GOWER'S KNOWLEDGE
OF *POETRIA NOVA*

Masayoshi Ito*

Did Gower know *Poetria Nova* (hereafter *PN*) of Geoffrey Vinsauf? This paper is an attempt to answer this question. This question, besides being simple, may sound as anachronistic or even absurd, for now a long time has passed since J. Murphy in his "A New Look at Chaucer and the Rhetoricians " (*RES*, XV (1964), 1–20) put an end to what he called in it the " Cult of Vinsauf " which had enjoyed a long—more than thirty years '—popularity. Murphy surprised us with his provocative opinion that Chaucer learnt rhetorical devices not from such rhetorical manuals as *PN* and *Ars Versificatoria*, as Manly and his followers believed, but from the grammatical works taught at schools or directly from the contemporary French literature, and he warned us not to overestimate the influence of *PN* upon Chaucer because in England it was only as late as fifteenth century that the influence began to appear. In addition to this, in his doctoral thesis, " Chaucer, Gower and the English Rhetorical Tradition " (Stanford, 1956), Chap. 7, Murphy had also attempted to separate Gower from Vinsauf, and he appears to have had an easy success, since both the researches on Gower's rhetoric and the evidence for Gower's indebtedness to Vinsauf are much less than in the case of Chaucer, and therefore, he had few enemies to fight with.

I

The first full-scale study of Gower's rhetoric was B. Daniels' " Figures of Rhetoric in John Gower's English Works," unpub. Yale diss. (1934), a Gowerian version of what Manly or Naunin

---

* Associate Professor at Shizuoka University.

did with regard to Chaucer. Taking it for granted that Gower
was familiar with *PN*, Daniels showed us the extent to which
Gower used various " colors of rhetoric " in his English works—
Confessio Amantis and *Peace*—with the conclusive remark that
Gower did not swallow the bolus prescribed by Vinsauf, but
made an eclectic use of his instructions with taste and discrimina-
tion. This favorable opinion of Gower was similar to the as-
sessment by Manly of Chaucer's use of rhetoric, and we should
admire Daniels for speaking highly of Gower's art so early, that
is, before the appearance of C. S. Lewis' *The Allegory of Love* (1936).
But after Daniels we have had no significant studies on Gower's
rhetoric, except perhaps M. Wickert's interesting suggestion that
Gower used the contemporary sermon rhetoric in the third book
of *Vox Clamantis*.[1] Now, Murphy's criticism of Daniels' thesis
is not directed to his conclusions but to his proposition that
Gower was familiar with *PN*. It can be summarized like this:
Daniels thinks all the rhetorical colors in *Confessio* and in *Peace*
are derived from *PN*, but this is questionable. It is more likely
that Gower, like Chaucer, learnt them from grammatical books
at school or directly from the French literature which was avail-
able to him. In fact, Daniels' contention that Gower read *PN*
virtually depends on a single proof, the only one phrase from *Vox*
(III, 955–56). Moreover, this phrase is a conventional one and
cannot be considered to have been borrowed from *PN*. After
all, as there is no clear evidence that Gower read *PN*, the whole
argument of Daniels cannot be considered well-founded and con-
vincing.

This argument of Murphy against the influence of *PN* on
Gower will be welcomed by those who have just been persuaded
by his argument on Chaucer's rhetoric, for the former is in a
sense an extention or an echo of the latter. But I cannot quite
agree with him for some reasons. First, Gower was not a
follower of Chaucer and we should warn ourselves against such

---

[1] M. Wickert, *Studien zu John Gower* (Cologne, 1953), Kap. 3.

an assumption or analogy that since Chaucer did not know much about the rhetorical tradition of the day, Gower, a lesser poet, must have been equally or rather more ignorant. We should also remember that Gower wrote in Latin, as Chaucer did not, and that *PN* was primarily a manual for Latin writings. Moreover, in my opinion, the evidence for Gower's acquaintance with *PN* as seen in *Vox* is neither so scanty nor so unreliable as Murphy thinks. And this paper pretends to be a corrective to his somewhat hasty conclusion.

