

### EDITOR OF RECTANGLE OFFERS RESIGNATION

Rutherford College, N. C.,  
December 10, 1928.  
Prof. D. D. Holt, Chmn.,  
Publication Committee,  
Rutherford College, N. C.

Dear Sir:

I find it impractical to continue in the office of Editor of The Rutherford Rectangle for the following reasons:

1. There is a lack of cooperation among the student body as a whole and I find that I am unable to secure this necessary cooperation.

2. Owing to this lack of cooperation, I have to write—or leave unwritten—much of the material. This takes too much of my time from my scholastic work.

3. The older students have the preference on the campus and seem to resent a newer man taking the initiative.

4. I have ideals and beliefs which conflict with faculty dogmas and creeds.

5. The faculty, as a whole, opposes a progressive, live issue of the paper. They say what can and what cannot—mostly cannot—be printed. I do not mind working as hard as is necessary on a student publication, but I will not work that hard on a faculty paper.

6. Owing to the excessive criticism and severe reprimands following the advent of the November 10 issue of The Rectangle, I think it best to resign as Editor of The Rutherford Rectangle. I will not work under a faculty censorship.

There have been a few who have given me unlimited support. They are: Edwin B. Hunt; Fred Hedgepath; Grady Kincaid; Charles P. Roper; Miss Elma Barnhart; and the literary society reporters. These students have been a great help and are to be commended for their splendid cooperation.

Respectfully,  
HENRY F. SNOW, Editor,  
The Rutherford Rectangle.

### PUBLICATION COMMITTEE ACCEPTS EDITOR'S RESIGNATION

Dear Mr. Snow:

I have your resignation as editor of The Rectangle. We regret that there seems to be a lack of cooperation among the students, that there is a conflict between your beliefs and creeds and those of the faculty to the point of breaking, and that you are not willing to work under faculty censorship; but since we believe your criticism of both student body and faculty unjust, and since we have faculty supervision over all college publications, under which you are not willing to work and because you desire to be released as editor, I, as chairman of the Publication committee, accept your resignation.

Very truly yours,  
D. D. HOLT, Chairman,  
Publication Committee.

### COURTLY LOVE SYMBOLS.

By Gay W. Allen.

Dodd in his discussion of the relations of the Canterbury Pilgrims to the Courtly Love System seems to me to bring in two characters, the Prioress and the Monk, on evidence which is almost ingeniously frail—if, indeed, it is evidence at all. Dodd says:

"Two other characters of the Prologue are brought into relation with this study by what the poet says of them; these, strangely enough, are the Prioress and the Monk. The Prioress wore a brooch on which was written the motto, 'Amor vincit omnia.' Similarly, the Monk wore a pin, the larger

end of which was fashioned like a love-knot. Of course, neither of these characters was a lover; but the devices which they wore show the prevalence of love ideas at this time."

Dodd then quotes from Warton, whose theory on this particular point Dodd has obviously adopted and paraphrased:

"Chaucers' Prioress and Monk, whose lives were devoted to religious reflection and the most serious engagements, and while they are actually travelling on a pilgrimage to visit the shrine of a sainted martyr, openly avow the universal influence of love. They exhibit on their apparel badges entirely inconsistent with their profession, but easily accountable for from wears a bracelet on which is inscribed, with a crowned A, 'Amor vincit omnia.' The Monk ties his hood with a true lover's knot."

I am a little bit doubtful whether these two critics are arguing precisely the same point. Is Dodd's statement that "the devices which they wore show the prevalence of love ideas at the time" exactly the statement that these two devices "openly avow the universal influence of love?" It seems to me that there is a slight discrepancy, just as there is actually a difference between a "brooch" and a "bracelet!" But both men seem to be accepting the same conclusion, i.e., that the motto on the Prioress's brooch (or bracelet if Warton insists) and the love-knot on the Monk's pin in his bonnet are symbols of the love represented in the courtly love system.

Whether or not Dodd and Warton meant to insinuate that the Prioress and the Monk wore these symbols because they realized that they were courtly love symbols is left for conjecture; but most assuredly they did mean that the motto "Amor vincit omnia" and the love-knot were symbols of the love represented by the courtly love system. And I think that the evidence for either of these contentions is entirely insufficient.

To avoid confusion let us consider the Prioress and the Monk separately, especially in dealing with the first point (which, we must admit, Dodd and Warton may or may not have intended). Nowhere, either in Chaucer's characterization in the Prologue or in the Prioress's Prologue and Tale, do we find the least indication that the Prioress is the sort of person who would be the least interested in courtly love or in courtly love matters; but everywhere we do find indications that she is most devoutly interested in another kind of love, i.e. spiritual love, the kind of love which she was taught that Christ preached and that her religious order was supposed to sponsor.

