"The God of Shepheards *Tityrus* is Dead": Spenserian Poetics in *The Shepheardes Calender*

Yoshiko KOBAYASHI

1.

The Shepheardes Calender opens with an envoy, in which Spenser's overtly humble alter ego, "Immerito (unworthy man)," sends off his finished work to Sir Philip Sidney, the "president /Of noblesse and of cheualree," in the hope of gaining social and literary sanction for the poem from this noble friend.[1] The same gesture is repeated in the second envoy attached to the last eclogue, but this time Immerito's intention is not to dedicate his book to Sidney, but to admonish it to follow reverently in the footsteps of his worthy literary predecessor, Geoffrey Chaucer. This act of entrusting one's work to a superior authority is an obvious allusion to the end of *Troilus and Criseyde*, where Chaucer bids his "litel bok" to revere such classical poets as "Virgile, Ovide, Omer, Lucan, and Stace," and at the same time submits it to correction and emendation by his contemporaries, "moral Gower" and "philosophical Strode."[2]

Immerito's address to his book thus reveals Spenser's profound indebtedness to Chaucer, but more importantly, it also evokes numerous versions of the "Go, litel bok" phrase by fifteenth-century imitators of Chaucer. Seth Lerer has pointed out that Lydgate, Hoccleve, and many other versemakers in the fifteenth century obsessively imitated and rewrote Chaucer's Envoy to the *Troilus*, with the result that the form of envoy was promulgated "as a genre almost in itself."[3] One of the reasons why Chaucer's Envoy became so popular in the fifteenth century is that there was a growing self-consciousness about the complex relationship among author, audience, and the preceding literary tradition on the part of poets, who found the form of envoy suitable for making this very relationship the subject of their poem. We can see Spenser's use of the Chaucerian envoy in *The Shepheardes Calender* as the culmination of this fifteenth-century tradition of thematizing the text's own reception. The self-reflexive nature of the *Calender* is further underscored by the fact that the annotations and interpretations by Spenser's "verie special and singular good frend E.K." are incorporated into the very structure of the poem.[4] The whole apparatus of *The Shepheardes Calender*, including the two envoys and E.K.'s commentary, is a strategy carefully designed to show how this work by the "newe Poet" Spenser is expected to be read against the backdrop of the preceding literary history.

The promulgation of the Chaucerian envoy in the fifteenth century does not merely reflect poets' fascination with this particular form. It is also a manifestation of the general movement in that period to

canonize Chaucer and define his style as the single model for imitation. This fifteenth-century cult of Chaucer as the "refiner of language and the English version of the classical *auctor* and the trecento *poeta*"[5] finds its echo in Immerito's second envoy:

> Goe lyttle Calender, thou hast a free passeporte,
> Goe but a lowly gate emongste the meaner sorte.
> Dare not to match thy pype with Tityrus hys style,
> Nor with the Pilgrim that the Ploughman playde a whyle:
> But followe them farre off, and their high steppes adore,
> The better please, the worse despise, I aske nomore.

According to the internal commentator, E.K., "Tityrus" stands for Chaucer. In view of the fact that the spurious *Plowman's Tale* was included in all of the major sixteenth-century editions of the *Canterbury Tales* from 1542 onwards,[6] it may be fair to conclude that the person implied in the fourth line is also Chaucer. In Immerito's literary canon, Chaucer dominates as the absolute authority to look up to, in place of the ancient Greek and Roman *auctores* evoked in the *Troilus* Envoy.

The canonization of Chaucer implicit in Immerito's closing envoy is made explicit and confirmed by E.K., who calls Chaucer "the Loadstarre of our Language" at the outset of his dedicatory epistle following the opening envoy. As E.K. himself makes clear, this is a citation from Lydgate's encomium on Chaucer in the *Fall of Princes*:

> My maistir Chaucer, with his fresh comedies,
> Is ded, allas, cheeff poete off Breteyne,
> That whilom made ful pitous tragedies;
> The fall of pryncis he dede also compleyne,
> As he that was of makyng souereyne,
> Whom al this land sholde off riht preferre,
> Sithe off oure language he was the lodesterre.[7]

We shall see later Lydgate's lament for Chaucer's death closely imitated by Colin Clout in his mourning for Tityrus in the *Shepheardes Calender*, but at the moment I would like to consider the implications of Lydgate's praise of Chaucer as the "cheeff poete off Breteyne." John Fisher has made an intriguing suggestion that the sudden publication of Chaucer's poems after 1400 and his concomitant "enshrinement as the perfecter of rhetoric in English" should be understood as part of the deliberate policy of Henry IV and Henry V to elevate English to the status of the "official and prestige language of the nation."[8] Behind this language policy lay the urgent need on the part of the newly established Lancastrian dynasty to "engage the support of Parliament and the English citizenry for a questionable usurpation of the throne."[9] What began as the official endorsement of Chaucer and his vernacular literature at the beginning of the fifteenth century developed into a general nostalgia among individual readers and imitators of Chaucer toward the middle of the century. The period following Henry V's reign was characterized by dynastic

insecurities due to his early death and the immaturity of his successor, Henry VI. The political instability of Henry VI's reign made it harder for poets to secure royal patronage for their literary activities. A strong anxiety about the social and financial status of poets gave rise to the idealized image of Ricardian England as a political and literary golden age, characterized by strong and confident kingship and mutually beneficial relations between the king and his court poets. When Lydgate called Chaucer as the "cheeff poete off Breteyne," he was projecting onto the historical figure, Chaucer, his own fantasy of an Edenic past. In Lydgate's view Chaucer was the supreme national poet in the Ricardian court who, through his dexterous command of English, provided the king with the affirmations of his rulership and in return enjoyed munificent royal support and the officially sanctioned status of the "poet laureate." This imaginary aspect of Chaucer's portrait in the fifteenth century cannot be emphasized too much. As Lerer explains:

> Lydgate sees the poet, and for that matter all earlier writers, within a mythological rather than historical moment. Lydgate creates a private mythology of writing, one complete with gods and heroes drawn from the trecento past and with a landscape drawn not to the borders of political states but to the contours of the imagination. In this world, poets live harmoniously with their generous patrons and responsive readers. They receive both praise and payment for their service. In a word, theirs is an "aureate" age. . . . [10]

