Chaucer and Pronominatio

Chaucer and *Pronominatio*

Amanda Holton
University of Reading

Pronominatio, or *antonomasia*, is the replacement of a proper noun with another noun or adjective or a periphrastic formulation, such as 'Cristes mooder' for Mary.[1] I apply the term only when the reader needs some knowledge outside the immediate context in order to understand the reference and when the name itself is not given at all in surrounding lines. [2] *Pronominatio* is a fairly common figure in classical and medieval literature, and Chaucer encountered it in a number of his sources; indeed this article, while it focuses on Chaucer's practice, also indicates how it is used in a range of his sources and analogues. The figure is discussed in various classical and medieval rhetorical manuals, featuring, for example, in the *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* and in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*.[3] Chaucer's own use of it as a freestanding figure is sparse, highly selective and often pointed, and reveals mixed feelings about its potential, for he is very conscious of how it can express both grandeur and pomposity, splendour and insincerity. After discussing Chaucer's preferred methods of denoting people and places, this article examines how his use of *pronominatio* relates to his response to Virgil, and, by extension, how he uses the figure as a marker of epic style in several texts. It then demonstrates how he exploits its more negative possibilities when denoting Diomede in *Troilus and Criseyde* and Mary in the *Prioress's Tale*.

On the whole Chaucer shows a strong preference for simple and direct naming, and will often reject *pronominatio* even when he encounters it in a source he otherwise favours stylistically. He

tends to name all of the characters he is going to name unambiguously and early. A brief examination of the openings of two of the stories in *The Legend of Good Women* exemplifies this. The Legend of Hypsipyle, based on Guido delle Colonne's *Historia,* begins:

> In Tessalie, as Guido tellith us,
> There was a kyng that highte Pelleus,
> That hadde a brother which that highte Eson
> [...]
> Of which Eson this Jason geten was[.]
> (1396-8, 1402)

This nominative clarity is typical of Chaucer, and in this instance it has a direct counterpart in Guido, who shared Chaucer's taste for nominative explicitness.[4] Guido introduced the characters and places in precisely the same way, with Chaucer's emphasis on specific naming ('highte') clearly sourced in Guido's 'nomine':

> In regno Thesalie [...] regnabat tunc temporis rex quidam iustus et nobilis nomine Pelleus [...] habuisse quendam fratrem Hesonem nomine [...] Ex hoc [...] Hesone supererat quidam natus, Iason nomine.[5]

Yet even when working with a very different source-text, one which favours indirect references to people, Chaucer makes alterations to avoid periphrastic naming and to bring actual names to the forefront. Here is the beginning of the Ovid-based Legend of Hypermnestra:

> In Grece whilom weren brethren two,
> Of whiche that oon was called Danao
> [...]
> Among his sones alle there was oon

> That aldermost he lovede of everychoon.
> And whan this child was born, this Danao
> Shop hym a name and callede hym Lyno.
> That other brother called was Egiste
> [...]
> Of whiche he gat upon his ryghte wyf
> A doughter dere, and dide hire for to calle
> Ypermystra, yongeste of hem alle.[6]

Again there is a strong emphasis on verbs of naming: 'called', 'shop hym a name', 'callede', 'dide hire for to calle', but this time Chaucer's version is markedly different from the source. In Ovid's version in *Heroides* XIV, there are no names at all in the first fourteen lines, simply nouns like 'fratribus' ('brothers', 1), 'pater' ('father', 9) and 'vir' ('husband', 12).[7] In the narrative as a whole, Lynaeus is referred to as 'Belide' ('[grand]son of Belos') at 73 and not given his full name until 123, and Juno is 'ipsa Iovis coniunx' ('Jove's wife herself') at 28, while Aegyptius (Chaucer's Egiste) is never named, being referred to indirectly as 'socer' ('father-in-law', 24). It is telling that Chaucer has confused the figures of Danaus and Aegyptus, making Danaus Lynaeus' father and Aegyptus Hypermnestra's, where in Ovid it is the other way round. It has been suggested that Chaucer may have been following a mistake in a commentary such as Lactantis Placidus' *Commentarius in Statii Thebaida* or an Italian translation of the *Heroides*;[8] this may be the case, but Ovid's obliqueness about names would account for confusion in itself, and it is precisely this kind of unclear denotation Chaucer himself is rigorously careful to avoid. Something very similar happens in *The House of Fame*. In his re-telling of the *Aeneid*, Chaucer comments on Aeneas' 'yonge sone Iulo,/ And eke Askanius also' (177-8), apparently thinking that Iulus and Ascanius are different people where in fact they are, of course, variant names for the same character. This confusion can be ascribed to Chaucer's own drive to assign a single name to a character and then stick to it, and,

perhaps, to a default assumption that his classical sources do the same.