Now, " the only one proof " as Murphy points out is as follows:

> Sic differt Clemens nunc a clemente vocatus,
> Errat et Acephalo nomine nomen habens,
> (*VC*, III, 955–56)
> (So the one now called Clement is far from being clement, and he is wrong in keeping this name, for his name lacks a prefix.)[1]

G. C. Macaulay, editor of *Vox*, was the first to point out the resemblance this couplet bears to the following passage of *PN* :

> Papa stupor mundi, si dixero Papa Nocenti,
> Acephatum nomen tribuam; sed, si caput addam,
> Hostis erit metri. (*PN*, 1–3)
> (Holy Father, wonder of the world, if I say Pope Nocent I shall give you a name without a head; but if I add the head, your name will be at odds with the metre.)[2]

This phrase, " a headless name " and its application to an address to a pope are common to both, although there is a great difference in tone (the former is a blame and the latter is a praise). However, Murphy objects to this assumption for two reasons.

---

[1] All translations of *Vox* are from E. W. Stockton, *The Major Latin Works of John Gower* (Seattle, 1962).

[2] All translations of *PN* are from M. Nims, *Poetria Nova of Geoffrey of Vinsauf* (Toronto, 1967). Other recent translations of *PN* are: Murphy, J. J., ed., *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1971); Gallo, Ernest A., *The Poetria Nova and its Sources in Early Rhetorical Doctrine* (The Hague and Paris, 1971).

One is that the wordplay on *acephalus* was a traditional one going back as early as the patristic period (he cites from Isidore), and the other is that it is to be considered one of many puns on bodily parts scattered through the chapter which the above couplet brings to an end.   Indeed, with this uncertain proof alone we cannot be sure of Gower's reading *PN*.   However, it is also impossible to prove that Gower *did not* read it.   Moreover, Murphy is not correct when he says, " Daniels finds no other allusion to or imitation of Vinsauf (p. 219)," for he overlooks, intentionally or not, another verbal parallelism Daniels points out (p. 83):

> Sic et pastor oues, quas pascere iure tenetur
> Iam vorat, et proprium predat ouile suum.
> <div align="right">(VC, III, 925–26)</div>

(Thus the shepherd devours the sheep which he is bound by right to feed, and he preys upon his own sheepfold.)

> Instar papa boni pastoris ab ore lupino
> Servat ovile suum . . .   (*PN*, 1337–38)

(The pope like a good shepherd guards his fold from the jaws of the wolf.)

Both passages compare a pope to a shepherd and have some resemblance in wording.   The comparison itself was very common in the medieval literature, but it is noteworthy that here we find the same contrast in tone (Gower reproaches and Vinsauf praises) as in the first proof, which, moreover, belongs to the same chapter as this passage does.   In other words, this passage is also a blameful allusion to the cruel, bellicose pope, Clement VII.   Thus, Daniels says:

> Of itself this small likeness would perhaps have little or no significance ; but when it is found in the very same passage in which Gower mentions the " headless name " of the pope, it only confirms the belief that Gower was familiar with the *Poetria Nova* (p. 84).

It is a pity that Murphy overlooked this second proof, and it is more regrettable that Stockton's translation of *Vox*, while

providing us with rich postwar source studies of the work, does not mention it,[1] and that as far as Gower's relationship with Vinsauf is concerned, he is not a step ahead of Macaulay.

II

Nevertheless, these two proofs are not sufficient for us to assert that Gower knew *PN*, for such exact line-length parallelism as to confirm borrowing is lacking in both. But I have discovered a third, surer proof also in *Vox*. The passage and its probable source in *PN* are as follows:

Rebus in aduersis ne laxes frena timori,(a)

Si dolor in mente sit, sine teste dole:(b)

Si dolor incurrat in animum, similacio vultum

Erigat(c), et facies contegat inde metum:(d)

Vultus iocundus timor hostibus est et amicis

Gloria,(e) nam facies nuncia mentis erit.(f)

(Italics and underlines are mine.)

(*VC*, VI, 979–84)

(Do not slacken the reins in adverse times because of fear. If there is grief in your thoughts, grieve privately. If grief assails your spirits, let a feigned appearance cheer your aspect, and let your face hide the fear in it. A happy countenance is a terror to your enemies and a joy to your friends, for the face is the harbinger of the mind.)