Immerito's imitation of Chaucer's Envoy and E.K.'s citation of Lydgate's remark both point to the fifteenth-century tradition of idealizing and mythologizing Chaucer's world. Furthermore, the fact that these two allusions literally frame the twelve eclogues of *The Shepheardes Calender* urges us to consider the lingering presence of the dead poet Tityrus in this pastoral world in light of the fifteenth-century cult of Chaucer. As we shall see later, whenever Tityrus's poetic genius is evoked in the eclogues, it is described in nostalgic and elegiac terms. Such shepherd-characters as Thenot and Colin Clout recall this dead poet wistfully as an eternal youth capable of bringing through his artistic skills a great deal of public good to the pastoral community. In the minds of these shepherds, Tityrus's youthful and joyous world is sharply contrasted by the "iron age" they live in, whose decay is exemplified by the failure of poetic inspiration and the general lack of interest in and support for literary activities.[11] The nostalgic glance toward the idealized world of Tityrus's age is thus inextricably tied to a disillusionment with the present condition. As I shall try to demonstrate in the following section, the nostalgia evoked by Tityrus's memory bears a close resemblance to the fifteenth-century attitude toward Chaucer, particularly the wistful fantasy about Chaucer's "aureate" world found in Lydgate's poetry.

The question remains, though, as to whether Spenser himself shared this kind of nostalgia. E.K. apparently gives an affirmative answer to this question when he tells us in a footnote to the *January* eclogue that under the name of "Colin Clout" the author of the *Calender* "secretly shadoweth himself." Moreover, as if to confirm Spenser's analogy with fifteenth-century imitators of Chaucer, he draws a parallel between Lydgate's relationship with Chaucer and Colin's relationship with Tityrus at the opening of his dedicatory epistle:

> VNCOVTHE VNKISTE, Sayde the olde famous Poete Chaucer: whom for his excellencie and wonderfull skil in making, his scholler Lidgate, a worthy scholler of so excellent a maister, calleth the Loadestarre of our Language: and whom our Colin clout in his Æglogue calleth Tityrus the God of shepheards, comparing hym to the worthines of the Roman Tityrus Virgile.
>
> (Dedicatory Epistle, 2-3)

At first glance, E.K.'s argument gives the impression that Spenser, through his disguise as Colin Clout, implicitly aligns himself with Lydgate in canonizing Chaucer and idealizing his world. One might also be tempted to understand Spenser's attempt at imitating "Chaucerian" language in the *Calender* as a reflection of his fervent wish to relive in the sphere of imagination the literary golden age of Chaucer in which poetry prospered and was brought to a perfect refinement under a munificent rule.

My argument in this essay, however, is that Spenser's appropriation of Chaucer's language should be regarded, not as an indication of a subservient attitude toward the literary past, but instead as an innovative enterprise of creating a new literary language for a new age. I will elaborate on this point later in the final section, but for the moment I would like to call attention to the fact that E.K.'s obtrusive presence as an interpreter of Chaucerian language in *The Shepheardes Calender* precludes any facile identification of Spenser's use of that language with Lydgatian nostalgia. Despite his apparent reverence for Lydgate and his defense of the use of Chaucerian idiom in the *Calender*, E.K. widely departs from his fifteenth-century predecessor in his profound historical awareness of linguistic change. A close examination of his argument reveals his acute sense of the strangeness and obscurity of Chaucer's language. It is clearly a sense cultivated under the influence of continental humanism with its strong emphasis on philology, textual criticism, and pedagogy. These projects centering on the close linguistic and textual analysis of ancient texts gave rise to a historical relativism, which made it possible to perceive the otherness of the past, the otherness only recoverable through the reconstruction and conscious imitation of the ancient language. E.K. imposes on the reader of the *Calender* such a historicizing approach to Chaucerian language. Every time he intrudes into the poem to explain the meanings of obsolete words, the reader is made aware of the linguistic and historical distance of Chaucer's literary world. Louis Adrian Montrose is right in pointing out that "the tendency of modern literary criticism to think of *The Shepheardes Calender* merely as a poem, and to reproduce and anthologize it as such, obscures what must have been its original intended impact as a printed *book*."[12] It is important to be alive to the ways in which the *Calender*'s overall structure conditions its reception.

In my opinion, the inclusion of E.K.'s arguments and glosses into the poem is a deliberate strategy to create a contrast between the humanist—and historicist—approach to Chaucer represented by E.K. and the Lydgatian nostalgia for the past that is widely shared by the inhabitants of the *Calender*'s pastoral world. I would further suggest that Spenser created this dialectic in order to reveal a dehistoricizing and mythologizing impulse lurking behind the fifteenth-century reception of Chaucer. It is no doubt that Spenser was fascinated by Chaucer's poetry and shared a profound respect for his acchievement with such fifteenth-century Chaucerians as Lydgate. Nevertheless, he was aware that Lydgatean nostalgia would

never make it possible to cope constructively with the overwhelming pressure of Chaucer's influence. It was crucial for young Spenser to distance himself from the fifteenth-century Chaucer tradition and to explore a new way of dealing with Chaucer's legacy. Spenser's alter ego, Colin Clout in *The Shepheardes Calender*, represents a naive fascination with Chaucer, conceivably an element in young Spenser himself which he thought he must outgrow to pursue his poetic career. In the following sections, I will first examine the shepherds' attitudes toward Tityrus described in the *February, June,* and *December* eclogues to consider Spenser's critical assessment of the fifteenth-century receptions and imitations of Chaucer's poetry. Then in the final section, I will go on to focus on E.K.'s epistle in an attempt to understand Spenser's humanist encounter with Chaucerian language and his creation of a new poetics predicated on that encounter.

2.