Thus Chaucer has a strong taste for clear direct naming and is wary of being tempted into use of *pronominatio* and other indirect methods of denotation even when he is offered them by a source he generally favours as strongly as Ovid. However, despite his strong tendency to avoid solely periphrastic naming, there are various remarkable exceptions.

Firstly, Chaucer shows an unusual hospitality to the figure when he is working with Virgil. Virgil himself is particularly fond of nominal periphrases and of their more etiolated siblings, those periphrases which have lost their strength through convention: 'Cytherea' (literally 'the Cytherean one') for Venus, for example (instances include *Aeneid* I, 257 and 657).[9] The ubiquity of these ailing periphrases, which include many patronymics among their number, creates large numbers of synonyms for people and places; Troy, the Trojans and places or items associated with them, for instance, are, in the *Aeneid*, variously named 'Danaum' (I, 96; 'Troy'), 'Iliacis [...] campis' (I, 97; 'Trojan plains'), 'Lycios' (I, 113; 'Trojans'), 'Phrygias[...] biremis' (I, 182; 'Trojan galleys'), 'Pergama' (I, 651; 'Troy'), as well as 'Laomedonteae [...] gentis' (IV, 542; 'Laomedon's race'), and of 'domus Assaraci' (I, 284; 'house of Assaracus'). And although in most respects Virgil's poetic style leaves little trace on Chaucer's work, his heavy use of *pronominatio* makes an impression on Chaucer and his own style, as we will see.

A relationship between Virgil and the use of *pronominatio* is clearly visible in *The House of Fame*. As the narrator walks around in the temple of glass in his dream, he comes across 'a table of bras' (142), on which is engraved a translation of the opening of the *Aeneid*:

> I wol now synge, yif I kan
> The armes and also the man
> Tht first cam, thurgh his destinee,

> Fugityf of Troy contree,
> In Itayle, with ful moche pyne
> Unto the strondes of Lavyne. (143-8)

This follows the famous opening of Virgil's poem very closely, keeping to its pure *pronominatio* as a means of identifying Aeneas:

> Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
> Italiam, fato profugus, Laviniaque venit litora[.][10]

So far, so straightforward: given how well-known the lines are, and given the fact that this attempts to be a literal translation, the adherence to Virgil's *pronominatio* is not particularly surprising. However, Chaucer's use of indirect naming at the beginning of the poem overspills this patch of direct translation, for in line 158 we find, most unusually in Chaucer, a variant name for Troy in the reference to 'How Ilyon assayled was'. The effect is to capture and reproduce Virgil's high style in its own terms as an appropriate rhetorical medium for the epic story of Aeneas.

This association between Virgil and an unusually high Chaucerian use of *pronominatio* is continued in *The Legend of Good Women* in the Legend of Dido. Here we find Aeneas asking the suspiciously divine-looking huntress he meets to confirm that she is 'Phebus syster' (986), namely Diana (she is in fact his mother, Venus). Similarly, when Dido first sees Aeneas, she asks, without mentioning his name, 'Be ye nat Venus sone and Anchises?' (1086); Aeneas is referred to only as 'the Troyan' on several occasions (1172, 1211, 1265), and, what is more, as in *The House of Fame*, Chaucer uses a variant name for Troy here, 'Ylioun' (936), where usually he will choose one name and then stick to it. This difference from his normal practice clearly reflects the influence of Virgil – not of Ovid, the other source for the Legend, despite the fact that Ovid also uses *pronominatio* in his Dido-story,[11] for in other Ovid-sourced texts the same hospitality

to periphrastic naming is not visible. Virgil appears to have little stylistic impact on Chaucer, and so this particular point of clear influence is worth noting as an exceptional element of closeness and a susceptibility to Virgil's practice.

