of the many complexities which attend such lucid expositions of medieval themes as are given in the notes, and to provide an account of the whole field as simple as it is informative. Certain topics, however, one could wish to have been touched on or examined more fully. We have some knowledge (not much, it is true) about the sort of music for which some of these lyrics (no. 1, for example, the *cantus beati Godrici*) were composed, and such a general survey as this would have been an appropriate place for an appeal to the musicologists for more help on this matter. Then, too, though the editor laudably refrains from presenting those worn-out theories about the derivation of mediaeval poems of divine love from secular courtly models which are still being repeated in other surveys of the period, his treatment of the origins and development of songs of *amour courtois* is compressed to the point of inadequacy.

But these are all minor criticisms of a book which both beginner and specialist can read with enjoyment and profit. Perhaps its real achievement is to make some of us for the first time aware that the want, which it supplies, of a popular introduction to the wealth of medieval English lyrics has existed, unsatisfied, for so long.

ERIC COLLEDGE

FRUYT AND CHAF, Studies in Chaucer's allegories, by B. H. Huppé and D. W. Robertson; Princeton U.P./O.U.P.; 36s.

More recent scholarship has disturbed old generalisations about Chaucer. No one now would repeat epithets like *naif*, or *unsophisticated*, which were once freely used of him. In fact it was the critics who were unsophisticated when they undertook to estimate and 'explicate' a poet of another age according to the artistic conceptions and conventions of their own. Chaucer has now for some time been established as a highly accomplished artist, precisely aware of the extent of his own use and disuse of the literary principles and devices of his day. Professors Huppé and Robertson go still further and, following the lines already opened up by their earlier work on Langland and on Chaucer himself, attribute to him in this book an even overflowing measure of that 'high seriousness' which Matthew Arnold denied him altogether. In his own words of another he is full of 'hy sentence', of profound and pious meaning.

The two authors have not rested content with Geoffrey de Vinsauf's exposition of the colours of rhetoric; they have pursued their researches into the literary views of the theological, liturgical, and Biblical writers who played as important a part in conditioning the minds of Chaucer's times as the popularising scientists do in conditioning the minds of the men in the street of today. It appears that if their methods of serious exegesis be systematically applied to Chaucer's allegories—this book treats only of the *Book of the Duchess* and the *Parliament of Fowls*—they will yield an almost alarming abundance of instruction.

The book contains a wealth of reference which would certainly seem to

establish that account must be taken of these sources in any further discussion of Chaucer's meaning and intention. In particular, the treatment of the *Book of the Duchess* in this light suggests an interesting relation between the figure of the Duchess and Dante's Beatrice, while the comment on the *Parliament* attributes to it a teaching which is certainly consistent with what appears from the so-called Marriage Group of the *Canterbury Tales*.

And yet, this interesting book is not wholly convincing. If all its proof be accepted it proves too much. It creates a figure psychologically different from that poet who records his own dialogue with the eagle in the *House of Fame*, and who made the Host of the *Canterbury Tales* describe him as seeming 'elvish of his contenaunce'.

M. PAULINE PARKER, I.B.V.M.

COURTLY LOVE AND CHRISTIANITY, by Kenelm Foster, O.P. (Aquinas Paper No. 39); Aquin Press; 2s 6d.

The theological voices of the twelfth century give a general impression of hard feelings when it comes to affairs of the heart. Peter the Venerable stands out as a rare figure in his acceptance of the Abelard-Heloise situation. More typical is Saint Bernard, who thought nothing of breaking all kinds of emotional ties in order to get postulants for Cîteaux, while Hugh of St Victor felt obliged to put the relationship of Mary and Joseph into the very centre of his marriage theology. William of St Thierry speaks of his *schola charitatis* as the exact antithesis of the courts of love when he says 'Here (in the monastery) the study of love is pursued, and love's disputations held, love's questions answered . . . ' His idea of a 'natural' love is the one that follows its 'natural bent towards God', while flesh is synonymous with corruption. As Emile Mâle says, 'pour le moine, la femme est presque aussi redoubtable que le démon'. And so, bearing all this in mind, it is interesting and important that a cleric in the 1180's should set down in so many words the reasons why Queen Eleanor thought that young men make better lovers than old ones.

Having always been rather baffled by the *de Arte Honeste Amandi* of Andreas Capellanus, I feel extremely grateful to Fr Kenelm Foster for uncovering some of the layers of highly unexpected thinking that explain the goings-on at the courts of love. It wasn't that one disbelieved Andreas when he claimed to be reporting verbatim what Marie de Champagne said, and how Queen Eleanor backed her up ('We dare not oppose the opinion of the Comtesse de Champagne!'). It was just very difficult to see why they were so intent on laying down who may make love to whom, as if they all had dreadful scruples about what was non-u. Where, one wondered, did they get the rules for this prissy game of love, 'carefully controlled and directed by reason', with *mizura* so exalted and passion so played down? The ladies clearly felt a need to justify themselves, and so, possibly, did Andreas. This was an age of dynastic marriages,