of Cupid,' says Furnivall. 'He based it mainly on Christine de Pisan's L'Epistre au Dieu d'Amours . . . needless to say that he never alludes to her.'[1] Skeat similarly drew attention to the French original when he edited the 'Letter' for his supplementary volume to Chaucer's *Works*: 'This poem is imitated, rather than translated, from the French poem entitled L'Epistre au Dieu d'Amours, written by Christine de Pisan in May, 1399. . . . Hoccleve even rearranges some of the material.'[2] Furnivall went so far as to provide a somewhat perfunctory collation of the English and French texts, and Skeat drew attention to a number of passages wholly original with Hoccleve. There the matter has rested, with Hoccleve's poem accurately enough characterized as at once a translation, an imitation, a *précis*, and a rearrangement of Christine's.

So far as its subject matter is concerned, Christine's 'Epistre' is a difficult piece to classify. It is usually called a 'defence of women', and so it is; but much of its charm and effectiveness lies in the temperance and judiciousness of its claims on behalf of ladies. Christine avoids countering the absurd generalizations of the clerical misogynism she sets out to refute with unsupportable counter-exaggerations of her own. Thus the 'Epistre' is not so much a 'feminist' polemic as an essay in anti-antifeminism, which is not the same thing. Cupid does not deplore the *seigneurie* of men, but the harsh, ungenerous, and unrealistic generalizations of professional misogynist literature, the caricature illustrations to the 'book of wikked wyves'. On the face of it, it seems an odd poem to

capture Hoccleve's attention. His muse's interests were narrow: praising and counselling famous men, adoring the Blessed Virgin, scolding heretics, and trying to get people to pay him his money. The 'Letter' does not entirely avoid these concerns—it is ostensibly didactic, and it includes a passage, original with Hoccleve, in praise of the Virgin, who 'hath swich excellence þat al to weyk is mannes facultee to declare it'—but it is Hoccleve's only poem dealing with themes usually associated with 'courtly love'. He never translated or composed anything remotely like it again.

In order to talk about Hoccleve's 'artistry' in this poem, a work far from uncommon in an age innocent of the laws of plagiarism, one would be required to do a certain amount of tedious spade work, to sort out the elements of the poem which have been translated, those imitated, those added, and so on; then to attempt some explanation for Hoccleve's strategy in his rearrangements and interpolations. Apart from some useful hints tossed off by Furnivall and Skeat, this has not been done—which may be one of the reasons that nothing noticeably illuminating has ever been said on the subject of the poem's construction and meaning. In so far as the 'Letter of Cupid' can be said to have a reputation at all, it is a reputation for antifeminism. Thus Derek Pearsall has recently written that: 'The Letter of Cupid (A.D. 1402), a translation of Christine de Pisan's defence of women against detraction, shows that Hoccleve could laugh at women as well as himself.'[3] This remark strikes me as somewhat cryptic, to say the least, since it is not clear on the face of it why a defence of women against detraction should laugh at women; but as a judgment on Hoccleve's poem it is, as we must presently see, part of the thin trickle which is the mainstream of the poem's criticism. The immediate question, however, is not whether a charge of antifeminism against the 'Letter of Cupid' jibes with scholarly tradition, but whether it jibes with the poem. So far as I can see, it does not. If Hoccleve really turned a defence of women into a joke against women *en translant*, how could he have gone about it? We have already seen that the operations of translation and adaptation which Hoccleve performed on Christine's 'Epistre' were complex, and each offered him opportunities significantly to alter its spirit. The technical transformation of Christine's rhyming couplets into rhyme royal stanzas was for Hoccleve only a beginning. He also rearranged the poem substantially, shortened it, and made several additions of his own.

The best copy of the 'Letter', in the Ashburnham MS., reorganizes the French text in a curious way. Hoccleve has taken Christine's poem apart as though it were made of so many building blocks, then discarded half the blocks and put the rest back together without paying much attention to their original positions. Another manuscript of the English text (Fairfax MS.), differing very markedly from the Ashburnham MS., is somewhat closer to the French but still by no means very close.[4] So

far as I can tell, heresy though it may be against theories of the organic unity of poetry, this rearrangement makes little difference. The ordering of the elements in Christine's poem hardly displays the rigour of a syllogism in any case. Her arguments are gently repetitive and, while not exactly thrown together at random, loosely organized; so far as I can tell Hoccleve has distorted neither the tone nor the thrust of her poem.

The matter of Hoccleve's omissions is a thornier bush. His translation leaves out altogether a number of Christine's arguments, including some amusing and effective ones; but since the whole of her poem is a chain of cognate arguments, it would have been virtually impossible for Hoccleve to have shortened the poem by half (as in effect he did) without disposing of some of them entirely. If this amounts to a kind of editorial special pleading on his part, it is nowhere blatant. The first lengthy passage in the 'Epistre' largely dispensed with in the English text argued that men should not generalize about women from a few unfortunate examples, that they should hate not the sinner but the sin (197–258)—a point made sufficiently elsewhere in the text.[5] Hoccleve further neglects Cupid's opinion that antifeminist books, Latin and French, 'plus dient de mençonges qu'uns yvres' (281); he is likewise silent on the good examples of Penelope and others (461 ff.). Only one of the best passages in Christine's poem is lost—a delightful section in which she parodies the ingeniousness of clerical arguments against women, neatly reversing against the clerks one of their own exegetical arguments. Women, says Christine

> ne fu pas (faitte) du lymon de la terre
> Mais seulement de la coste de l'omme,
> Lequel corps ja estoit, c'en est la somme,
> Le plus noble des choses terriennes. (601–3)

Furnivall thought that at least one of Hoccleve's suppressions (Cupid's statement that books about women would be different had they been written by women) was disingenuous, but this is by no means clear. The fact is that Hoccleve reduced Christine's poem to half its original size without totally neglecting more than a few of her disparate lines of attack. The final test here would seem to be the test of tone. Taken as a whole, Hoccleve's 'Letter' captures and preserves the tone of Christine's 'Epistre'. The editorial excisions needed to compress the French poem to fit the dimensions of the English 'Letter' inevitably involved some violence, but they did not, so far as I can see, conceal an attack on the spirit, intent, or effectiveness of the original. There is no evidence of antifeminism here either. What of Hoccleve's additions to Christine's text?