What might Chaucer's unusually heavy use of the figure when in proximity to Virgil signify? Crucially, if the *Aeneid* is taken as a model of high style, of epic grandeur, then Chaucer's retention of the figure may simply point to his implicit recognition of it as a marker of that high style. This is further supported by one of the ways Chaucer uses *pronominatio* in *Troilus and Criseyde*.

If *pronominatio* can evoke elevated style suitable for epic, it is not surprising that it finds a home more comfortably and uncontroversially in *Troilus* than in all of Chaucer's other works, although the figure is still used, on balance, extremely sparingly in this long poem. For the most part it is used here for classical deities of love. We find 'god of love' for Cupid several times in the poem (I, 15, 206, 421, 932; II, 1565, for instance). This is so conventional a term and spaced so unintensely, however, that it is unobtrusive. The same is true of some of the material involving Venus. 'Cipride' for Venus is used by Troilus (III, 725, in an attack of panic amidst Pandarus preparing for the consummation scene), Criseyde (IV, 1216, on coming round from the faint which results from the shock of discovering she must leave Troy) and the narrator (V, 208, reporting Troilus' grief-stricken speech after Criseyde has left Troy).[12] Again, as with use of 'god of love' for Cupid, these instances of 'Cipride' are sufficiently widely spaced to avoid any sense of rhetorical flourish. It is noteworthy, however, that they do all occur in emotionally-loaded contexts and as part of invocations, prayers or formal curses. (Similarly, 'Cipris' in *The House of Fame* occurs as part of an invocation in the proem to Book II.)[13]

However, there is also more intense use of *pronominatio* in connection with Venus. This is found at the beginning and end of Book III. The proem, which is a full 49 lines long, is largely an invocation to Venus, who is not named until line 48, and Venus'

identity is initially established instead by a cluster of instances of *pronominatio*:

> O blisful light, of which the bemes clere
> Adorneth al the thridde heuen faire;
> O sonnes lief, O Ioues doughter deere [...]
> (III, 1-3)

Her identity emerges clearly here despite the fact that she is not directly named. Venus is the planet of the third sphere, she is the sun's love because she moves with it through the sky, and she is, of course, Jove's daughter. What is special about the use of *pronominatio* here is its open-throated stylistic appropriateness. The invocation to Venus as a whole is taken unproblematically from *Il Filostrato*, where the passage appears as part of Troiolo's song, but its re-siting at the head of a book gives it a more weighty status and a new grandeur. Within this context, the initial uses of *pronominatio*, which have a close analogue in Boccaccio,[14] help to forge the high style characteristic of the proems in *Troilus* and are entirely fitting in an epic romance. The end of Book III uses the same technique to the same effect: when the narrator bids goodbye to his various muses, Venus is addressed not by name but solely by the *pronominatio* 'Thow lady bright, the doughter to Dyone' (1807), clarified indirectly by the following line, 'Thy blynde and wynged sone ek, daun Cupide'. Thus Book III, the heart of the poem, is framed by *pronominatio* for Venus, which both conjures high style and highlights the centrality of the majesty of love in the Book.

Neither is this the only time *pronominatio* is used in this kind of position. The only time Troilus himself is named through *pronominatio* is also in a passage at the very beginning of a book, this time to Book V, where he is denoted solely as 'sone of Ecuba the queene' (12). Although the first two stanzas of this Book are not strictly speaking a proem, nevertheless, as Windeatt notes,

they are in the 'grand manner',[15] and this is partly constructed by the use of *pronominatio*.

There is one significant area in which *pronominatio* is used in *Troilus* for an effect other than straightforwardly conjuring high style, however, and this concerns the denotation of Diomede. He is named as 'the sone of Tideus' at V, 88 and 1746; this is not in itself a large number, to be sure, but it is a high proportion of *pronominatio*-namings given how little of the text is devoted to him: his actual name is used 29 times as compared to Troilus', which is used 246 times. Hence proportionally Diomede is referred to via *pronominatio* over seventeen times more often than Troilus is. There are several suggestive possibilities for this. Firstly, there is irony in the use of a potentially high-style figure to denote the most debased character in the story. Secondly Diomede is a cunning and exploitative man whose thoughts and words do not match: his ingratiating and bullying words are rarely unaccompanied by an account of his real thoughts, and the imagery associated with him clarifies his nature as predator: famously he ponders