The first person to mention Tityrus in *The Shepheardes Calender* is Thenot in the *February* eclogue. Thenot is an old shepherd, "who for his crookednesse and unlustinesse, is scorned of Cuddie," Thenot's young and amorous interlocutor. The eclogue opens with Cuddie complaining bitterly about the February wind's icy blasts. Cuddie's lament, full of self-pity and hyperbole, does not awaken sympathy in his old shepherd companion. Instead, Thenot reprimands Cuddie's lack of endurance and youthful folly, offering to tell a moral tale he learned from Tityrus when he was still alive. Cuddie's response is enthusiastic:

> THENOT.
> But shall I tel thee a tale of truth,
> Which I cond of *Tityrus* in my youth,
> Keeping his sheepe on the hils of Kent?
>
> CVDDIE.
> To nought more *Thenot*, my mind is bent,
> Then to heare nouells of his deuise:
> They bene so well thewed, and so wise,
> What euer that good old man bespake.
>
> THENOT.
> Many meete tales of youth did he make,
> And some of loue, and some of cheualrie:
> But none fitter then this to applie. (*February*, 91-100)

It is noteworthy that the two shepherds provide us with slightly different images of Tityrus. Young Cuddie remembers him as a "good old man" full of wisdom. For Thenot, Tityrus is a poet renowned for his "meete tales of youth." In spite of their apparent contradiction, these two portraits of Tityrus accurately convey the images of Chaucer created and circulated in the course of the two centuries following his death.

As is indicated by the existence of numerous imitations of Chaucer's love visions by Lydgate, Hoccleve, and Clanvowe in the fifteenth century, as well as by the inclusion of a number of spurious poems on amorous themes in the sixteenth-century printed editions of Chaucer's work, the predominant image of Chaucer among his early successors is that of a love poet.[13] Among the stories contained in *The Canterbury Tales*, the one that enjoyed especial popularity was the tale of "loue" and "chevalrie" told by the youthful Squire. That Spenser himself took particular interest in this tale is demonstrated by his attempt to retell it in the Legend of Cambel and Triamond in Book IV of *The Faerie Queene.* Alongside this image of Chaucer as a love poet existed the view of him as a didactic author, a view largely initiated by Lydgate. In the prologue to *The Siege of Thebes*, for instance, Lydgate characterizes Chaucer as a purveyor of moral truth, who kept the "substaunce" of every subject he deals with in his poetry, "[v]oiding the Chaf" and "[e]nlumynyng the trewë pikëd greyn / Be crafy writinge of his sawes swete."[14] Chaucer's readers in the late medieval and early modern periods appreciated not only the moral truth hidden inside his "sawes swete," but also, at a more pragmatic and domestic level, their usefulness for exemplary purposes. This latter tendency in Chaucer's reception associated his name with such advisory literature as the *Book of Curtesye*, which was designed to teach proper manners to young people.[15] By offering to tell a moral tale about the consequences of youthful frivolity, Thenot positions himself as an inheritor of this didactic strand of the Chaucer tradition, even as he pays tribute to Tityrus's (and therefore Chaucer's) accomplishments as a skillful composer of love lyrics.

The dialogue between the two shepherds in the *February* eclogue thus nicely encapsulates the manners of reception of Chaucer's work in Spenser's time. Yet more importantly for the sake of understanding the significance of this particular eclogue, we must note that Thenot's speech attests to a nostalgic longing for the time he spent with Tityrus in his youth, a feeling that seems to contradict his stated intention to warn of the vanity of youthful pleasures. His emphasis on "meete tales of youth" in Tityrus's repertoire reflects his desire to relive the good old days that he, as a young man, spent listening to the talented poet. Those days represent not only Thenot's own youth, but also a prime and vigorous age in the history of English poetry. Thenot's tendency to idealize the past is bound up with his somber view of time and mutability expressed in his opening speech, a view that defines human history as nothing other than a constant process of deterioration:

> Must not the world wend in his commun course
> From good to badd, and from badde to worse,
> From worse vnto that is worst of all,
> And then returne to his former fall? (*February*, 11-14)

Harry Berger has pointed out that Thenot's rebuke of Cuddie's frivolity and his Stoic counsel are in fact "intimately associated with his attachment to the joys of youth, his bitterness at their early, perhaps, unexpected, loss."[16] Although I agree with Berger that Thenot's speech hides beneath its ostensible moral his obsessive attachment to the irrecoverable past, I would go further and suggest that it is not merely "the joys of youth" that Thenot looks back on with a nostalgic glance, but the literary golden age that has passed

away with the death of Tityrus. The invocation of Tityrus's youthful tales is a desperate attempt on Thenot's part to rescue the fond memory of the lost age from time's destructive force.

The manner of Thenot's tale-telling also calls attention to his tendency to idealize bygone times. The tale he chooses is concerned with the quarrel between an old oak and a young briar. Growing under the shade of the big oak tree, the briar blames the oak scornfully and contentiously for being an obstacle to its further growth. Hearing this complaint and sympathizing with the briar, a Husbandman—in fact the very person who planted the oak tree—decides to cut down the aged oak. The oak tries in vain to arouse the Husbandsman's pity by reminding him of its former service to him, but eventually the Husbandsman's merciless ax destroys the old tree. After this event, the briar lives proudly for a while, enjoying ample space and plenty of sunshine. The arrival of winter, however, changes this whole situation: with no oak to protect it from cold blasts, the briar finally withers away. It is obvious that Thenot identifies himself with the oak, Cuddie with the briar, thereby warning Cuddie of the unpleasant consequences of his scornful attitude toward his elders. Spenser arranges the details of the tale, however, in such a way as to bring into relief, not so much its moral, as the narrator's fear of time's destructive effects. This is, for example, illustrated by the particular attention Thenot pays to the process of the oak's decay:

> There grewe an aged Tree on the greene,
> A goodly Oake sometime had it bene,
> With armes full strong and largely displayd,
> But of their leaues they were disarayde:
> The bodie bigge, and mightely pight,
> Throughly rooted, and of wonderous hight:
> Whilome had bene the King of the field,
> And mochell mast to the husband did yielde,
> And with his nuts larded many swine.
> But now the gray mosse marred his rine,
> His bared boughes were beaten with stormes,
> His toppe was bald, and wasted with wormes,
> His honor decayed, his braunches sere. (*February*, 101-14)

Thenot stresses the imposing height of the aged tree. In the past, it was the king of the field, sustaining the lives of both people and animals by providing them with its fruit. The oak's past glory is then contrasted by its present misery. The repetition of the word "his" in the last three lines creates an incantatory effect, transforming the description of the decayed tree into a lament for the past age. The image of the hollowed oak represents the overwhelming power of devouring time. It is for Thenot too awful an image to bear.