Skeat gives a list of the stanzas in the 'Letter' which seem to be wholly original with Hoccleve, so that it is possible to make a quick and rough-and-ready survey of the translator's interpolations. Stanza 11 says that a

man who boasts of his seduction of a woman is worse than the woman; 14 says that men often use a two-faced friend to help their progress. Other men (19), whose dishonourable advances have been rejected by ladies, revenge themselves through lying slanders. 'A foul vice is of tonge to be light' (21). Stanza 24 draws an analogy between the band of the Disciples and womankind: one in twelve was untrue, but that should not condemn the rest. Men should honour their mothers (26) and not defile their own nests (27). If men were constant, women would love them (39). The final two additions contain the real meat of Hoccleve's own implied arguments, and they must be examined separately and in some detail; but it must be obvious from the gist of Hoccleve's original stanzas so far summarized that his additions can by no stretch of the imagination be said to 'laugh at women'. On the contrary, his original moral commentary is sober if not solemn criticism of some typical vices of men; it points out, without spoiling the case by making extravagantly 'courteous' claims on women's behalf, that a number of the conventional antifeminist arguments are double-edged.

To summarize briefly, we may say that Hoccleve's reorganization of the 'Epistre au dieu d'Amours' does not violate its spirit of anti-anti-feminism, that his editorial excisions do not seriously blunt its arguments, and that his own additions do not distort its principal intent. Accordingly, if we wish to agree with Derek Pearsall that 'the Letter of Cupid ... shows that Hoccleve could laugh at women' we shall require some other evidence than the text of that poem; for what the text shows is that Hoccleve could fairly represent Christine's best arguments against the conventional extravagances of mediæval literary antifeminism and add a few more of his own. What other evidence is there?

Stowe published the 'Letter of Cupid' in his edition of Chaucer in 1561, together with the gossipy speculation that Hoccleve had originally called the poem 'A Treatise of the conuersation of men and women in the little Island of Albion: which gate hime such hatred among the gentlewomen of the Court, that he was inforced to recant in that book of his, called *Planctus proprius*'. In a manner not uncommon with Stowe, this is half fiction and half simple error. The preciousness of the title is presumably a Renaissance affectation of the antique: certainly it has no manuscript basis, least of all in the Durham MS. which Stowe annotated; and the poem in which Hoccleve was 'inforced to recant' was not the 'Complaint' but the 'Dialogue'. More to the point, Hoccleve does not 'recant' antifeminism in the 'Dialogue', he denies it.

The context of Hoccleve's discussion of the 'Letter' in his 'Dialogue' is revealing. In a general discussion of some literary and moral questions with a 'friend', Hoccleve mentions that he has long owed a book to his patron Duke Humphrey, but that illness and depression have kept him from the task. He has considered translating for him the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* of Vegetius, but rejected the plan since Duke Humphrey's

proved martial valour shows he has small need of primers of military tactics. The friend then offers a suggestion: why not write something praising women? That will please Duke Humphrey, who enjoys innocent companionship with the ladies, and at the same time placate women offended by his earlier poems:

> 'Euene as thow by scripture hem haast offendid,
> Right so let it be by wrytynge amendid.'[6]

Hoccleve is nonplussed by this report that he has written against women, but the friend is insistent:

> 'Yis, Thomas, yis in thepistle of Cupyde
> Thow haast of hem so largeliche said,
> That they been swartwrooth & ful euele apaid.' (754–6)

Hoccleve responds by saying that although there may be some things in the 'Letter' which 'sowneth but right smal to hir honour', he has merely followed his 'Auctour' (which is true) and that it is a gross misrepresentation to say that he has attacked women:

> 'Who-so þat seith I am hir Aduersarie,
> And dispreise hir condicions and port,
> ffor þat I made of hem swich a report,
> He mis-auysed is and eek to blame.
> Whan I it spak I spak conpleynyngly;
> I to hem thoghte no repreef ne shame.
> What world is this how vndirstande am I?
> Looke in the same book what stikith by?
> Who so lookith aright ther-in may see
> Þat they me oghten haue in greet cheertee.' (768–77)

It is true that taken as a whole, the passages in the 'Dialogue' which discuss Hoccleve's alleged mysoginism are light-hearted, and even comical: but the gentle laughter is directed not against women, but against those who cannot understand the meaning of a text. That the 'Dialogue' bears historical testimony to any substantial criticism of antifeminism against the 'Letter of Cupid', whether 'among the gentlewomen of the Court' or anywhere else, may be seriously doubted. Rather, the passages in question seem to be Hoccleve's adaptation of the elegant fiction spun by Chaucer in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* which introduces that poem much in the way Hoccleve's 'Dialogue' introduces his translation of the story of Jereslaus's wife from the *Gesta Romanorum*. In any case, it is possible to sustain a charge of antifeminism against the 'Letter of Cupid' only if, like Hoccleve's friend, one is irrelevantly impressed by the opinions of the Wife of Bath (694 ff.), or if, again like the friend, one has not actually read the poem (781).

Both the poem and the poet, then, emphatically deny the charge of laughing at women. How is it that the charge could ever have been made,

even if only as a part of a playful fiction? I think the answer must be this: while the 'Letter of Cupid' does not laugh at women in general, it does laugh a little at *one* woman, Christine de Pisan, and this motive in the translation was apprehended by many readers. Hoccleve pokes fun at Christine not for advancing anti-antifeminist arguments with which he himself seems totally in sympathy, let alone for being a woman, but for being a bad literary critic. While he does not go so far as Jean de Montreuil, the 'father of French humanism', who said that Christine was behaving like 'the Greek whore who dared to write against Theophrastus', Hoccleve clearly does imply—at least to those *au courant* of literary and scholarly affairs—that she was making a public fool of herself.

Furnivall thought that Hoccleve could have spared himself trouble if he had but owned up that the 'Letter of Cupid' was really a translation of Christine's 'Epistre'; but it is almost certain that the courtly audience for whom his poem was intended would have already known this. So far as I know, the most relevant fact about the historical importance of the 'Epistre', the circumstance which probably explains why Hoccleve would have known the poem and been interested in it in the first place, has never been brought to bear on the question of his treatment of it. It is true, as Maurice Roy says, that the 'Epistre' begins the major phase of Christine's career as a public poet, and that 'nous sommes autorisés à penser que L'Epistre au dieu d'Amours eut un retentissement considérable et dût certainement placer Christine au rang des écrivains les plus remarqués';[7] but a chief reason for its wide circulation, quite apart from its intrinsic merit, was its intentionally public and polemic character. It was the first blast of Christine's trumpet against the monstrous regiment of women-haters. And, whatever the circumstances surrounding its actual composition by Christine in 1399, by the time Hoccleve came to translate it in 1402 it had become part of a public *dossier* documenting a *cause célèbre*; for it was the first manifesto of the so-called 'Quarrel' over the *Roman de la Rose*. The 'Quarrel' is usually said to have had its origins in conversations between Christine and Jean de Montreuil in 1400; Jean then wrote a letter or treatise, now lost, defending the *Roman*; Christine replied, Gontier Col joined battle against her, and the 'Quarrel' was well under way.[8] But such an account of the origins of the 'Quarrel', like the accounts given of the immediate causes of most wars, is somewhat arbitrary; in fact, Christine's slur on the *Roman* in her 'Epistre' was as good a *causa belli* as another. Her poem was not, it is true, a schematic attack on the *Roman*; Jean de Meun is mentioned only once, in passing, and he receives but a glancing blow. The connection of the poem with the development of the 'Quarrel' is nonetheless likely; it was an 'incident' which presaged a larger attack, and for all we know it may have been the immediate stimulus for Montreuil's supposed lost letter. Certainly, when the 'Epistre' was published in the Renaissance it was entitled 'Le Contre