> With al the sleghte and al that euere he kan,
> How he may best with shortest tarying
> In-to his net Criseydes herte bryng.
> To this entente he koude neuere fyne;
> To fisshen hire he leyde out hook and lyne.
>
> (V, 773-7)

Pronominatio is a figure of doubleness, and hence potentially of deceit, and as such it can be exploited to reinforce the sense of Diomede's sinister duplicity. Thirdly, the periphrasis 'sone of Tideus' necessarily recalls Diomede's father.[16] This is strengthened by the fact that the name Tydeus occurs a total of nine times in Book V of *Troilus*,[17] partly as a result of Cassandra's decoding of Troilus' dream of the boar. Tydeus was a successful warrior, certainly, but his violence extended beyond honourable

battle: he was a vicious murderer, in some stories killing his uncle, in others his brother, in others many men. His own death is dishonourable as well as gruesome: having killed one of his enemies, he breaks open the dead man's head and sucks out his brains, an act which (understandably) so disgusted Athena that she refrained from giving him the immortality she had planned to grant. The element of unmotivated brutality possessed by Tydeus sheds an unfortunate light on his son Diomede, an effect which is subtly constructed by Chaucer through the use of *pronominatio*.

Furthermore, because *pronominatio* is a periphrastic figure, it has the potential for evasiveness. One strand of the narrative voice in *Troilus* goes to some lengths to obliterate the objectionable Diomede from the text as far as humanly possible to avoid the almost unbearable subject of Criseyde's betrayal and its conniving catalyst. Hostile to the necessity of representing Diomede at all, the narrator abruptly curtails reporting of his speech:

> What sholde I telle his wordes that he seyde?
> He spak i-nough [...] (V, 947)

And the use of *pronominatio* to refer to him can be seen as a rhetorical strategy to further that sense of distaste and evasion.

So far I have been discussing texts which make limited, if telling, use of *pronominatio*. I will now turn to another text which shows a strikingly emphatic and sustained use of the figure. This is the *Prioress's Tale*, a miracle of the Virgin Mary, which is packed with indirect stand-alone denotations of Mary.[18] Within nine lines of the opening of the Prologue we launch into an extended encomium consisting of an intense series of instances of *pronominatio*. At no stage in the Prologue is her name given:

> Wherfore in laude, as I best kan or may,
> Of thee [Christ], and of the white lylye flour
> Which that the bar, and is a mayde alway,

> [...]
> For she hirself is honour and the roote
> Of bountee, next hir Sone, and soules bote.
>
> O mooder Mayde! o mayde Mooder free!
> O bussh unbrent, brennynge in Moyses sighte,
> That ravyshedest doun fro the Deitee,
> Thurgh thyn humblesse, the Goost that in th'alighte
> [...]
> O blisful Queene [...][19]

This anticipates *pronominatio*'s contribution to the Tale itself. In the Tale we find 'blisful Mayden free' (664), 'our blisful Lady free' (532), 'Oure Lady' (543), and, most frequently, 'Cristes mooder' (506, 538, 550, 556, 597, 656, and 678), 'Oure blisful Lady, Cristes mooder deere' (510), 'Crist [...] his mooder, honour of mankynde' (618-9), and 'his Mooder deere' (654). The intense rhetorical focus on Mary's maternity provided by the heavy use of freestanding *pronominatio* stresses the theme of motherliness in the Tale. There is obviously an implied parallel between Mary/Jesus and mother/murdered child in the story. Both women experience the deaths of innocent and pious sons. Both Jesus and the murdered child are curiously fatherless, the 'clergeon' (503) being a 'wydwes sone' (502). The child is a 'martir [...] folwynge evere in oon/ The white Lamb celestial' (579-81), and is killed by the Jews. The entire slant of the story is maternal, and the idea that the Chaucerian text is specifically focused in this way is supported by the fact that where there is *pronominatio* in the analogues (of which more below), it rarely denotes Mary in terms of her maternity. The heavy use of the word 'mooder' also constructs a morbidly ironic play between '[m]ordre' (576) and 'mooder', a play possible in English but not Latin (the language of most of the analogues), where the equivalent would be the more distant 'mater' and 'mors'.