If Chaucer intended to use the motto as a symbol, most assuredly, it seems to me, it symbolizes spiritual love, or, at least, that was what the symbol meant to the Prioress herself. Even if it was the custom of the time to wear such a motto as a symbol of sensual (sensual as opposed to spiritual—and certainly courtly love these principles. The Prioress was sensual) love, certainly Amor to the very spiritual-minded Prioress meant spiritual love. Of course, it may be true, as the Freudians would have us believe, that when a Nun consciously thought and talked of spiritual love (e.g. "Bride of the Church," "Married to Christ," "her Master's Beloved," etc.) she subconsciously—or enjoyed vicariously—physical and sensual love. Kittridge is hitting dangerously near this idea when he says, commenting upon the Prio-

ess's sad story of the pious little boy, "Nowhere is the poignant trait of thwarted motherhood so affecting a sin this character of the Prioress." But there is no evidence (in this particular case, at least) of the sensual courtly love in that trait, and the Freudian discussion is entirely beside the point here.

As for the Monk, his wearing of the love-knot as a conscious symbol of the love of the courtly system is entirely inconsistent with his character as revealed in Chaucer's Prologue and in the Monk's Tale, which is piously religious throughout; however, if any of the insinuations made in "The Murye wordes of the Hoost to the Monk" are based on actual traits in the Monks' character, it would not be at all inconsistent for him consciously and intentionally to wear a courtly love symbol.

This maketh that our wyves wole assaye  
Religious folk, for ye mowe bettre paye  
Of Venus paimentz than mowe we.

God woot, no Lussheburghes payen ye!

says the jovial Host. And we are told that the Monk is not the sort of person to "make himself mad through study;" also, he is exceedingly fond of hunting—"that lovede venere"—; but there is no evidence that the Monk was, or system merely because he wore a love-knot in his bonnet. I can not see how the simple fact that he did wear one proves anything, except perhaps that he is interested in such trinkets and vanities. Unless we had evidence that love-knots in Chaucer's day were recognized as a conventional literary symbol of a definite kind of love, the presence of one proves no more than the vanity of the wearer. Of course Chaucer must have had some definite reason for mentioning such an observation, and I think the explanation I suggested above is reasonable. Today there are some people who wear four-leaf clovers and horse-shoe pins, pendants, and other trinkets, but the wearing of such a symbol of luck does not necessarily mean that the wearer is superstitious—nor does it necessarily "openly avow the universal influence" of superstition!

### CITIZEN OF DREXEL WRITES A COMPLAINT

Mr. Henry F. Snow, Editor,  
The Rutherford Recorder,  
Rutherford College, N. C.

Dear Editor:

I was at the Rutherford College Gymnasium on Friday night, November 23, to see the Drexel basket ball teams play the opposing teams from Hildebrand. I was shocked beyond words at the behavior of some of the town boys and worse shocked at the behavior of one or two of the college boys. On the whole the conduct of the students was with little reproach, but there were a few whose conduct was most annoying—to say the least.

I have in mind a certain young man—not gentleman—who had a very loud mouth and a terrible manner of expression. I understood that his name was Hauser. He was most annoying to the visiting girls and in a few instances actually forced his attentions upon them. There were one or two others, but they were not so noticeable.

I sincerely hope and trust that this will not be the case when the basket ball teams have the privilege of playing on your court

again. I am sure that this was unintentional and unavoidable, and that it will not be the case next time.

Thanking you to pript this, I remain

Yours very truly,  
A CITIZEN OF DREXEL.

Trade With Our  
ADVERTISERS

### PANGBURN'S BETTER CANDIES

For Sale Only by

**Burke Drug  
Company**

MORGANTON, N. C.

Make your appointments now for Christmas Portraits. Our new stock of cards have arrived. Come in and see them. We are making Christmas Greeting Cards from your kodak negatives. Something different. Kodak Finishing, Commercial and Portrait Photography

### WEBB'S STUDIO

MORGANTON, N. C.

### BUMBARGER'S

A GOOD BOOK STORE IN A  
GOOD TOWN

HICKORY, - - - N. C.

WE WILL ALWAYS BE GLAD TO SEE YOU

NEW AND LARGER

*Whippet*

AT THE OLD PRICE

**STANDARD MOTOR  
COMPANY**

MORGANTON, - - - N. C.

**PARKER  
WATERMAN  
JOHN HOLLAND  
PEN SETS**

Whitman and Hollingsworth  
**CANDIES**  
IN GIFT PACKAGES

**KIBLER DRUG COMPANY**  
MORGANTON, N. C.