Rommant de la Rose nomme le *Gratia dei*'.[9] There is good reason to follow Alfred Coville in viewing the piece as the first document of the 'Quarrel'.[10]

The 'Epistre' is ostensibly Cupid's reply to all detractors of women, but the only two misogynists he attacks by name are Ovid and Jean de Meun; the only books, Ovid's and the *Roman de la Rose*. A lady poet who had, as yet, produced no more than a number of polite pieces of promising conventional verse, had attacked the greatest French poet who had ever lived principally on the grounds of alleged antifeminism. My argument in this article is that one of Hoccleve's motives in translating the 'Epistre', as evidenced by two skilful additions to the French text, is to engage himself on the side of Christine's opponents in the controversy over the *Roman de la Rose* which her poem had initiated and her further attacks had protracted.

The intrepid explorer of the intellectual history of Europe in the late fourteenth century frequently must hesitate by the banks of swift streams of uncertain depth; for often he will find no serviceable bridges built for his amenity by the scholarly giants of old, or only rickety and treacherous ones. Such a stream is the so-called 'Quarrel' about the *Roman de la Rose*, a unique episode in the history of mediæval vernacular literature. For a period of several years, beginning in 1399 with the publication of the French original of the 'Letter' which is the subject of this article, a number of the top people of France publicly and energetically argued about France's top poem. Epistles were penned, dispatched, copied, and circulated; there followed more letters, defence and counter-attack, and a couple of sermons. The Chancellor of the University of Paris experienced a literary vision. The 'Quarrel' was, in short, a notable affair, remarkable for its distinguished participants no less than for its subject matter, and charged with extraordinary suggestion for the student of literary allegory in the age of Chaucer. The documents in the debate have, for the most part, long since been edited, and the episode has been the subject of a certain amount of serious historical analysis. The 'Quarrel' is well known, but badly understood. 'Nous le verrons de mieux en mieux . . .' wrote André Combes some years ago, 'l'histoire du débat relatif au Roman de la Rose est à peine ébauchée.'[11]

Combes's strictures are directed against serious scholarly confusion concerning various *minutiae* of the 'Quarrel', well illustrated by the many infelicities of C. F. Ward's edition of the documents in the debate.[12] But such philological deficiencies were venial sins; what has chiefly impeded a fruitful understanding of the 'Quarrel' is not the imperfection of accessible texts of the polemical documents so much as the faulty historical perspective from which they have been viewed.[13] The trouble is that the two censors of the *Roman*, Christine de Pisan and Jean Gerson, are much more famous than their opponents in the debate, Jean de Montreuil and the brothers Col. They have had, for the most part, a 'good

press'; and the chief discussions of the 'Quarrel' have been in the context of approving assessments of the work of one or other of them. The most extensive discussion of the 'Quarrel' is in a biography of Christine de Pisan, where the actual issues in the debate, and the positions taken, fight a losing battle against the author's hero (or rather heroine) worship.[14] Gerson's admirers are likely to maintain that the 'Quarrel' was 'the old conflict, so often repeated when the spirit of Art for Art's Sake runs afoul of sober judgement';[15] Gerson is supposed to have taken up Christine's cause out of 'concern for the spiritual welfare of the ordinary Christian faithful.... Though more than a century old, the *Romance*, with its contempt for the Christian ideals of chastity and its frank encouragement to uncurbed indulgence of natural pleasures, as well as its philosophic determinism, was judged by Gerson to contain both moral and intellectual dangers.'[16] So far as these particular judgments are concerned, the chief objection is simple historical implausibility. The 'spirit of *Art for Art's Sake*' was a most unfamiliar spirit in Parisian clerical circles; and 'the ordinary Christian faithful', who were illiterate, were unlikely either to read the *Roman* or to be rescued from its intellectual dangers by Latin sermons preached at the University. But a more serious objection is that no account of the 'Quarrel' which assumes the unquestionable rightness of the case for censorship is likely to yield an illuminating analysis, since the entirely indisputable fact is that the points of view taken by Christine and Gerson were, so far as the poem's reputation can bear witness, novel and eccentric.[17]

Fortunately, there is now a brief account of the 'Quarrel' which neglects neither the relevant primary materials in the debate nor the relevant historical background, and which can serve as a safe introduction to the principal intellectual problems raised by the episode.[18] Christine and Gerson attacked the *Roman de la Rose* from quite different points of view. Of the two critics, Gerson is unquestionably the more interesting mind; and, for the broader cultural implications raised by the 'Quarrel', his impressive 'Traité' is perhaps the most important of all the documents in the dossier. But he cannot be considered here since the 'Traité' comes too late (it is dated 18 May, 1402) to have had a bearing on Hoccleve's translation of the 'Epistre'. So far as Christine is concerned—and it is of course her attitude to the *Roman* which is relevant to the discussion of Hoccleve's 'Letter'—the objections to the *Roman de la Rose* are two: it is antifeminist, and it is filthy. With regard to the first point she cites the long speeches of La Vieille and 'Jalousie' (she means, of course, the Jaloux); and as evidence of smut she refers to the end of the poem, and to the fact that Dame Reason openly refers to Saturn's testicles by their quite proper French name of *coilles*.

Taken at face value, neither of Christine's principal arguments seems very telling, or even very intelligent; and her squeamishness about calling *coilles coilles* borders on the ludicrous in light of the passage in the *Roman*,

one of Jean de Meun's greatest comic *coups*, where the lecherous Lover registers similar sensitivity to the obscenities of 'God's daughter' Lady Reason. It is probably worth mentioning that the late Rosamond Tuve, who yielded to none in her admiration of Christine, found this line of argument so extraordinary that she concluded that Christine's posture in the 'Quarrel' had been largely whimsical. There is no real evidence that Christine's opponents thought she was joking, though it must be said that throughout the 'Quarrel' the attitude of the brothers Col remained good-natured if not light-hearted, and even the Ciceronian epistles of Jean de Montreuil sparkle with laughter. Gerson's 'Traité' changed all that: no guffaws from him, or even smiles. But when Hoccleve responded to the 'Quarrel' in 1402 with his 'Letter', the affair was by no means mirthless.