It is only at the very end of the Tale that a less indirect denotation is finally yoked to Mary's name. The Tale ends:

> Preye eek for us, we synful folk unstable,
> That of his mercy God so merciable
> On us his grete mercy multiplie,
> For reverence of his mooder Marie. Amen. (687-90)

For the first time and finally her name is given, stamped as the final rhyme word of the Tale. This sudden nominal resolution is curious, and perhaps reflects a release of the pressure on the parallel between Mary and the Tale's 'wydwe': now that the 'clergeon' is finally comprehensively dead, the parallel between him and Jesus and between his mother and Mary disintegrates, and the naming of the latter points up the separateness of the two women.

This marked stylistic feature of the *Prioress's Tale* is highly distinctive in the context of Chaucer's works, even if it is not unparalleled in other medieval religious writing.[20] There is not a single instance, for example, in any of the five preceding tales, those of the Squire, Franklin, Physician, Pardoner, or Shipman, which together make up some 3000 lines. The *Prioress's Tale*, together with its Prologue, is a mere 239 lines long. A useful comparison can be made with the hagiographical *Second Nun's Tale*, the story of St Cecilia. Interestingly the Prologue to this Tale, with its 'Invocatio ad Mariam' has much in common with that of the Prioress, and indeed the Prioress's version may be based on the Second Nun's.[21] The Second Nun's Prologue, with its Marian invocation and lengthy *interpretatio* of Cecilia's name, suggests a fixation on naming, the significance and evolution of names and ways of denoting, but nevertheless the Tale itself is not characterised by use of the figure and in this respect is completely different in technique from the *Prioress's Tale*.[22]

Although Chaucer's precise source for the *Prioress's Tale* is unknown, there are a number of analogues, and as regards

pronominatio, these texts bear an interesting relation to Chaucer's. None of those from the group which most closely resembles Chaucer's version shows equivalent taste for the figure, and those texts which pre-date his use the figure particularly lightly.[23] This indicates that he was not influenced into his use of the figure by a stylistic tradition fused with this particular story. However, the later an analogue is, the more likely it is to use it, those texts contemporary with and post-dating Chaucer (C5 on) using it with increasing frequency, although none matches Chaucer's extreme discrepancy between number of instances of *pronominatio* and number of direct denotations.

The fact that the *Prioress's Tale* differs both from many of its analogues and from the other saint's life in the *Canterbury Tales* shows that this stylistic habit is not inseparably characteristic of either the specific story-tradition or of genre, or indeed of Chaucer's own take on the genre. Benson remarks of the *Prioress's Tale* and the *Second Nun's Tale* that '[a]s becomes increasingly apparent when the tales are read together, Chaucer is once again exploring the possibilities of a form',[24] and the way *pronominatio* is used in the *Prioress's Tale* (but not the *Second Nun's*) is one of the markers of how the tales follow very different trajectories within the same form.

This being the case, we might consider relating the distinctive use of *pronominatio* in this particular participant in the genre to its teller. The Prioress as pilgrim has attracted consistent interest among critics, and her personal characteristics have often been identified with her Tale, either to positive or negative effect: Kittredge[25] regards the Tale as an 'infinitely pathetic legend' (p. 177) which is a very natural choice for the Prioress, with 'her gentleness and sweet dignity' (p. 176) the most 'sympathetically conceived' of all the pilgrims (p. 175), with her table-manners 'the perfection of mediæval daintiness' (p. 177). Others see a rather less flattering portrait; Chauncey Wood, for example, concludes of the *General Prologue* portrait that Chaucer 'has been at some pains to portray a completely failed ecclesiast', denying that 'there

is something delightful, amiable or charming in her failure as a nun'.[26] If we take Kittredge's line, we might interpret the Prioress's use of *pronominatio* as a sign of her humility and delicacy in its reluctance to name the holy directly, and we might see in her rhetoric an innocent dainty decorativeness which dovetails with her table-manners while stressing the decorous nature of her devotion. If, however, we extend Wood's observations of the Prioress into an examination of the style of her Tale, we might interpret its heavy use of *pronominatio* as a sign of a completely trivial concern with surfaces and rhetorical curlicues, as a coy, inappropriate and mealy-mouthed evasiveness and refusal to engage deeply with the full implications both of her faith and her story. From this point of view, the connection between the Prioress and *pronominatio* can be likened to Diomede's connection with the figure: although she may not be deliberately deceptive and conniving in the same way as Diomede, nevertheless the Prioress shares with him a lack of healthy straightforwardness.