As if to wish away this horrible picture of time's relentless power, Thenot shifts his attention to the sacredness of the oak tree that derives from its great antiquity:

For it had bene an auncient tree,
Sacred with many a mysteree,
And often crost with the priestes crewe,
And often halowed with holy water dewe. (*February*, 207-10)

Here Thenot's attachment to the oak tree turns into a form of idolatry. It is an idealizing and ahistoricizing attitude toward his lost youth, based on the wishful belief that by the acts of cult and magical invocation, its blessed memory may be kept eternally alive and present. So long as Thenot's youth is associated with Tityrus and his poetic skills, the oak tree surrounded by the mystical aura can be seen as the symbol of an ideal literary past. It is a past mythologized in the imagination of Tityrus's followers who are left behind in the debased present.

Apart from the nostalgia for the lost golden age, what is particularly significant about Thenot's remembrance of Tityrus is its emphasis on his personal knowledge of the renowned poet. This is a factor that makes Thenot look strikingly analogous to Chaucer's immediate successors, such as Lydgate and Hoccleve. In Lerer's terms, "throughout the fifteenth century, it was the idea of a personal acquaintanceship with Chaucer and his followers that placed the writer in the genealogy of English letters."[17] For instance, Hoccleve, who claims to have known Chaucer and directly received his instruction and encouragement, tries to convey such a close tie by calling Chaucer his "master" and "father":

O maister deere and fadir reverent,
My maister Chaucer, flour of eloquence,
Mirour of fructuous entendement,
O universal fadir in science!
Allas that thow thyn excellent prudence
In thy bed mortel mightest nat byqwethe!
What eiled deeth? Allas, why wolde he sle the? [18]

The same kind of emphasis on the personal relationship with Chaucer is detected in Lydgate's panegyric on Chaucer I have cited earlier in this essay, in which Lydgate refers to him as "my maistir." What is also common between Hoccleve and Lydgate's eulogies is that the announcement of Chaucer's death is couched in highly personal expressions of mourning. The following lines from Lydgate's *Troy Book* give us another example:

And Chaucer now, allas! is nat alyue
Me to reforme, or to be my rede,
For lak of whom slou3er is my spede.[19]

These fifteenth-century praises of Chaucer are all marked by their elegiac tone, their stress on the "remembered presence of the dead Chaucer."[20] For Chaucer's immediate successors, he is their master and father whose authority, even after his death, is insurmountable. In a more public sense, he is also a

laureate figure of a literary golden age, a personal connection with whom authorizes and validates his followers' poetic productions. As Lerer has rightly argued, as far as poets cling to the notion of the imaginary coterie built around the instructive and paternal figure of Chaucer, it is impossible for them to overcome their subservient and infantilized position in relation to the great Chaucerian legacy.

This is precisely the dilemma that confronts Colin Clout, another shepherd in the *Calender* who claims personal acquaintance with Tityrus. In the *June* eclogue, he laments over the death of Tityrus in a fashion reminiscent of the fifteenth-century encomia on Chaucer I have just cited:

> The God of shepheards *Tityrus* is dead,
> Who taught me homely, as I can, to make.
> He, whilst he liued, was the soueraigne head
> Of shepheards all, that bene with loue ytake:
> Well couth he wayle hys Woes, and lightly slake
> The flames, which loue within his heart had bredd,
> And tell vs mery tales, to keep vs wake,
> The while our sheepe about vs safely fedde.
>
> Nowe dead he is, and lyeth wrapt in lead,
> (O why should death on hym such outrage showe?)
> And all hys passing skil with him is fledde,
> The fame whereof doth dayly greater growe.
> But if on me some little drops would flowe,
> Of that the spring was in his learned hedde,
> I soone would learne these woods, to wayle my woe,
> And teache the trees, their trickling teares to shedde. (*June*, 81-96)

Colin Clout is a lovelorn shepherd. That the Love of God is so tyrannical as to silence Colin's poetic voice is regretted by Cuddie in the *October* eclogue. It seems to me, however, that another cause of Colin's shrinking inspiration lies in his failure to outgrow his infantile attachment to his dead poetic master. His former relationship with Tityrus is succinctly couched in the word "homely" at line 82, a term which connotes kindness, familiarity, and intimacy. Colin was a member of the family, the classroom, and the pastoral community led by the paternal figure Tityrus. As a leader of such an intimate circle, Tityrus concerned himself with maintaining the communal good. His songs on the theme of the love-sufferings that he himself had experienced offered consolation to lovelorn shepherds, and his narration of "mery tales" cheered them up. That the consolation brought by Tityrus's poetic talent greatly contributed to the good of society is indicated by Colin's remark that while Tityrus was telling tales, "our sheepe about us safely fedde."

Colin, by contrast, is not able to apply his poetic skills to benefiting others. We are informed by Hobbinol in the *April* eclogue that Colin's poetry once performed a public function when he composed an

excellent panegyric on "Queen Eliza." Colin's figure as we see in the *June* eclogue, however, is hopelessly narcissistic. He can derive his poetic inspiration only from the legacy left by Tityrus, or, to borrow Colin's own phrase, the "learned hedde" of his dead master. Moreover, the only way he can put this inspiration to use is to sing of his unrequited love and to make the woods echo his woe. The whole of nature is thus reduced to a Narcissan mirror reflecting Colin's personal grief. What we are witnessing here is a shrinking and narrowing process of the Tityrus tradition. Now Colin can only apply his master's rich legacy to his own personal uses. What is produced is mere replicas of Tityrus's love-complaints transformed into highly introvert expressions. We may be able to see in Colin's poetic sterility Spenser's implicit criticism of one aspect of the Chaucerian inheritance in the late medieval to early modern periods, the aspect represented by a great number of servile and uncreative imitations of Chaucer's love lyrics.[21] Spenser was aware that the convention of pseudo-Chaucerian love lyricism must be renounced in order for him to emerge as a "newe Poet" of his own age.

The final eclogue in the *Calender* opens with the image of Colin sitting alone in the shade, lamenting his unrequited love. We are told again that Colin is one of Tityrus's literary disciples:

> The gentle shepheard satte beside a springe,
> All in the shadowe of a bushye brere,
> That *Colin* hight, which wel could pype and singe,
> For he of *Tityrus* his songs did lere.
> There as he satte in secreate shade alone,
> Thus gan he make of loue his piteous mone. (*December*, 1-6)

Colin's problem is that he is no longer able to apply his skill to any social function as his master Tityrus or he himself in his youthful days did. Colin's failure to duplicate the achievements of his master is suggested by his remark earlier in the *June* eclogue when he says, "pyping lowe in shade of lowly groue, /I play to please my selfe, all be it ill" (71-72).