That the 'Letter' *is* a response to the 'Quarrel' is strongly suggested both by the date of its appearance and (more importantly) by Hoccleve's final editorial interpolations into Christine's text. The 'Epistre' is dated May 1399, and the next document in the debate is the supposed 'lost treatise' of Montreuil, which it had perhaps provoked, hypothetically assigned by Piaget to late 1400 or early 1401. The year 1401 saw a flurry of letters—Christine's response to the 'lost treatise', Gontier Col's quite remarkable piece of 15 September, and Christine's spirited and unrepentant response. It is clear from references in the correspondence that, all along, the affair was considered public, but Christine took steps to ensure not only that it was public, but that it would become a *cause célèbre*. In late 1401 or early 1402 she gathered together the correspondence to date into *dossiers* and sent them, apparently for chivalric adjudication, to Isabeau de Bavière, the French queen, and Guillaume de Tignonville, Provost of Paris.[19] Hoccleve's 'Letter' is of course dated May 1402; but both Furnivall and Skeat were of the opinion that while Christine's 'Epistre' actually *was* written in May as suggested in the text, the date in Hoccleve's translation is mere imitation. Neither assumption is absolutely safe since (1) May is Cupid's month, but (2) people *do* sometimes actually write things in May—witness Gerson's 'Traité'; hence it is possible that Christine is being imitative, and Hoccleve literal. We are perhaps justified in saying no more than that the 'Letter' was written in 1402, and that it shows no evidence that Hoccleve was aware of Gerson's entry into the 'Quarrel'. The likelihood, then, is that Hoccleve had seen a copy of one of Christine's *dossiers*, which clearly must have circulated widely outside the immediate circle of the contending parties to judge from surviving copies.[20] While it cannot be positively established that there was a copy in London in 1402, the suggestion is reasonable. The unfortunate nature of Anglo-French relations at the time did not keep a copy of Christine's 'Epistre', at any rate, out of Westminster Palace at a time when that poem was chiefly famous as a document in the 'Quarrel'.

H. S. Bennett maintains that 'on the whole Hoccleve had not a sensitive alert mind'.[21] But if we accept this judgment at all, it appears that the 'Letter of Cupid' shows him at his exceptional best, where, indeed, mental agility is his conspicuous virtue. For what Hoccleve really 'does' to Christine's poem, without for a moment vitiating its effectiveness as a piece of anti-antifeminism, is very cleverly, by means of two skilful additions to her text, to render it harmless as an attack on the *Roman*. In the first place he calls to the witness box in defence of Jean de Meun the greatest English poet of the Middle Ages, Geoffrey Chaucer; and, secondly, he forcefully draws attention to the blunder in literary criticism on which the attacks on the *Roman de la Rose* had been founded.

Christine mentions in the 'Epistre' (437 ff.) the examples of Medea and Dido, two faithful women cruelly deceived by men, and Hoccleve translates the passage without comment (st. 44 and 45). But Hoccleve knew, as Christine perhaps did not know, that the histories of those two noble ladies had already been incorporated in the canon of Love's martyrology, so that he makes Cupid go on to say (st. 46):

> In our legende of martirs may men fynde,
> who-so þat lykith ther-in for to rede,
> That ooth noon ne byheeste may men bynde:
> Of repreef ne of shame han they no drede;
> In herte of man conceites trewe arn dede;
> The soile is naght ther may no trouthe growe:
> To womman is hir vice nat vnknowe.

The reference to the *Legend of Good Women* here is entirely apt for a brief against male fickleness since there are indeed a number of men mentioned in that poem who behaved very badly toward their women. But the allusion is also relevant as regards the *Roman de la Rose*, since according to the light-hearted fiction of its Prologue, the *Legend of Good Women* was written as a penance for literary offences against the god of Love. Chaucer had anticipated Christine in presenting Cupid as a literary critic presiding over a Star Chamber for the suppression of naughty books. In the Prologue of the *Legend of Good Women* the two works of Chaucer's singled out for proscription are the translation of the *Roman de la Rose* and *Troilus and Criseyde*. Speaking rather loosely, one may say that Cupid's complaint against *Troilus* is 'antifeminism'; it is the story of a bad woman for which a collection of stories about good women might be an appropriate reparation. But the god's charge against the *Roman* is not antifeminism but 'heresye'; for in that poem Jean de Meun portrays sexual passion as a kind of folly, and counsels wise readers to flee Cupid:

> Thou hast translated the Romauns of the Rose,
> That is an heresye ageyns my lawe,
> And makest wyse folk fro me withdrawe.

And thinkest in thy wit, that is ful cool,
That he nis but a verray propre fool
That loveth paramours, to harde and hote. (A255–60)

Needless to say, such a characterization of the *Roman* has little in common with currently fashionable scholarly opinion about that poem, which derives largely from the schools of 'courtly love' on the one hand (C. S. Lewis) and 'scolastique courtoise' on the other (Gérard Paré); but it does have the advantage of corresponding very closely indeed with the view of the *Roman* put forward by the defenders of Jean de Meun at the time of the 'Quarrel', particularly in the fine essay of Pierre Col. D. W. Robertson, whose brief but brilliant analysis of the *Roman* has brushed away some of the cobwebs spun around Jean's poem since the time of the 'Quarrel', has rightly drawn attention to this evidence of Chaucer's attitude toward the great work of his old 'auctor'.[22] Hoccleve's quiet insertion of Cupid's *Legende of Martirs* does the same thing.