Rebus in adversis si laxet frena timori,(a)

Hac opere verborum timido succurre potenti:

. . . .

Si timeas, sine teste time,(b) mentisque timorem

Ignoret facies;(f) quia, si timor intimus ora

Carpit et emacerat, animus jocundior hostem

Nutrit et impinguat, et gaudia suggerit illi

Exsugens tua membra dolor.(e) Consultius ergo,

---

1 He says he has not seen Daniels' dissertation (p. 336).

Masayoshi Ito

Si timor incurvet animum, simulatio vultum
Erigat, (c) et clypeo vultus succurre timori ; (d)
(Italics and underlines are mine.)

(*PN*, 304–15)

(If the timid man should give free rein to fear in time of adversity,
come to his aid with this potent resource of words . . . if you fear,
fear without witness, and let not your countenance know the
fear of your mind ; for if fear in your heart feeds on and wastes
your features, a happier spirit fosters and fattens your enemy;
and the grief that is sucking your limbs dry heaps up joy for
your foe. More advisedly, therefore, if fear casts down your
spirit, let a happy deceit lift up your head, and with the shield
of brave features succour your fear ;)

Gower's passage forms the conclusion of the thirteenth chapter
of the sixth book, in which he advises Richard II to be a brave,
undaunted warrior after the example of his father, Richard the
Lion-hearted. Vinsauf's passage is part of the third example of
" apostrophe " or *exclamatio*, an encouraging speech to a timid
man, which is in turn the fourth of the various devices of ampli-
fication. By the way, the generally—except Murphy—accepted
source of Chaucer's famous passage beginning with " O Gaufred,
deere maister soverayn " (*CT*, VII, 3347–54) closely follows this
passage, being the fifth example of apostrophe.

At first glance we can recognize that the passages of Gower
and Vinsauf have striking resemblances to each other, especially
in the italicized parts (a), (b) and (c). First, in the case of (a),
Gower's line is almost a transcript of Vinsauf's. This can be
explained from the metrical point of view. The verse form of
Vox is similar to that of *PN :* the former is elegiac couplet, that
is, the alternation of hexameter and pentameter, while the latter
is hexameter throughout with the same kind of foot (dactyl or
spondee). And both lines of (a) happen to be hexameter. So,
Gower, in changing the word " sī "—which was required from
the context—chose a metrically equivalent word " nē " so that
the rhythm of the entire line might remain unchanged. The same

can be said of (c). Line 981 of *Vox* and l. 314 of *PN* are again hexameter, and in spite of a few verbal differences they are of the same rhythm as well as of almost the same meaning. In the case of (b), there is less similarity between the two lines, but it tells us more about Gower's art of borrowing. This time Gower had to write a short line (i.e., pentameter) which does not exist in *PN*, so he took only a portion of l. 309 of *PN* and then expanded it into one-line length without changing its meaning. To be precise, he made four words (*dolor in mente sit*) out of one word (*timeas*). This procedure of Gower becomes more interesting when we learn the fact that this technique, i.e., a circuitous expression using not verbs but substantives of the same or a similar sense is recommended later in *PN* (1602 ff.). The case of (d) tells the same story. Writing a pentameter line again, Gower could not borrow the whole line, so he took only its initial word (*Erigat*), and the remainder, i.e., (d), he changed into a different expression of the same import. In doing so he modified the original by means of a plain language, as seen in the change from " clypeo vultus " into " facies ", and this is one of the favorite techniques of Gower in his adaptation of a source, as referred to later. In the cases of (e) and (f), such a close resemblance as in the above cases cannot be seen, but there seems to exist some conceptual likeness. Namely, Gower's reference to the close relationship between the face and the mind (984) may have been suggested by Vinsauf's " mentisque . . . facies " (309–10), and the concept that a feigned countenance of joy is a terror to the enemies (Gower, 983) is perhaps a reversed adaptation of the idea that a fearful countenance makes the enemies cheerful (*PN*, 310–13).