Significantly, Colin's poetic exhaustion is associated in the *December* eclogue with his awareness that he is already past his prime. Although Colin is relatively young in comparison to Thenot, he shares this old shepherd's excessive fear of temporal decay:

> My boughes with bloosmes that crowned were at firste,
> And promised of timely fruite such store,
> Are left both bare and barrein now at erst:
> The flattring fruite is fallen to grownd before,
> And rotted, ere they were halfe mellow ripe:
> My haruest wast, my hope away dyd wipe. (*December*, 103-8)

We can find in Colin's lament an echo of Thenot's description of the aged oak tree. These two shepherds both voice a pessimistic view of mutability that engenders a nostalgic view of the past. In their imagination, their youth spent with Tityrus is transformed into a golden age in which poetry flourished

under his leadership. Due to this master's death, however, the source of poetic inspiration has dried up. The present age is perceived as poetically "bare and barrein," and concomitantly, Tityrus becomes enshrined as a sacred "God" in his successors' minds.

This atmosphere of nostalgia is occasionally broken by E.K.'s comments. At the moment when Thenot begins his tale-telling, for instance, E.K. interrupts and tells us that "this tale of the Oake and the Brere, he telleth as learned of Chaucer, but it is cleane in another kind, and rather like to Æsopes fables." The tone of E.K.'s voice is alien to the feelings evoked by the shepherds as they fondly recall Tityrus's poetic genius. E.K. is an outsider to the coterie consisting of Tityrus and his followers in the *Calender*'s pastoral world. His voice in his footnotes is that of a textual critic concerned with distinguishing a counterfeit from the original, the spurious from the authentic. The intrusion of his voice places Tityrus in a distant past, and thereby prevents the reader from sharing Thenot's emotional and personal response to the memory of the dead poet.

An implicit critique of Thenot's attachment to his vision of an ideal literary past is also hidden in the subtext of the oak tale. Lynn Staley Johnson has demonstrated that Thenot's description of the decayed oak is based on Du Bellay's poem on the ruins of ancient Rome, which Spenser himself translated fairly early in his career.[22] Spenser's translation of the poem is as follows:

> He that hath seene a great Oke drie and dead,
> Yet clad with reliques of some Trophees olde,
> Lifting to heauen her aged hoarie head,
> Whose foote in ground hath left but feeble holde;
> But halfe disbowel'd lies aboue the ground,
> Shewing her wreathed rootes, and naked armes,
> And on her trunke all rotten and vnsound
> Onely supports herselfe for meate of wormes;
> And though she owe her fall to the first winde,
> Yet of the deuout people is ador'd,
> And manie yong plants spring out of her rinde;
> Who such an Oke hath seene, let him record
> That such this Cities honour was of yore,
> And mongst all Cities florished much more.
>
> (*Ruines of Rome* 28) [23]

Du Bellay himself adapts the simile of the old oak from Lucan's *Pharsalia*, in which Lucan employs this image to portray aging Gnaeus Pompey, who, emptied of his former valor, stands crooked in the shadow of his own great name. In the original text, Lucan directs his sarcasm to the people who make the decayed oak, rather than nearby fresh trees, an object of veneration. When Du Bellay applied the same image to his representation of ancient Rome, the sarcasm toward the "deuout people" paying homage to the hollow idol of the past is turned to himself. Du Bellay was aware that in his veneration for the ancient Roman culture

and his efforts to revive the spirits of Latin authors, there might also be a strain of idolatry, an impulse to idealize and mythologize the past. As Thomas Greene has pointed out, however, this very awareness, his own skepticism about his nostalgia, prevented Du Bellay from falling into naive anachronism, and instead enabled him to establish historical distance from the antiquity he was trying to reconstruct. [24]

Thenot's blindness to the implications of his own narration on the oak tree aligns him with the camp of the "deuout people" criticized by Lucan and Du Bellay. His desperate wish to deny the awful effects of time, combined with his vengeful intention to reprimand and humble proud young Cuddie, gives rise to a naive trust in the sacredness of the ancient oak tree which is utterly devoid of the kind of self-reflection and self-irony we can find in Du Bellay's poem. In Spenser's manipulation of the surface text and subtext in the tale of "the Oak and the Briar" may be detected his implicit criticism of Thenot's and, by extension, Colin's attitudes toward their literary past. From Spenser's viewpoint, their nostalgia is unproductive precisely because it lacks historical imagination. It is symbolic that Thenot's tale is rudely interrupted by impatient Cuddie in the *February* eclogue, and that *The Shepheardes Calender* as a whole opens with Colin's act of breaking his pipe. Their poetic activities must fail in order to give way to Spenser's new poetics.

3.

In E.K.'s argument on the use of Chaucerian language, we find an attitude toward the literary past radically different from the one represented by Colin and Thenot. These two shepherds' recollections of Tityrus are characterized by nostalgic feelings toward the past and the memory of their personal acquaintanceship with the dead poet. In these respects, as well as in their view of Tityrus as a paternal and instructive figure, Thenot and Colin look very much like Chaucer's followers in the fifteenth century. E.K.'s account of Chaucer reveals a great deal of respect for this "Loadstarre" of the English language, but it does not share the memories of cult or coterie fostered in reality by Chaucer's immediate successors and represented figuratively in the shepherds' attitudes toward Tityrus in the *Calender*'s fictional world. For E.K., Chaucer is already unmistakably an "antique" poet, whose verbal artistry, so highly regarded by Lydgate and other fifteenth-century writers, can only be appreciated by someone with a scholarly background, and more specifically, an acute philological sense. By offering a glossary of the Chaucerian vocabulary used in *The Shepheardes Calender*, E.K. implies that he is such a scholar himself. The author of the *Calender* is another such person, and according to E.K., it is precisely Spenser's keen awareness of Chaucer's historicity and his ability to consciously appropriate and manipulate old Chaucerian language that distinguish him as a "newe Poet."