Helen Cooper, discussing the heavy use of the word 'litel' in the *Prioress's Tale*, argues that '[t]he excess is not [...] parody or satire, so much as a demonstrated recognition of certain qualities – certain limitations – of the form itself, and which make such a tale especially appropriate for Madame Eglentine';[27] the same comment could be made about the Tale's use of *pronominatio*. It is possible that Chaucer, with an eye to the teller, is taking to an extreme the kind of coyly evasive rhetoric possible if the genre be pushed to its stylistic limit. And it is striking that it is those analogues which are contemporary with or later than Chaucer's version whose use of the figure most closely resembles his own. There is no reason to think the *Prioress's Tale* was a model for these later texts; rather it seems as if Chaucer was exploiting (in an extreme form to be sure) stylistic possibilities which were increasingly becoming part of the palette in this kind of writing. Nevertheless, given the other prompts to us to examine this Tale and its teller with some caution, and given that the figure is

sometimes used elsewhere with a sardonic and critical edge, it is likely that we are meant to treat it here as a potentially critical tool.

The author of *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* comments that in the use of *pronominatio* 'non inornate poterimus, et in laudando et in laedendo, in corpore aut animo aut extraneis rebus dicere sic uti cognomen quod pro certo nomine collocemus'.[28] In other words, he outlines the ability of *pronominatio* to provide extra information, either neutral or moral, and he regards the figure as an ornamental stylistic plus: the key words here are 'non inornate'. Chaucer's attitude to *pronominatio* is rather more equivocal, however, and has far more edge. He does not use it casually as an elegant compressed way of including information: if this were his technique we would find it throughout his writing and not only in such rare and localised instances. For him it is more heavily coded: it can be a signal of high style, and clearly relates to Virgil as far as Chaucer is concerned; because its rarity makes it emphatic, it can draw attention to specific aspects of a person or specific themes (Diomede's telling relation to Tideus, maternity in the *Prioress's Tale*); and it can suggest a slightly suspicious awareness of the deceptive or superficial capacities of rhetoric itself.

NOTES

[1] Chaucer, *Prioress's Tale*, 506. All quotations from Chaucer are from Larry D. Benson (ed.), *The Riverside Chaucer* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1987), except in the case of *Troilus and Criseyde*, for which I use B. A. Windeatt's edition (London, Longman, 1984), henceforth referred to as 'Windeatt'. Translations from foreign-language texts are mine.

[2] Most commonly Chaucer uses these kinds of periphrasis in combination with a specific name even when they are conventional enough to be clear without it.

Hence we have in the *Knight's Tale* 'the blisful Citherea benigne – / I mene Venus' (2215-6), and 'O lady myn, Venus,/ Doughter to Jove and spouse of Vulcanus,/ Thow gladere of the mount of Citheron' (2221-3). This method of combining name and other denotation is used to sly and bathetic effect in *Troilus*: as Pandarus prays: '"Immortal god," quod he, "that mayst nought deyen,/ Cupide I mene' (III, 185-6).

[3] See, for instance, *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* IV, xxxi, 42 ([Cicero], *Ad C. Herennium: De ratione dicendi* [*Rhetorica ad Herennium*], trans. Harry Caplan [London, Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1954], pp. 334-5); Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* VIII, vi, 29-30, trans. H. E. Butler [London, Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1966]), vol. III, pp. 316-19.

[4] Guido favours an almost tortuous explicit clarity at times; a typical example is 'Habitationis eciam huius Siciliam legimus non expertem, que primo a rege Sicano, qui in Siciliam a Troya peruenit, habitata describitur, vnde Sicania dicta fuit. Et eo postmodum a Sicilia recedente, relicto in Sicilia Siculo fratre suo, vnde postmodum Sicilia dicta est [...]' (Guido de Columnis, *Historia Destructionis Troiae*, ed. Nathaniel E. Griffin [Cambridge, Mass., The Medieval Academy of America, 1936], Book II, lines 31-35 [lines numbered consecutively throughout each Book]); 'We read that Sicily was not free from their settlement either; it is said to have been inhabited first by King Sicanus, who came to Sicily from Troy, because of which it was called Sicania. And afterwards, having departed from Sicily, leaving in Sicily Siculus his brother, because of which it was afterwards called Sicily'.