Moreover, it is interesting to note that even some differences in reading between the two passages seem to be negligible. For among various manuscripts of *PN* there are the same or much the same readings as those of *Vox*. First, in the case of (b), among the manuscripts collated by Faral one named *G*, i.e., Glasgow, Hunterian Lib. MS 511, reads " doleas . . . dole " instead of

" timeas . . . time," which is nearer to Gower's " dolor in mente sit . . . dole."   In addition to this, according to Professor Nims' kind and valuable answer to my question on this point, there are at least ten more manuscripts of *PN*—mostly earlier and very good ones, though not mentioned by Faral—containing the same reading as *G*'s.[1]   Next, also in the case of (c), Gower's readings, " dolor," " incurrat," and " similacio," can be found in some manuscripts of *PN*, though concerning the last two, there is less certainty.[2]   It is of course impossible to identify the kind of manuscript Gower might have read since no single manuscript contains all of Gower's readings above.   However, at least we can say that Gower's readings have strong manuscript support, which all the more confirms his knowledge of *PN*.

No proofs hitherto given for Gower's—or even Chaucer's—knowledge of *PN* are clearer than this, to the best of my knowledge.   And the superiority of this proof certainly depends on the fact that *Vox* was written in the same language and in nearly the same verse form as *PN*, and that, as *Vox* was probably the first Latin work for Gower, a kind of literary excercise, he tended to borrow extensively from his literary models including *PN* and

---

[1] Professor Nims points out the following MSS:

i.	Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 406.
ii.	Trinity College, Cambridge, R. 3. 29.
iii.	„ „ „ R. 3. 51.
iv.	„ „ „ R. 14. 22.
v.	Bodleian Library, Oxford, Laud Miscel. 515.
vi.	„ „ „ Digby 104.
vii.	Cathedral Library, York, XVI. Q. 14.
viii.	Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, fonds latin 505.
ix.	Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 144.
x.	Bodleian Library, Oxford, Selden Supra 65.

[2] According to Nims, " dolor " appears in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 406 and in Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, fonds latin 505; " similacio " (or *simulacio, similatio*) is found in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 406 and in Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, fonds latin 8246; " incurrat " is probably the reading in Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, fonds latin 8246.

to follow them so faithfully that the borrowed matter underwent less artistic change than, for instance, in Chaucer.

III

In addition to the above-mentioned three possible borrowings from *PN*, of which the last has just been proved conclusive, there seem to be in *Vox* some other ones.   Although each of them is not so definite a proof as the *rebus-in-aduersis* passage, taken together, they will, I believe, lend a strong support to a contention that Gower knew and used *PN*, and at the same time they will tell us more about his art of borrowing because, so long as they are real borrowings, the further they depart from the source, the more skilfulness of handling is expected to be seen.

The first case occurs in the description of a beautiful woman (V, 79–128).   She is represented as a bad type of woman who snares knights and corrupts them.   It is generally accepted that the whole description is an example of *descriptio* (a kind of amplification) or *effictio* (a kind of *ornatus facilis*), both of which appear among the rhetorical devices in *PN*.[1]   However, no specific sources have hitherto been identified in the work, although Gower's indebtedness to the other literary models has been pointed out.   And in my opinion, Gower's description is partly based on the description of a beautiful woman in *PN* (562–99) given as an example of *descriptio*.

Macaulay was the first to find out the resemblance between *Vox*, 98 and *BD*, 942 and two borrowings: ll. 121–22 taken from *Heroides* (iv, 71–72) and ll. 123–24 from *Fasti* (ii, 763).   Although he does not specify the sources, the borrowings from Ovid are from the descriptions of Lucrece and of Hippolytus.   The postwar source study of *Vox* has made a remarkable progress, and Beichner discovered in this description as many as eight lines taken almost verbatim from the portraits of Absalom and of the Virgin in

---

[1] *PN*, 554 ff.; 1359 ff.