At the beginning of the dedicatory epistle, E.K. compares Chaucer to the "Roman Tityrus Virgile." In this comment, Chaucer, together with Virgil, is defined as a "classical" poet, and thereby sent back to a remote past only recoverable by such humanist techniques as philological analysis and textual criticism. E.K.'s ensuing defense of Spenser's use of Chaucerian language highlights its archaic quality. He says that of many things which may seem strange in *The Shepheardes Calender*, its language will seem the "straungest, the words them selues being so auncient, the knitting of them so short and intricate, and the

whole Periode and compasse of speache so delightsome for the roundnesse, and so graue for the straungenesse."

It is a historical fact that Chaucer's language had already become archaic by Spenser's time. Writing in the late fifteenth to early sixteenth century, Skelton said in the *Phyllyp Sparowe* that the only reservation he had about Chaucer's poems was his English, which "now men would have amended."[25] This fact of linguistic change certainly made it difficult for Spenser to share with Lydgate and other immediate successors of Chaucer their nostalgic fantasy or their sense of belonging to the same literary community with the great master. Spenser was aware, however, that his sense of Chaucer's remoteness could be turned into a strategy for creating a new kind of poetry. Precisely because Chaucer's language sounds so ancient, in a manner similar to Virgil's Latin, it can be exposed to the humanist program of philological recovery. Chaucerian language, having thus been recovered, can then serve as a new literary language that sixteenth-century poets can imitate and appropriate in order to make their writings sound "delightsome" and "graue."

Interestingly enough, E.K.'s defense of Spenser's new poetics bears some analogies with Pietro Bembo's argument in his *Prose della volgar lingua* (published in 1525), in which Bembo promotes the use of Petrarchan language. As Chaucer's language was perceived as archaic by Spenser's contemporaries, Petrarch's language was outdated in Bembo's time. This is demonstrated in the following remark in Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier*, a criticism explicitly directed to Bembo's classicism:

> It is true, of course, that one meets with many words in Petrarch and Boccaccio that have now been dropped from usage. And I for one would never use these either in speaking or writing; nor do I think that they themselves would use them any longer if they had lived into our time. [26]

Bembo's project of making Petrarchan language a standard literary language for his time is motivated by his desire to assign to the vernacular the same kind of cultural value and status that people assign to the Latin language. In his attempt to reach this goal, Bembo analyzes the Italian poems of Petrarch to demonstrate that vernacular writings lend themselves to the same philological and rhetorical methods used in the study of Latin literature. After thus elevating Petrarch to the ranks of classical poets, Bembo claims that Petrarch's language should be regarded as the sole, universal model for imitation, just as Cicero's prose and Virgil's verse are the objects of emulation for many Latin authors in the Renaissance period.

What is particularly appealing to Bembo about Petrarch's style was its "gravità."[27] In defending the use of Chaucerian language, E.K. similarly stresses "gravity" as its most important effect. He argues that "olde and obsolete wordes" bring to the verse "great grace" and "auctoritie":

> For albe amongst many other faultes it specially be obiected of Valla against Liuie, and of other against Saluste, that with ouer much studie they affect antiquitie, as coueting thereby credence and honor of elder yeeres, yet I am of opinion, and eke the best learned are of the lyke, that those auncient solemne wordes are a great ornament both in the one and in the other; the one labouring to set forth in hys worke an eternall image of antiquitie, and the other carefully discoursing

> matters of grauitie and importaunce. For if my memory fayle not, Tullie in that booke, wherein he endeuoureth to set forth the paterne of a perfect Oratour, sayth that ofttimes an auncient worde maketh the style seeme graue, and as it were reuerend. (Dedicatory Epistle, 7-8)

E.K.'s reference to Lorenzo Valla is significant in suggesting Spenser's familiarity with Italian humanists, possibly including Bembo himself.[28] Moreover, E.K.'s citation of Cicero in his argument aligns him with what is called Ciceronianism in humanist controversy, a theory of imitation which "held up the prose of the Roman orator and the verse of the Augustan poets as the highest achievement of Lain letters and the sole, timeless model for imitation."[29] In upholding Cicero's prose and Virgil's verse as the literary standard, and later substituting Boccaccio for Cicero and Petrarch, now the supreme model, for Virgil, Bembo served as one of the most important exponents of Ciceronian classicism.

In addition to the emphasis on "gravity," E.K.'s argument also resembles Bembo's in its stress on the purity of the Chaucerian language that Spenser is trying to reconstruct. E.K. points out that until Spenser attempted to restore Chaucer's vocabulary, these "good and naturall English words" had been "long time out of vse and almost cleane disherited." This, according to E.K.,

> is the onely cause, that our Mother tonge, which truely of it self is both ful enough for prose and stately enough for verse, hath long time ben counted most bare and barrein of both. which default when as some endeuoured to salue and recure, they patched vp the holes with peces and rags of other languages, borrowing here of the french, there of the Italian, euery where of the Latine, not weighing how il those tongues accorde with themselues, but much worse with ours: So now they haue made our English tongue, a gallimaufray or hodgepodge of al other speches. (12)

This argument bears a striking similarity to Bembo's opposition to the use of loanwords. Arguing against Dante's style in the *Divina Commedia*, Bembo says that Dante "would very often use now Lain words, now foreign ones which have not been accepted in Tuscan."[30] In Bembo's view, Petrarch's language, by contrast, is pure, free from any contamination by foreign tongues. It must be noted that this is a deliberate distortion of the reality, since Petrarch's Italian is of a highly composite nature, mixing Provençalisms, Sicilian court usage, Latinisms, archaisms, and even idiosyncratic neologisms.[31] This is also true of Chaucer's English. It consists not only of indigenous English but also of words he borrowed from Latin, French, and Italian, and this very nature of Chaucer's language was the object of admiration for Lydgate, as is revealed by his following remarks in *The Life of Our Lady:*

> And eke my master Chauceris nowe is grave
> The noble rethor Poete of Breteine,
> That worthy was the laurer to have
> Of poetrie, and the palme atteine,
> That made firste to distille and reyne
> The golde dewe droppis of speche and eloquence
> Into oure tounge thourgh his excellence,

And founde the flourys first of rethoryk
Oure rude speche oonly to enlumyne. [32]

E.K.'s argument against the use of foreign loanwords should be considered in the context of the mid-sixteenth-century controversy over the purity of English diction, initiated by humanists at Cambridge and most certainly known to Sidney and Spenser. As early as 1544, Peter Betham says, "I take them best English men which follow Chaucer, and other old writers, in which study the nobles and gentlemen of England are worthy to be praised, when they endeavor to bring again his own cleanness, our English tongue, and plainly to speak with our own terms, as our fathers did before us . . ." [33] What E.K. says about the purity of Chaucerian language owes a great deal to this kind of argument; yet E.K.'s important contribution to the Cambridge controversy is his definition of the use of the "pure" native English as an essential part of the creation of a new literary language for Elizabethan England. In this respect, Spenser's Chaucerianism and E.K.'s advocacy of it greatly resemble Bembo's endeavor to promote Petrarchan language as the standard literary language of contemporary Tuscany under the Medici rulers.