[5] Guido, *Historia* I, 1, 3-4, 26-7, 38-9; 'in the kingdom of Thessaly there reigned at that time a just and noble king, called Peleus [...] having a brother by the name of Aeson [...] A certain son of this Aeson, Jason by name, succeeded him'.

[6] *Legend of Good Women*, 2562-3, 2566-9, 2573-5.

[7] Ovid, *Heroides; Amores*, ed. G. P. Goold and trans. Grant Showerman (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1977), XIV.

[8] See *Riverside* note p. 1074.

[9] Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI*, ed. G. P. Goold and trans. H. Rushton Fairclough (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1935).

[10] *Aeneid* I, 1-3; 'I sing of arms and the man who, exiled by fate, came first from the coasts of Troy to Italy and Lavinian shores'.

[11] For instance the denotation of Anchises solely by the phrase 'senior [...] pater, pia sarcina nati'; 'aged father, the burden of a loyal son' (*Heroides* VII, 107).

[12] In the second and third of these, the word is used as a rhyme-word, and it is certainly a convenient one as it rhymes with 'cride', 'glide' and 'Cupide'. It is recognised by Windeatt as a harder reading than the 'Cupide' which many scribes preferred in IV, 1216.

[13] In the same passage, we encounter the markedly indirect denotation of the Muses as they are invoked: 'ye, me to endite and ryme/ Helpeth, that on Parnaso duelle,/ Be Elicon, the clere welle' (520-22). (For a discussion of the confusion over whether Helicon is mountain or well, see *Riverside* p. 982, note to 521-2.)

[14] *Il Filostrato* III, 74, lines 1-4; 'O lucé eterna, il cui lieto splendore/ fa bello il terzo ciel dal qual ne piove/ piacer, vaghezza, pietate ed amore,/ del sole amica, e figliuola di Giove [...]' (Windeatt p. 248); 'O eternal light whose brilliant radiance makes beautiful the third sphere, from which pleasure, desire, compassion and love rain down, friend of the sun, and daughter of Jove'.

[15] Windeatt p. 447, note to 1-14. It is rather interesting that Windeatt characterises this 'grand manner' as being typical of the *Teseida* rather than *Il Filostrato* when in fact the *Teseida*, despite its clearly epic design and mythological material, makes very little use of *pronominatio*, that component of high style. *Teseida* III, for instance, is unusually rich in its total yield of two: the conventional 'Citerea' (*Teseida* III, 14,6; 'Cytherea') and, to denote Apollo, 'il padre di Fetone' (*Teseida* III, 16,3; 'the father of Phaeton', namely Apollo).

[16] Diomede's name is also yoked to a phrase denoting his relationship to Tideus at V, 1513-4: 'Diomede, Tideus sone', and he refers to 'my fader Tideus' at V, 932.

[17] *Troilus* V, 88, 803, 932, 1480, 1485, 1493, 1501, 1514, 1746.

[18] The style of the *Prioress's Tale* is most often characterised as markedly plain; for a brief discussion see, for instance, C. David Benson, 'The Aesthetic of Chaucer's Religious Tales in Rhyme Royal' in *Religion in the Poetry and Drama of the Late Middle Ages in England*, ed. Piero Boitani and Anna Torti (Cambridge, D. S. Brewer, 1990), pp. 101-17, discussion p. 109. Thus the exceptionally heavy use of *pronominatio*, unnoted by Benson, is even more striking. Payne remarks on the Tale's frequent 'substitution of a highly connotative phrase or word for a primarily denotative one' (Robert O. Payne, *The Key of Remembrance* [Westport, Greenwood Press, 1973 repr.], p. 168).

The figures he groups thus are *circumlocutio*, *epithetum*, and *determinatio*, and he seems to include *pronominatio* under the first. He argues that 'the Prioress's Tale is the summation of an effort [...] to write a purely affective narrative in which irony, characterization, and complexity of action all give way to a very rigidly controlled stylistic artifice' (p. 169).

[19] Lines 460-62, 465-70, 481.

[20] There are, for example, a number of medieval lyrics about Mary or addressed to her which never mention her name. See, for instance, R. T. Davies, *Medieval English Lyrics* (London, Faber and Faber, 1963), 'Thanks and a plea to Mary', p. 64, 'In praise of Mary', pp. 64-7 and 'The penitent hopes in Mary', pp. 69-70 (all titles editorial).