Aurora.[1] Stockton also showed us that two lines (83, 84) are borrowed from Ovid's description of Narcissus (*Met.*, III, 422).[2] Thus, Gower's picture of the beautiful woman can be said a montage made of fragments of famous portraits (not only of women but also of men !) by classical and medieval writers. And I think Vinsauf was also among these contributors. To begin with, we recognize a general resemblance concerning the parts of the body and the manner of their arrangement. In *PN* they are described in this order: hair, forehead, brow, eyebrows and the space between them, nose, eyes, facial complexion, mouth, lips, teeth, the fragrance of mouth, chin, neck, throat, shoulders, arms, hands and fingers, chest, teats, waist, legs, and feet. Gower mentions almost all of these items,[3] although in place of *brows* he mentions *ears*, and with regard to the lower parts he seems to follow not *PN* but rather Chaucer's portrait of Duchess Blanche, in his reference to the woman's skill in dancing and singing (100–103). The order of arrangement is also much the same as in *PN*. It is true that there are a few differences: *nose* follows and not precedes *eyes*, and *shoulders* comes after and not before *hands* and *fingers*. But there are no such radical changes as seen in Chaucer's description of Alysoun, which starts with her *body* and leaps up to her *eyes* (*CT*, I, 3233ff.), or Gower's description of the ugly hag in the *Tale of Florent* (*CA*, I, 1678ff.), where the first reference is to her flat *nose*. There has hitherto been much controversy as to whether or not Chaucer's description of Lady Blanche was based on the above-mentioned model in *PN*.[4] But in my opinion, it resembles *PN* less than Gower's portrait does, and one of the reasons is certainly that Chaucer intended to mingle the outer description

---

[1] P. Beichner, " John Gower's Use of *Aurora* in *Vox Clamantis*," *Speculum*, XXX (1955), 588–89.

[2] Stockton, p. 429.

[3] In Stockton's translation (p. 198) we find no reference to *chin*. This comes from his mistranslation of " menti " (the genitive of " mentum " and not of " mens ") into " of her mind."

[4] Cf. Murphy's dissertation, pp. 158 ff.

with the inner one, that is, to pay due attention to the moral and spiritual excellences of the noble woman.[1] Similarly, the physical description of Amans' love in *Confessio* (VI, 767–90) is not so much faithful to *PN* as the portrait in *Vox* is, in spite of Daniels' opinion that it was surely inspired by *PN* (pp. 138–39).

Between *Vox* and *PN* there are also a number of resemblances in concrete details. First, both describe a blonde woman. Of course, the golden hair was one of the most conventional features of an ideal feminine beauty in the Middle Ages. Yet, what is interesting is that among various synonyms of " hair,"[2] Gower selected the same one as Vinsauf used (i.e., *aurigeros crines* (*VC*, 81); *crinibus . . . auri* (*PN*, 564)). Next, as to the descriptions of *eyes*, there is some resemblance in wording between *oculos qui solis ad instar / Lucent* (*VC*, 83–84) and *radient . . . sideris instar ocelli* (*PN*, 569–70). Thirdly, such traits as "a straight nose," " white, regular teeth," " properly fleshy shoulders," " long, slim arms," are also common to *Vox* and *PN*, though different in expression. Moreover, the following details are strikingly similar: " the fragrance of mouth " (*fragrat et oris odor* (*VC*, 86); *thuris et oris / Sit pariter conditus odor* (*PN*, 577–78)), " a crystalline throat " (*gutture cristalli* (*VC*, 90); *cristallino . . . gutture* (*PN*, 582)), " a snow-white chest " (*niue candidior nitet eius pectore candor* (*VC*, 91); *Pectus, imago nivis* (*PN*, 591)), " soft fingers " (*digitosque / Lanaque nec mollis mollior astat eis* (*VC*, 95–96); *digitos . . . mollis* (*PN*, 588)). These descriptions were probably not so conventional as they appear, for we find none of them in the pictures of Absalom and of the Virgin in *Aurora*, which greatly contributed to the latter half of Gower's portrait, nor in the famous description of Helen by Matthew of Vendôme in *Ars Versificatoria* (Faral, pp. 129–30).

---

[1] Cf. W. Clemen, *Chaucer's Early Poetry*, trans. Sym (London, 1963), pp. 54–57.

[2] For instance, " caesaries " (e.g., in Maximian's *Elegies* or in the description of Absalom in *Aurora*); " coma " (e.g., in the portrait of Helen in *Ars Versificatoria*). The description of the Virgin in *Aurora* has " crinis . . . auri " (Evang. 47), but the portion in which this phrase appears was lacking in the first version of *Aurora*, which, according to Beichner, Gower read.