In spite of the number of similarities between the arguments advanced by E.K. and Bembo, what is present in the former and absent in the latter is the insistence on the historicity of the imitated language. Bembo is, of course, perfectly capable of discerning linguistic change, thanks to his training in humanist philology and textual criticism; yet he cautiously excludes this historical awareness in his attempt to elevate Petrarch's language to a timeless ideal. There is indeed a paradox contained in the whole humanist program of Ciceronianism. Although it is an approach to literature deriving from the sense of a rupture between ancient Latin and the corrupt and vulgarized Latin of the Middle Ages, in the process of singling out one ancient author as the universal model, the initial sense of cultural divide yields to the emphasis on the continuity between the model and the imitator. Ironically, the Ciceronian elevation of an ideal classical writer results in a dehistoricizing attitude toward the past, despite its origin in historical relativism. As Thomas Greene argues,

> Although in the *Prose* Bembo recognizes the fact of linguistic change, this does not problematize for him the recommendation to imitate the trecento masters. His stylistic purity remains essentially a synchronic purity; his classicism draws its absolute rigor from the atemporal. There is a revealing passage in the *Prose* that represents the visitor to Rome training his eye by sketching the monuments of antiquity. The extraordinary aspect of this little vignette is the failure to mention the ruinous state of the monuments. For Bembo they are still whole, integral, *present*. [34]

E.K., by contrast, never denies the oldness of the model. While discussing the power of the classical language to present an "eternall image of antiquitie," he admits that Chaucerian vocabulary is "strange" and "obsolete." He goes so far as to say that Chaucerian words are "fittest for such rusticall rudenesse of shepheards, eyther for that theyr rough sounde would make his rymes more ragged and rustical, or els because such olde and obsolete wordes are most vsed of country folke." In this remark can be found no effort to elevate Chaucer's language to a "synchronic purity." On the contrary, E.K. insists on the

discontinuity between Chaucer's English and the sixteenth-century usage. For that matter, it is worth recalling that even in Thenot's naive idealization of the aged oak, there is undeniably a creeping awareness of temporal decay. Unlike Bembo's poetics, that of Spenser is not based on the denial of historical distance.

What is unique about Spenser is his conscious manipulation of Chaucerian archaism as one element in creating a literary form. He acknowledges the strangeness of Chaucer's language and assigns aesthetic values to that strangeness. The "grace" inherent in the opaqueness of Chaucer's old vocabulary is to be fully realized only when it is placed side by side with modern usage. According to E.K.'s explanation,

> nether euery where must old words be stuffed in, nor the commen Dialecte and maner of speaking so corrupted therby, that as in old buildings it seme disorderly and ruinous. But all as in most exquisite pictures they vse to blaze and portraict not onely the daintie lineaments of beautye, but also rounde about it to shadow the rude thickets and craggy clifts, that by the basenesse of such parts, more excellency may accrew to the principall; for oftimes we fynde ourselues, I knowe not how, singularly delighted with the shewe of such naturall rudenesse, and take great pleasure in that disorderly order. Euen so doe those rough and harsh termes enlumine and make more clearly to appeare the brightnesse of braue and glorious words. (8-10)

It may be possible to detect a contradiction in E.K.'s argument here, for his emphasis on the "rough" and "disorderly" nature of Chaucer's language jars with his earlier assessment of it as "stately" words capable of lending grace and authority to Spenser's poem. What is apparent, though, is that an ideal literary language, as Spenser conceives it and E.K. advocates it, consists of the symbiotic coexistence, or harmonious blending, of ancient and modern languages.

This brings us back once again to Thenot's tale of "the Oak and the Briar." We have seen that Thenot's vengeful motive in telling the story causes him to overlook the danger involved in his own naive idolization of the oak tree. Another important moral which does not receive due emphasis in Thenot's skewed narration is the importance of the two trees' cohabitation. The overwhelming presence of the aged oak certainly precludes the young briar's healthy growth. The absolute denial of the oak's beneficial influence, however, results in the briar's self-destruction. As for the oak, its aged, crooked body can never be recovered by the acts of cult and worship. The only way the oak can resist and overcome time's destructive power is to pass down its legacy to posterity by nourishing and fostering younger trees. As I tried to demonstrate in the previous section, this tale can be read allegorically as a story of the inheritance of the Chaucer tradition. The Chaucerian literary past, as represented in the image of the aged oak, is recoverable, not by such memories of coterie and cult as the ones cultivated by Chaucer's fifteenth-century followers, but by the conscious effort to appropriate and incorporate Chaucer's language into modern usage. Since this project requires as its foundation the scholarly appreciation of the historical distance of Chaucerian language, its imitator needs to outgrow a subservient and child-like relation to the great master, and to become himself a "poete laureate" in the sixteenth-century sense of the word as a poet with a humanist education. As we have seen, Spenser's poetics is characterized by its attempts to rehistoricize

Chaucer and to recover his language and style for application in the present national literature. This historicizing process of Chaucer's reception distinguishes Spenser from his fifteenth-century predecessors, in that the use of archaic language not only canonizes the old poet but also, through its dynamic integration with a modern idiom, serves to canonize Spenser as well, as a "newe Poet" of a new literary language.