Chaucer's defence of himself in the Prologue of the *Legend of Good Women* is entirely adequate. Alceste attempts to get him off the hook by pleading, on his behalf, diminished responsibility: 'he wroot the Rose and eek Crisseyde / Of innocence, and niste what he seyde' (A344–5). Chaucer, however, not disposed to acquiesce in a plea of imbecility, maintains that he *did* know what he was doing:

Ne a trewe lover oghte me nat blame,
Thogh that I speke a fals lover som shame,
They oghte rather with me for to holde,
For that I of Cresseyde wroot or tolde,
Or of the Rose; what-so myn auctour mente,
Algate, god wot, hit was myn entente
To forthren trouthe in love and hit cheryce;
And to be war fro falsnesse and fro vyce
By swich ensample; this was my meninge. (A456–65)

Whatever truth there may be in this argument about the *Roman* and *Troilus*, or in any other arguments he might put forward, is not likely to launch any boats in Cupid's ocean since 'Love ne wol nat countrepleted be / In right ne wrong' (A466–7). Such a policy of dictatorial whim well befits a polite personification of *cupido*, or irrational passion; but Hoccleve himself seems to have found Chaucer's argument more compelling. We have already seen that Chaucer's Prologue provided Hoccleve with the inspiration for the discussion of antifeminism in the 'Dialogue', and elsewhere he appropriates Chaucer's arguments, and his words, to defend himself against charges such as those reported by his friend:

To goode wommen shal it be no shame
Al thogh þat thow vnhonest wommen blame.[23]

In the *Regement of Princes* Hoccleve calls Chaucer 'the mirour of fructuous entendement'; whatever precisely he may have meant by this, he presumably cannot have considered Chaucer a pornographer and a bully. Yet Christine's attack on the *Roman*, a poem which Chaucer had translated and which had left its mark on practically every page he ever wrote, insisted on Jean de Meun's misogynism and his lubricity. If Jean had undertaken a 'lewede occupaccioun' in writing the *Roman*, what of 'virtuous' Chaucer, *grant translateur*? If we knew no more than Chaucer's reverence for the *Roman*, and Hoccleve's for Chaucer, there would be a strong *a priori* case for believing that Hoccleve would be much more likely to associate himself with Jean de Montreuil and the brothers Col in the 'Quarrel' than with Christine de Pisan. His adroit use of allusion to the *Legend of Good Women* in his translation of Christine's 'Epistre' removes the matter entirely from doubt. Cupid claims by lawful right the poem written especially for him by a penitent English poet; but in appropriating the *exempla* of Chaucer's 'good women', Cupid cannot but revive, in the minds of English readers, his own quarrel with the poet about the *Roman de la Rose*, the playful debate which strikingly anticipates the quite serious exchange of letters and invective taking place in Paris in 1402. Chaucer had maintained against the god of Love, whose only argument was wilful *fiat*, that his aim in translating the *Roman* had been 'to forthren trouthe in love' (cf. Eph. iv:15), and 'to be war fro falsnesse and fro vyce'. Similarly for Pierre Col the *Roman* was rich in teachings 'to follow all virtues and flee all vices'. The forty-sixth stanza of Hoccleve's 'Letter of Cupid' raises the ghost of Geoffrey Chaucer to defend the French poet at whose feet he had learned the major skills of his craft against unprecedented and intemperate attack.

Hoccleve realizes a satiric and ironic end within the 'Letter of Cupid' without marring its glossy enamel finish with open parody or brash intrusion. The poem remains the elegant essay in anti-antifeminism it was for Christine, but for readers who held the memory of Chaucer dear, its force as a polemic against Jean de Meun must have been spent in gentle laughter. This is a most skilful poetic achievement, and one important to appreciate. Hoccleve applauds Christine's canons of courtesy, but suggests that Christine has misapplied them to Jean de Meun's poem. If his translating really 'gate him such hatred among the gentlewomen of the Court, that he was inforced to recant' it cannot be because the 'Letter of Cupid' sullies the good name of women which Christine had set out to defend, but because it amusingly suggests the irrelevance of a charge of antifeminism in a public debate about the *Roman de la Rose*.

A word must be said about the alleged misogynism of Jean de Meun's part of the *Roman de la Rose* itself, since it is at the heart of Christine's attitude in the 'Epistre' and since it nicely exemplifies the larger problem of literary criticism at the heart of the entire 'Quarrel'. It has become a

cherished *cliché* of literary history that Jean de Meun 'hated women', and that he turned Guillaume de Lorris's allegory of courtly idealism into a bourgeois-realistic satire 'against many aspects of mediæval life, but especially women'. As is often the case, the fiction of the critics is here greater than the fiction of poets. Claude Fauchet (Jean de Meun's Stowe, as it were) puts the matter into perspective. The ladies of the court—perennially in arms against the poets so far as Renaissance antiquaries can be believed—are supposed to have once captured Jean de Meun to thrash him soundly for the way he had treated them. Jean agreed to the punishment, provided that it be administered by 'la plus forte putain de toutes celles que i'ay blasmees'.[24] There is more in the story than just a good laugh. It is true that Jean *used* some of the materials of traditional mediæval antifeminism—just as he used materials from virtually every major literary tradition, and it is also true that antifeminist comedians of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries cited the *Roman* as an 'authority'.[25] On the other hand, readers used the *Roman* on a great many subjects including philosophy, theology, and ethics. But this was, in effect, to treat the *Roman* as an encyclopedia, and some readers, alert to its dramatic integrity, insisted on treating it as a poem instead. For example, there is a fourteenth-century French *débat* poem in which a married and an unmarried man argue the excellences of their respective states. One of the arguments marshalled by the bachelor, on the authority of the *Roman*, is that women are notoriously unfaithful. The married man counters in a surprising way:

> Quant est du livre de la Rose
> Il n'en parle que bien a point
> Et, qui bien entend la glose,
> Des femmes il ne mesdit point.[26]

Chaucer knew the 'glose'; so, apparently, did Hoccleve. It involves none of the 'glorious' and mysterious hermeneutics of Friar John in the 'Summoner's Tale', merely the common sense of literary decorum.

The principal 'antifeminist' episode in the *Roman* is to be found in Amis's discourse to Amant (beginning at l. 8425 in the new Lecoy edition); Amis first describes the grotesque plight of the Jealous Husband and then actually brings the Jaloux onto the stage, so to speak, to dramatize his attitudes. The Jaloux, of course, speaks in the manner of the absurd buffoon he is and, in this context, delivers the antifeminist monologue for which the *Roman* is famous. Now it was pointed out five and a half centuries ago by Pierre Col, and more recently by Lionel Friedman, that to accuse Jean de Meun of antifeminism on the basis of this text is to fall somewhat short of sound literary criticism. Friedman points out that both Amis and the Jaloux are stock characters of academic comedy, and he concludes that there is no justifiable critical

basis for confusing opinions expressed by them with Jean de Meun's own opinions.[27]