Thus, we may safely say that Gower depended upon *PN* in his portrait of a beautiful woman in Book V of *Vox*.

According to Daniels, Gower in his English works made extensive use of the rhetorical colors given in *PN*, but there is little trace of his using other devices of a larger scale, such as means of amplification and of abbreviation and structural techniques, for instance, various ways of beginning.[1] However, in my opinion, this is not the case with *Vox*. In fact, there are many examples of amplification, one of which is the just mentioned description of a woman. And there is also a possibility that Gower, at least once, tried to start a story with Vinsauf's instruction in mind. Namely, he seems to have applied to the beginning of Book I the method of beginning a story with an "exemplary image," the sixth of the artistic beginnings recommended by Vinsauf. We find in *PN* the following example:

> *Tristis* ab incauto furit aura sub aere *laeto*.
> *Nubibus* exsudat aer *sole* sereno.
> (Italics mine)   (*PN*, 194–95)
> (Suddenly the grim gale rages under a joyous sky; the murky air pours rain after a sun serene.)

A similar idea is found in Gower:

> Tristia post leta, post Phebum nebula . . .
>   (*VC*, I, 133)
> (Sadness often comes after joys, clouds after Phoebus,)

The italicized words in the quotation from *PN* all appear in Gower with slight differences. It seems to me that Gower took from Vinsauf's lines only the essential contrasts for brevity's sake. And the substitution of " Phebum " for " sole " is a case of *significatio*, as Vinsauf in his *Summa de Coloribus Rhetoricis* explains by the very same example:

> *Significatio* autem est quando per unum significatur aliud, ut . . .
> per " Phoebum " " sol " . . .   (Faral., p. 326)

---

[1] Daniels, pp. 161–62.

It is true, as Stockton says, that the first part of Gower's line (*Tristia post leta*) was probably proverbial, and it is also found in Ovid.[1] But in Ovid it is not followed by the sun-cloud contrast as in Gower, so I think *PN* is probably the source. Moreover, what is significant is that this occurs in the first chapter of Book I, i.e., in the introductory part of the animal allegory of the Peasants' Revolt, the main theme of the book. Thus, Gower is here doing exactly as Vinsauf tells, that is, he is applying the same example given by him to the same situation appointed by him. In fact, Gower's line symbolically heralds the sudden change the rebellion brought about of peaceful and prosperous England into a dreadful battlefield.

In the same chapter of the same book we find another possible borrowing from *PN*:

> Lis tamen ipsa pia fuit et discordia concors,
>
> (*VC*, I, 107)
>
> (The contention was mild, however, and the disharmony harnomious)

This closely resembles Vinsauf's following line:

> Pacificetque suam concors discordia litem.
>
> (*PN*, 843)
>
> (let harmonious discord reconcile their differences)

Vinsauf's line appears in the exposition of *transsumptio* (metaphor), a figurative explanation of the relationship between the tenor and the vehicle, which, he says, should be neither too close to nor too remote from each other. Gower applies the same idea to a different context. It is inserted into the description of a *locus amoenus* which figuratively represents the peaceful England before the rebellion. Namely, in the landscape we see birds and flowers vying with each other in pleasing people with their several songs

---

[1] Stockton, p. 347. Examples in Ovid are: ... *interdum miscentur tristia laetis* (*Fasti*, VI, 463); ... *quae tibi laeta videntur | dum loqueris, fieri tristia posse puta. (Pont.*, IV, iii, 57–58).

and beautiful figures, and on this Gower makes the above comment.