Notes

1) All the quotations from *The Shepheardes Calender* are from *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*, Vol. 7, *The Minor Poems*, Part 1, ed. Charles Grosvenor Osgood and Henry Gibbons Lotspeich (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943).
2) Geoffrey Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde*, Book 5, ll. 1786-92, 1856-59, in Larry D. Benson, ed., *The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987).
3) Seth Lerer, *Chaucer and His Readers* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993), 39.
4) E.K.'s identity has been the object of scholarly controversy. My position is close to that of Robert Lane, who states that "whomever E.K. may represent, his apparatus is consonant with Spenser's throughout the work, even where that apparatus consists of errors or misleading interpretations." See Robert Lane, *Shepheards Devises: Edmund Spenser's Shepheardes Calender and the Institutions of Elizabethan Society* (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1993), 203, n. 36.
5) Lerer, *Chaucer and His Readers*, 23.
6) Alice S. Miskimin, *The Renaissance Chaucer* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 247.
7) John Lydgate, *Fall of Princes*, Part 1, ed. Henry Bergen, EETS, ES 121 (1924; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), Prologue, ll. 246-52. Lydgate's role in determining the way Chaucer was received in Spenser's time is illustrated by the fact that The Stowe Folio of 1561, presumably the text Spenser used, contains Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes* as a convenient reference book for readers of *Troilus and Criseyde* (Miskimin, *Renaissance Chaucer*, 248). This practice of including the *Thebes* in the collected editions of Chaucer continued until 1687. Lydgate's other works were also much in demand throughout the sixteenth century. His *Fall of Princes* was reprinted in 1554 and 1558, and the *Troy Book* in 1555. For a useful account of Lydgate's popularity in the sixteenth century, see Derek Pearsall, *John Lydgate* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1970), 1-3.
8) John H. Fisher, "A Language Policy for Lancastrian England," *PMLA* 107 (1992): 1168-80, at 1170, 1178.
9) Ibid., 1170.
10) Lerer, *Chaucer and His Readers*, 34.
11) In the *October* eclogue, a shepherd poet, Cuddie, complains that he can only get "sclender prise" for his poems:

> *Piers*, I haue pyped erst so long with payne,
> That all mine Oten reedes bene rent and wore:
> And my poore Muse hath spent her spared store,
> Yet little good hath got, and much lesse gayne. (7-10)

This remark is reminiscent of Lydgate's following stanza in Book 3 of the *Fall of Princes*, where he evokes the past ages in which poets were properly rewarded for their poetic achievements, an ideal world entirely opposite to Lydgate's own literary environment:

> Daunt in Itaille, Virgile in Rome toun,
> Petrak in Florence hadde al his plesaunce,
> And prudent Chaucer in Brutis Albioun
> Lik his desir fond vertuous suffisance,
> Fredam of lordshepe weied in ther ballaunce,
> Because thei flourede in wisdam and science,

Support of princes fond hem ther dispence.

(John Lydgate, *Fall of Princes*, Part 2, ed. Henry Bergen, EETS, ES 122 [1924; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967], Book 3, ll. 3858-64.)

12) Louis Adrian Montrose, "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text," *Literary Theory / Renaissance Texts*, ed. Patricia Parker and David Quint (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 303-40, at 320.

13) On the imitations of Chaucer's love visions by fifteenth-century poets, see Lerer, *Chaucer and His Readers*, 57-84; A.C. Spearing, *Medieval to Renaissance in English Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 59-120. For an account of the inflation of the Chaucer canon in the sixteenth century, see Miskimin, *Renaissance Chaucer*, 226-51.

14) John Lydgate, *The Siege of Thebes*, Part 1, ed. Axel Erdmann, EETS, ES 108 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911), ll. 46-57.

15) Seth Lerer, *Chaucer and His Readers*, 85-93.

16) Harry Berger, Jr., *Revisionary Play: Studies in the Spenserian Dynamics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 418.

17) Lerer, *Chaucer and His Readers*, 148.

18) Thomas Hoccleve, *The Regiment of Princes*, ed. Charles R. Blyth (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1999), ll. 1961-67.

19) John Lydgate, *Troy Book*, Part 2, ed. Henry Bergen, EETS, ES 103 (London: Kegan Paul, 1908), Book 3, ll. 550-52.

20) Lerer, *Chaucer and His Readers*, 152.

21) Chaucer's successors in the fifteenth century frequently voice their anxiety that they could never hope to match their model. As Spearing has noted, this sense of inferiority is succinctly couched in Lydgate's use of the word "counterfeit" for describing his own poetic activities. Spearing cites as an example the following stanza included in Lydgate's *Troy Book*:

> Whan we wolde his [Chaucer's] stile counterfet,
> We may al day oure colour grynde and bete,
> Tempre our aȝour and vermyloun:
> But al I holde but presumpcioun—
> It folwep nat, perfore I lette be.

(John Lydgate, *Troy Book*, Part 1, ed. Henry Bergen, EETS, ES 97 [London: Kegan Paul, 1906], Book 2, 4715-19; cited and discussed in Spearing, *Medieval to Renaissance*, 107.)

22) Lynn Staley Johnson, *The Shepheardes Calender: An Introduction* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990), 69.

23) *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*, Vol. 8, *The Minor Poems*, Part 2, p. 152.

24) Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 225-28.

25) *The Complete Poems of John Skelton, Laureate*, ed. Philip Henderson (London: J.M. Dent, 1931), 82.

26) Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. Charles S. Singleton (New York: Doubleday, 1959), 51.

27) William Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 97-98.

28) Bembo is mentioned twice in Philip Sidney's *Defence of Poesie* as a great patron of poetry. In light of Spenser's connection with Sidney at the time of the *Calender*'s composition, it is conceivable that Spenser was also familiar with Bembo's treatise on vernacular poetry.

29) David Quint, *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature: Versions of the Source* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 6. For accounts of the Ciceronianism, see the first chapter of David Quint's book and the ninth chapter of Thomas Greene's *The Light in Troy* ("Sixteenth-Century Quarrels: Classicism and the Scandal of History").

30) Pietro Bembo, *Prose della volgar lingua*, cited in *Dante: The Critical Heritage, 1314(?) -1870*, ed. Michael Caesar (London: Routledge, 1989), 236.
31) Kennedy, *Authorizing Petrarch*, 84.
32) Cited by D.S. Brewer, "Images of Chaucer 1386-1900," in *Chaucer and Chaucerians*, ed. D.S. Brewer (London: Thomas Nelson, 1966), 246-47.
33) Ibid., 253.
34) Greene, *Light in Troy*, 175.