As the unpublished commentary to the Old French *Echecs Amoureux* puts it, the *Roman de la Rose* is that kind of allegory in which 'several characters appear in turn and speak according to their natures'.[28] That is to say, the *Roman de la Rose* is dramatic. It might at first appear that the dramatic integrity and autonomy of the *personae* in a poem of this sort would be taken for granted as a matter of common sense. We do not often hear it said that beginning in 1595 Shakespeare was determined to be a villain, or that after 1604 evil had become his good. But we do hear that for Jean de Meun 'love is simply an expression of the reproductive instinct, and this he regards as wholly and necessarily good . . . something to be followed at all times and in all circumstances, something that ought not to be confined by any regulations or institutions'.[29] The question of dramatic decorum in the *Roman* has been, historically, a crucial one for the poem's interpretation; it has proved to be a *pons asinorum* for critics from the time of the 'Quarrel' down to our own day. One of Jean de Montreuil's letters recently made accessible in the splendid edition of his *Epistolario* states the issue with admirable clarity. Of those who attack the *Roman* he justly says: 'Qui de personatuum varietate non discernunt, seu notant quibus passionibus moreantur aut induantur affectibus et quem ad finem quave dependentia aut quamobrem sint loquuti, nec quod demum satirici is instructor fungitur officio, quo respectu plura licent, que aliis actoribus prohibentur.'[30] Some few of the objects of Jean de Meun's satire have been allowed by the critics to live in their own 'variety'; so far as I know the long Faussemblant 'chapter' has escaped autobiographical interpretation. But in order to make Jean an antifeminist it is necessary to equate him with an absurdly jealous fool or an old whore, and to make him the sex mystic described by Professor Cohn, Jean's own views must be identical with those of his character Genius, a personification of natural concupiscence.

The last major addition Hoccleve made to the text of Christine's 'Epistre' exposes this very serious confusion which lies behind her attack on Jean de Meun. As he approaches the end of his reorganization of her poem, Hoccleve expands Christine's lines in praise of the Virgin (st. 59 and 60). Somewhat unexpectedly, Cupid then moves on to praise the martyr St. Margaret: 'Thow precious gemme . . . O constant womman . . . holy virgyne.' But even more unexpected, in light of the tone established by Christine's poem, is the following stanza, 62, in which Cupid qualifies his praise:

> But vndirstondith We commende hir noght
> By encheson of hir virginitee:
> Trustith right wel it cam nat in our thoght,
> For ay We werreie ageyn chastitee,
> And euere shal but this leeueth wel yee:

Hir louyng herte and constant to hir lay,
Dryue out of remembrance we nat may.

This passage, wholly original with Hoccleve, is in its context in the 'Letter of Cupid' very startling. 'This stanza is spoken by Cupid in his own character,' says Skeat in his editorial notes. 'It is, moreover, obvious that this stanza would hardly have been approved of by Christine.' Of course not; but the speaker in the poem is *supposed* to be Cupid, god of Love, son of Venus Citherea. It is his letter, not Christine's. The ostensible form of the 'Epistre au dieu d'Amours' is that of a 'dramatic monologue'. There is on the face of it no more reason that Christine should approve its sentiments than that Browning should approve the sentiments expressed in 'My Last Duchess'—or that Jean de Meun should in his own person agree with everything that *his* fictional creations say. But the fact of the matter is that Christine's poem does not work this way, as Hoccleve rather brilliantly demonstrates. Whatever else may be said of Christine's allegorical poetry, it cannot be given high marks for clever indirection or iconographic sophistication. Her allegorical veil is spun of fine transparent silk; it richly adorns, but barely conceals. When Cupido speaks in the 'Epistre', the voice is Christine's. There is no great distance between the poet and the fictive speaker in the poem, who is in a quite limited sense a mouthpiece. Indeed, what is startling about st. 62 is that for a moment Cupid stops talking like Christine and talks like himself. Hoccleve teaches Christine how to read the *Roman* by shock treatment.

What one makes of the *Roman* depends in large measure upon what one makes of its *dramatis personae*, since as Jean de Montreuil remarks the satirist operates through the manipulation of *personae*. For Christine the god Cupid seems a proper arbiter of French chivalry. So he did to Thomas Bradwardine who in his victory sermon after Crecy listed among the execrable vices of the French knights which had sapped their manliness and offended God the stinking sin of lechery. 'Errorem septimum amplexantes,' he says, 'simulari videntur antiquis gentilibus colentibus Hymeneum sive Cupidinem, deum carnalis amoris.'[31] Christine's canons of sexual seemliness, as is well known, were severe: she was scandalized by the very mention of the word *coilles*, even when it came from the mouth of the daughter of God. It is accordingly unlikely that she revered the memory of Hutin de Vermeilles or Odo de Grandson because they had been famous fornicators; yet there they are in her poem, Cupid's unofficial saints. Obviously, Bradwardine and Christine are not talking about the same dainty god. The bishop had in mind the *dieu d'Amours* of the *Roman de la Rose*, whose poetic function is left in doubt neither by his inconographic attributes nor by the explicit mythographic tradition of such poems as Alain de Lille's *De planctu Naturae*, Jean de Meun's richest quarry. The god of Love in the *Roman* is the son of Venus and brother to Jocus, called Deduit in French, into whose garden Amant is

admitted by Oiseuse (Idleness).[32] Amant's subjection to Cupid involves the formal abjuration of Reason, clearly associated with the sapiential Christ by both Guillaume de Lorris and Jean. And so it goes on: the god of Love has a firm mythographic identity *in malo* which crucially qualifies the *Roman's* religion of love and activates the ironies of its principal action. In Christine's 'Epistre', on the other hand, Cupido is merely a vaguely benign force, made elegant and slightly exotic with handbook mythology, who represents a chivalrous attitude towards women. Hoccleve draws the reader up short by giving him a glimpse of Jean's Cupid momentarily superimposed on Christine's. 'For ay We werreie ageyn chastitee.' With its obvious Chaucerian echo of passionate Palamon's oath to Venus to become her 'trewe servant' and 'holden werre alwey with chastitee', Hoccleve's line must remind us of those techniques of dramatic allegory of which Christine herself is innocent but which his master Chaucer had found so brilliantly exploited by Jean de Meun.

A common critical view of the *Roman* has it that its two authors reflect contrasting poetic visions—that of the one (Guillaume de Lorris) 'courtly' or 'chivalric idealism'; that of the other (Jean de Meun) 'bourgeois realism'. And Huizinga, among others, would see the 'Quarrel' in terms of a clash of such attitudes as they focus on the subject of love. This line of attack has been manifestly fruitless in terms of tenable criticism of the *Roman de la Rose*, and its usefulness for discussing the 'Quarrel' is extremely questionable. Thomas Bradwardine was not a 'bourgeois realist'. Neither was Jacques Legrand, who told Isabeau de Bavière to her face that Venus ruled her court—a remark neither offered nor received as a compliment, but nonetheless a remark motivated by 'courtly idealism'.[33] Both men were courtiers, and the differences between their treatments of amorous mythology and Christine's cannot be explained by reference to fictitious social distinctions. Similarly, the 'Quarrel' was a debate between a group of literary critics (all of whom were 'courtly'), not an obscure early episode in the Class War. The questions raised by the 'Quarrel' have little to do with sociology, but a good deal to do with the theory of allegory, principles of literary criticism and literary taste.