" Discordia concors " or " concordia discors " was, of course, not Vinsauf's invention. It appears as early as in Horace and is even traceable to the philosophy of Empedocles.[1] Moreover, in *Anticlaudianus* of Alanus de Insulis we find not only " discordia concors " but also " pax inimica," which resembles the remainder of Vinsauf's or Gower's line.[2] And Vinsauf may have been influenced by Alanus.[3] But Gower seems to have borrowed not from Alanus but from Vinsauf, since both Gower and Vinsauf employ the same word " lis " (strife) unlike Alanus. Gower here does not follow Vinsauf so closely as in the *rebus-in-adversis* passage, but he simplifies Vinsauf's complicated expression into two pairs of opposites using a parallel structure, and this method is quite the same as that seen in the just mentioned line, *Tristia post leta*, etc. By the way, his fondness for antithesis is one of the most salient features of *Vox*, as I pointed out before.[4]

And there is another antithetical word-pair frequently occurring in *Vox*, which seems to have been borrowed from *PN*. And this time again Gower transplants the borrowed matter into a different soil, that is, he applies Vinsauf's poetical or rhetorical theory to his own social criticism. It is a pair of opposite ideas involving a wordplay, *onus-honos* (or *honor*), appearing four times in *PN* (947, 948, 1880, 1984–85). For instance, Vinsauf comments on *transsumptio*, as follows:

> . . . Haec duo mixta
> Sunt et *honos* et *onus: onus* est transsumere vocem
> Ut decet, est et *honos* cum sit transsumpta decenter.
> (Italics mine)   (*PN*, 946–48)

---

[1] . . . *rerum concordia discors* (Horace, *Epistles*, Loeb Class. Lib., XII, 19 (p. 328)). As to its relationship with Empedocles, see *ibid.*, fn.

[2] I found this phrase quoted without indicating the source in an article.

[3] *PN* was written in 1208–13, shortly after the death of Alanus (1202).

[4] " On the English Translation (by E. W. Stockton) of *Vox Clamantis*," *Bulletin of College of General Education, Tohoku University*, No. 18 (1973), 1–17.

(Two elements combine here, the laudable and the laborious;
to transpose a word aptly is laborious, to succeed in transposing
it aptly is laudable.)

In Gower this paradoxical nature of poetic creation metamorphoses
itself into the ethical principle that honor should be accompanied
by responsibility. Like Vinsauf, Gower frequently uses this con-
trast, and out of the fourteen examples[1] three will be quoted here
for want of space (Italics are mine):

> Dum sit *honor* nobis, nil reputatur *onus*.　　(III, 116)
> (As long as the honor is ours, the shame[2] is not to be thought
> of.)
> Sic *honor* est vacuus, dum vacuatur *onus*,　　(V, 556)
> (Thus their honor is empty, since it is without responsibility.)
> Disce quod omnis *honor oneri* coniunctus adheret,
> Est *onus* in fine maius *honore* tamen:　　(VI, 1131–32)
> (Learn that every honor is closely yoked to a burden, yet in
> the end the burden is greater than the honor.)

CONCLUSION

Speaking, first, of Chaucer's knowledge of *PN*, a number of
proofs have hitherto been attested by many scholars for his bor-
rowing from *PN*, of which two seem to me to be convincing:
one is the above-mentioned apostrophe including the author's
name in *NPT*, and the other is Pandarus' comparison of his
planning to assist Troilus in the matter of love to building a house
(*Troil.*, I, 1065–71). Murphy, however, who tries to deny or at
least minimize the influence of *PN* upon Chaucer, questions even
these doubtless cases.[3] Concerning the first he thinks that
Chaucer took it from one of the fragments of *PN* then circulated

---

[1] III, 116, 569 f., 1003 f., Cap. xv head, 1266, 1341, 1765 f., 1769 f., 1778; IV, 947;
V, 556　656–62; VI, 1131 f., 1175 f.

[2] " Shame " seems a little inadequate (the same word appears in the translation of
onus in I, 1748). " Burden " or " responsibility " would be preferable.

[3] Murphy, "A New Look," 12–15.

separately, for instance, the one contained in *Annales* of Trivet whom Chaucer knew well, and that consequently Chaucer's knowledge of *PN* was secondhand. The second proof, which bears a striking verbal resemblance to *PN* (43–45), is also doubted by Murphy who says that the image of building a house was a conventional one as seen in the Bible and Boethius.

Compared with the case of Chaucer, the evidence for Gower's indebtedness to *PN* has hitherto been much less both in amount and in reliability. The generally accepted proof is the only one couplet in *Vox*, including a wordplay on the name of a pope (III, 955–56), first suggested by Macaulay, editor of *Vox*. Besides, it shows no definite sign of borrowing. What is worse, Gower never mentioned Vinsauf in his entire works, as Chaucer did. Such being the case, Murphy found it easy to construct his argument against Gower's knowledge of *PN*. Daniels claims to have found another proof also in *Vox*, which Murphy overlooks. But it is no less inconclusive than the first proof.