[21] See Robert B. Burlin, *Chaucerian Fiction* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1977), p. 278, n. 11.

[22] Also strikingly different from the *Prioress's Tale* is the *Man of Law's Tale*, often described as a secular saint's life. Here a resolutely belt-and-braces approach can be seen when dealing with conventional religious material. Despite the very conventional and transparent nature of many of the periphrases denoting Mary, for example, Chaucer regularly yokes a periphrastic tag with her name: 'thou, merciful mayde,/ Marie I meene, doghter to Seint Anne' (640-41), and 'Mooder [...] and mayde bright, Marie' (841).

[23] See W. F. Bryan and Germaine Dempster (ed.), *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* (New York, The Humanities Press, 1941), pp. 447-85 for a list and brief discussion of all known analogues to the *Prioress' Tale*. Those closest to Chaucer's version are in Group C, reproduced pp. 467-85 (line numbers are mine and re-start on each page). It is interesting that C1 (thirteenth century), without any instance of *pronominatio*, closes in precisely the same way as the *Prioress's Tale*, however, with the word 'Marie'. C2 (fourteenth century) contains an outline of the miracle in Latin and the full text of 'Alma Redemptoris Mater' in English. The antiphon, which does not appear in full in Chaucer's version, is in C2, as in the Latin original, pure *pronominatio*. In C3 (early fourteenth century) Mary is referred to explicitly as 'sancta Maria'. In C4 (early fourteenth century) the child sings 'Sancta maria'. C5 (late fourteenth century, in English) has 'vre ladi' (1), 'þe ladi' (4), 'vre Lady' (20), 'vr swete ladi' (144), 'þat ladi' (148), and part of the 'Alma Redemptoris' is paraphrased, 'Godus Moder, Mylde and Clene,/ Heuene ȝate and Sterre of se' (24-5); finally, in a similar manner to the *Prioress's Tale*, the text ends with an explicit naming: 'Now, Marie, for þi Muchele miht/ Help vs to heuene þat is so briht!' (152). C6 is the *Prioress's Tale*. In C7 (1409) Mary

frequently has freestanding denotation: 'beata virgine' (3, 10, 19, 26, 32); 'gloriose virginis' (7); but her name is also given at the beginning and end of the text (4, 34). In some ways this is closest to Chaucer's practice, although of course 'beata virgine' and 'Cristes mooder' refer to different aspects of Mary. C8 (1409) has two freestanding instances and one linked with a name (p. 476 lines 5, 9; p. 477 line 4). C9 (mid-fifteenth century; 97 long prose lines) contains several instances of 'beate virginis' (p. 477, line 4; p. 478, lines 2-3, 11, 19 and 25; p. 479, lines 11, 13, 17 and 33, most of which are freestanding. 'Marie' is also used only once (p. 478, line 11). C10 (end of fifteenth/ beginning of sixteenth century; 195 lines) contains a large number of instances of *pronominatio*, most of which focus on Mary's virginity: examples are p. 480, lines 1, 8, 26, 30; p. 481, lines 10, 11, 21, 22; p. 483, lines 13, 15, 28, 32, 33; p. 484, lines 1, 23; p. 485, lines 5 and 6. However, this text also contains a particularly high number of uses of Mary's name (p. 481, line 1; p. 484, lines 26, 29; p. 484, lines 9, 16, 23, 36), some in combination with *pronominatio* and others not.

[24] C. David Benson, *Chaucer's Drama of Style: Poetic Variety and Contrast in The Canterbury Tales* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1986), p. 139.

[25] G. L. Kittredge, *Chaucer and his Poetry* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1963).

[26] Chauncey Wood, 'Chaucer's Use of Signs in His Portrait of the Prioress' in *Signs and Symbols in Chaucer's Poetry* , ed. John P. Hermann and John J. Burke (University, University of Alabama Press, 1981), pp. 81-101, quotations from p. 100.

[27] Helen Cooper, *The Canterbury Tales* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 297.

[28] *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*, IV, xxxi, 42; 'we will be able to speak thus, not inornately, both in praise and in blame, about the body or the mind or external matters using a (descriptive) name which we put in the place of the real name'.