The formal arguments advanced by Christine and Gerson against the *Roman* have this much in common: from the point of view of both mediæval literary theory and literary practice, they are obtuse and naïve. Their shared argument seems to be a smokescreen for saying that some ideas are so nasty or so horrible that it is disgraceful to broach them under any circumstances. One must never say 'coilles', just as one must never say (no matter with what tone of irony) that all good fornicators will go to Heaven. Perhaps it is no longer possible to talk about Jean de Meun's Cupid at all, and still be courteous. But if we choose to call this kind of squeamish inhibition 'courtly' or 'chivalric', surely there is some

obligation to justify the adjectives by reference to actual courtly and chivalric institutions. What might be called the chivalric scene in France at the end of the fourteenth century was complex. While the widespread disillusion about the Schism and the disastrous war with England clearly bred despair in some circles, it also stimulated a new wave of chivalric idealism. Some of the manifestations of the 'courtesy' of the period are, from the point of view of stylistic history, altogether fascinating; and their possible connections with changing styles in 'courtly' literature is an intriguing question crying out for close and careful study, though only a word or two can be said about it here.

After the death of Odo de Grandson in a trial by combat which sadly reflects some of the ambiguities of 'courtesy', the two most vocal chivalric figures in France were probably the saintly Philippe de Mézières and the *maréchal* Boucicault; both men founded new chivalric orders. Philippe's, the Order of the Passion of Jesus Christ, had as its grandiose and visionary aim the permanent security of the Holy Land and the safeguard of the pilgrimage routes, while Boucicault's Order of the Green Shield was dedicated to the protection of women: God and the ladies, indeed! It must be admitted that both these new orders, seen from one point of view, were rather like the military band organized by Tom Sawyer. They formulated an impressive protocol of dragon-slaying, but produced few dead dragons. Still, the kind of spiritual and literary attitudes represented by Mézières, who was among other things a fluent allegorist, are most suggestive for an analysis of the 'Quarrel'. Philippe's holiness insulated him totally from bourgeois realism, yet his attitude toward Jean de Meun's *Roman* is indicated by his approving citation of it in the *Songe du viel pelerin*.[34]

A connection between the 'Quarrel' and the order founded by Boucicault and a dozen friends for the defence of persecuted women was taken for granted by Maurice Roy, partly because of the date of the order's foundation (April 1400) and partly because he believed Christine to be the author of the anonymous *Livre des faicts*, Boucicault's biography.[35] The case is not compelling, and the *maréchal*'s order remains largely obscure. The knights wore as an emblem 'vne targe d'or esmaillee de verd, a tout vne Dame blanche dedans'[36]—but whether they ever actually did anything we are not told. It seems evident from their rule, at any rate, that their conception of chivalric *Frauendienst* is better reflected by Duke Theseus' championing of the Theban widows than by the Wife of Bath's burning her husband's copy of *Wikked Wyves*. Christine's tactics in the 'Quarrel' reveal her as both clever and resilient, whatever capital she might try to make out of being a defenceless woman; it is difficult to see her playing Dulcinea to Boucicault's Quixote.

Christine is supposed to have been greatly encouraged, once again according to M. Roy, by the foundation of the *Cour amoureuse* by Philip the Bold and Charles VI on St. Valentine's day, 1401.[37] This 'whimsical

academy' (to use Richard Vaughan's nice phrase) is for the literary scholar perhaps the most promising of the chivalric foundations of the period, and seems at first glance particularly promising in its suggestions about the 'Quarrel'. Of the two known recipients of Christine's *dossiers*, one was Isabeau de Bavière, wife of Charles VI, and the other was Guillaume de Tignonville, Provost of Paris and one of the twenty-four *ministres* of the *Cour amoureuse*. The trouble with this line of argument is that Gontier Col was also a *ministre*, a fact which 'astonished' M. Roy.[38] Since Charles VI was mad much of the time, and Isabeau de Bavière shared her throne with Venus, one might hope that the *Cour amoureuse* would reveal the exotic naughtiness of 'courtly love' come true at last. Instead, it seems to have been no more than an elaborate *puy* and dining club, organized to take people's minds off the plague.[39] In addition to writing suitable love poems and courteous praises of ladies, its 'amorous' members (practically all of whom were either married or professional celibates) were expected, on one of her five great feast days, to write in honour of the most noble Lady of all, 'dame des angeles et mere de nostre tres doulz createur, advocatte de tous amoureux cueurs'.[40] Charles VI owned at least three copies of the *Roman de la Rose*, so that any of the *ministres* who wished to examine Christine's charges against the primary text would not have had far to go.[41] Yet there is no record that the *Cour amoureuse* as a body ever examined Cupid's brief against Jean de Meun. The only official ministerial opinion which has survived, Gontier Col's, claims Jean was a 'vray catholique, solennel maistre, et docteur en son temps en sainct theologie, philosophe tresperfont et excellent, sachant tout ce qui a entendement humain est scible'.[42]

Robertson has characterized the 'Quarrel' as an invaluable 'indication of a change in taste which took place in certain quarters after the death of Chaucer'.[43] In this respect, at least, the *Cour amoureuse* and other manifestations of the moist chivalry of the Middle Ages in decline are relevant to the study of the controversy. Clearly enough, the 'amorous' deeds performed by the civil servants and ranking prelates gathered at banquet in the Hôtel de Bourgogne differed from the amorous deeds of the young hero of the *Roman de la Rose*. The gentile god who, according to Bradwardine, could be nothing but the 'incentor luxuriae et nutritor' presides with Victorian propriety over Christine de Pisan's Order of the Rose, now a fumigated flower, and wanders innocently at will through the lyrics of Charles d'Orleans and a dozen other poets. All this is not simply a matter of iconographic nuance; it testifies to marked shifts in taste, and a softening of the Gothic conventions of 'humanistic' allegory, of which Jean de Meun's *Roman de la Rose* was the greatest monument.

From this point of view, Hoccleve's attitude as indicated by his clever handling of Christine's 'Epistre' may perhaps be considered old-fashioned. Certainly he was championing a poem which had had its day, and which would never again father a Machaut, or a Deschamps, or a Chaucer.