In this paper I have attempted to recover the lost relationship between Gower and Vinsauf, by pointing out a third, surer proof in the same work of Gower. Judging from the striking resemblances both verbal and conceptual, Gower evidently based part of his advice toward Richard II recommending courageousness (VI, 979–84) on one of the examples of apostrophe given in *PN* (304–15). It is very likely that Gower took it directly from the work since that example, unlike the one Chaucer probably borrowed into *NPT*, is included in none of the four fragmentary editions of *PN* that Faral lists.[1] Moreover, we can find in *Vox* several other possible borrowings from different parts of *PN*, which seem to corroborate Gower's firsthand knowledge of it.

R. Payne, in his " Chaucer and the Art of Rhetoric,"[2] shows himself as against Murphy, as far as Chaucer is concerned. He

---

[1] Faral, P. 28. The passages edited in this way are: ll. 368–430; ll. 326–66; ll. 625–65; ll. 2081–116.

[2] B. Rowland ed., *Companion to Chaucer Studies* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 54 f. By the way, I cannot understand what is meant by Payne's remark, " Gower's attempt to sum-

speaks of Murphy's " historicist's fallacy," thinking that even if the common people of his age could have learnt rhetoric only through grammatical books at school, such a great poet as Chaucer must have had more sources to draw from. This opinion is basically the same as Manly's, I think. Regarding Gower's knowledge of rhetoric, however, Payne's attitude is ambiguous. But judging from his remark that Gower did not know anything about Boccaccio, it seems that he is inclined to class him with the commons, and to give a tacit consent to Murphy's unfavorable view of Gower that he did not know *PN*. However, we must not treat Gower with any discrimination, and we should remember that in *The Kingis Quair* he stands on " the equal steps of rhetoric " with Chaucer.[1] In my opinion, Gower, who wrote a number of Latin works, knew *PN*—primarily a manual for Latin writings— as well as or possibly better than Chaucer.

But then, where and when could Gower have access to *PN*? It would be almost despairing for me to find an answer. However, there is a very suggestive remark in the introduction to *Aurora* edited by Beichner.[2] According to him, in Durham Cathedral Library there was a manuscript of *Aurora* in Chaucer's time, in which a manuscript of *PN* was contained. Namely, the catalogue of books of the library dated 1391 runs thus:

> Biblia versificata, seu liber Petri in Aurora . . . Et in eodem libro continentur Nova Poetria Galfridi Anglici qui vocatur Papa Stupor Mundi.

Now, *Aurora* was one of Gower's most favorite books at least when he wrote *Vox*. As Beichner suggests, he must have had a manuscript of it at his elbow, incessantly consulting it as occasions required it, and in fact he made extensive borrowing from it.

---

marize a specific source (Geoffrey of Vinsauf)." If it refers to Gower's discussion on rhetoric in Book VII of *Confessio Amantis*, " a specific source " must be Brunetto Latini instead of Vinsauf.

[1] Referred to in Daniels, p. 9.

[2] Beichner ed., *Aurora* (Notre Dame, 1965), p. xxix.

Interestingly enough, Murphy adduces this Durham manuscript of *PN* to verify the paucity of rhetorical books in the fourteenth-century English libraries (which, he thinks, is in turn a good proof for the paucity of rhetorical knowledge of Chaucer or Gower), saying that this manuscript is the only copy of *PN* he has ever been able to identify in the catalogue of such a library.[1] But he overlooks the suggestive fact that its " companion piece " was *Aurora*, Gower's companion to his writing *Vox*. And if Gower was acquainted with *PN* in this kind of manuscript (St Mary Overey Church—now Southwark Cathedral—in which Gower wrote *Vox* could have supplied him with one), all the statistics leading to the denial of Gower's knowledge of the rhetorical work would fail.

<div align="right">Received September 4, 1974</div>

---

[1] Murphy's dissertation, pp. 131 ff.