Perhaps to be unstylish was also to be impolite, and to invite the groundless charge of antifeminism which supposedly links the 'Quarrel' with courtly attitudes. Here one would like to know what is fact and what fiction in the passage in Hoccleve's 'Dialogue' dealing with the public reputation of the 'Letter of Cupid', since aside from the 'Letter' itself the jocular exchange between poet and friend represents the only indication we have of what the attitude of English court circles toward the 'Quarrel' was likely to have been. As for Hoccleve, both the occasion of his translation and the motives behind his subtle but telling interpolations seem certain; and when a complete and accurate edition of the documents in the debate of the *Roman de la Rose* is put together, the relevant passages from the 'Letter of Cupid' should claim a place.

JOHN V. FLEMING.

Princeton

NOTES

[1] EETS ES 61 p. xi.
[2] *Chaucerian and Other Pieces* (Oxford 1897) p. 499.
[3] 'The English Chaucerians' in *Chaucer and Chaucerians* ed. D. S. Brewer (London 1966) p. 225.
[4] The Ashburnham MS. was published by Israel Gollancz in *Hoccleve's Works* II (EETS ES 73) pp. 20–34, and my references are to this text. The differences in the ordering of the stanzas in the Ashburnham and Fairfax MSS. are noted by Furnivall, EETS ES 61 p. 92.
[5] References are to 'L'Epistre au dieu d'Amours' in *Œuvres poétiques de Christine de Pisan* ed. Maurice Roy (Paris 1891) II 1–27.
[6] Ll. 699–700; references to the 'Dialogue' in *Hoccleve's Works* I ed. Furnivall pp. 110–39.
[7] *Œuvres de Christine* II vii.
[8] A. Piaget 'Chronologie des *Epistres sur le Roman de la Rose*' in *Etudes romanes dédiées à Gaston Paris* (Paris 1891) pp. 113–20.
[9] *Œuvres de Christine* II ix.
[10] *Gontier et Pierre Col et l'humanisme en France au temps de Charles VI* (Paris 1934) p. 194.
[11] *Jean de Montreuil et le Chancelier Gerson* (Paris 1942) p. 39.
[12] *The Epistles on the Romance of the Rose and Other Documents in the Debate* ed. C. F. Ward (Chicago 1911); see the review by E. Langlois in *Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie* XIII (1913/14) ii 61–3.
[13] E.g., the discussion of the 'Quarrel' by J. Huizinga *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (London 1924) pp. 102 ff., despite some brilliant suggestions, is fundamentally misleading both in its account of the *Roman* and its analysis of the documents in the debate. Important views on the 'Quarrel' are summarized by Franco Simone *Il Rinascimento Francese* (2nd ed., Turin 1965) p. 245.
[14] M. J. Pinet *Christine de Pisan* (Paris 1927) pp. 64–87.
[15] James L. Connolly *John Gerson Reformer and Mystic* (Louvain 1927) p. 124.
[16] John B. Morrall *Gerson and the Great Schism* (Manchester 1960) p. 12.
[17] For the evidence see 'The Moral Reputation of the *Roman de la Rose* Before 1400' *Romance Philology* XVIII (1965) 430–5.
[18] D. W. Robertson *A Preface to Chaucer* (Princeton 1962) pp. 361 ff.
[19] Piaget 'Chronologie des *Epistres*' p. 118.
[20] There are at least four copies in the Bibliothèque Nationale alone: MSS. fr. 835, 604, 1563, 12779. See Léopold Delisle *Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V* (Paris 1907) II 270* no. 292 *bis*.
[21] *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford 1947) p. 149.
[22] *Preface to Chaucer* p. 104.
[23] *Hoccleve's Works* I 218.
[24] *Les Œuvres de feu M. Claude Fauchet* (Paris 1610) p. 590^{v}. Hoccleve may have known this joke, or a similar one, since he has his 'friend' say with regard to his own supposed antifeminism: 'No womman wole to thee ward maligne, / But swich oon as hath trode hir shoo amis', *Hoccleve's Works* I 218.
[25] *Recueil de farces françaises inédites du XV^{e} siècle* ed. G. Cohen (Cambridge, Mass. 1949) p. 55.
[26] *Recueil de poésie françoise* ed. Anatole de Montaiglon (Paris 1865) IX 161.
[27] '"Jean de Meung", Antifeminism, and "Bourgeois Realism"' *Modern Philology* LVII (1959) 13–23.
[28] Bibliothèque nationale MS. fr. 9197 f. 14^{r}.
[29] Norman Cohn *The World-View of a Thirteenth-Century Parisian Intellectual* (Durham 1961) p. 16.

[30] Jean de Montreuil *Opera* ed. E. Ornato I (Turin 1963) 220–1. Gerson was cognizant of the principle of dramatic decorum; it is the affirmative proposition which 'Theological Eloquence' sets out to refute (but fails to) in his 'Traité' ed. E. Langlois *Romania* XLV (1918/19) 33–4.

[31] 'The *Sermo Epinicius* Ascribed to Thomas Bradwardine (1346)' ed. H. A. Oberman & J. A. Weisheipl *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* XXV (1958) 323.

[32] Such is the mythographic analysis of the exegete of the *Echecs Amoureux* in Bibliothèque nationale MS. fr. 9197 f. 197[r].

[33] 'In tua curia domina Venus solium occupans, ipsi eciam obsequntur ebrietas et commessacio, que noctes vertunt in diem, continuantes choreas dissolutas.' *Chronique du religieux de Saint-Denys* ed. L. Bellaguet (Paris 1839–52) III 268.

[34] *Le Songe du Vieil Pelerin* ed. G. W. Coopland (Cambridge 1969) I 625.

[35] *Œuvres poétiques de Christine* II ii–iv.

[36] *Histoire de Mre Iean de Bovcicavlt* ed. Theodore Godefroy (Paris 1620) p. 145.

[37] *Œuvres poétiques de Christine* II pp. x–xi; see also A. Piaget 'La Cour Amoureuse dite de Charles VI' *Romania* XX (1891) 446–7.

[38] 'La Cour Amoureuse' pp. 427, 429; *Œuvres de Christine* II xi*n*.

[39] A. Piaget 'Un manuscrit de la *Cour Amoureuse de Charles VI*' *Romania* XXXI (1902) 599.

[40] C. Potvin 'La Charte de la Cour d'Amour de l'année 1401' *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* 3me série XII (1886) 211–12.

[41] *Inventaire de la bibliothèque du roi Charles VI* (Paris 1867) nos. 109, 319, 321.

[42] Ward *Epistles on the Romance of the Rose* p. 29.

[43] *Preface to Chaucer* p. 364.