

2011

Clergie , Clerkly Studium , and the Medieval Literary History of Chr  tien De Troyes's Romances

Levilson C. Reis
Otterbein University, lreis@otterbein.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.otterbein.edu/mlanguages_fac

 Part of the [French and Francophone Literature Commons](#), [Medieval Studies Commons](#), and the [Modern Languages Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Reis, Levilson C., "Clergie , Clerkly Studium , and the Medieval Literary History of Chr  tien De Troyes's Romances" (2011). *Modern Languages & Cultures Faculty Scholarship*. Paper 20.
http://digitalcommons.otterbein.edu/mlanguages_fac/20

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Modern Languages & Cultures at Digital Commons @ Otterbein. It has been accepted for inclusion in Modern Languages & Cultures Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Otterbein. For more information, please contact library@otterbein.edu.

CLERGIE, CLERKLY STUDIUM, AND THE MEDIEVAL
LITERARY HISTORY OF CHRÉTIEN DE TROYES'S ROMANCES

Levilson C. Reis

Modern Language Review 106 (2011): 682–696 DOI: 10.5699/modelangrevi.106.3.0682

Abstract

This article traces the development of medieval literary history across the thirteenth century through manuscript readings of Chrétien de Troyes's romances. Redefining *clergie* as the clerkly pursuit of learning, the author argues that scribes played an important role in shaping Chrétien's romances and establishing their place in medieval literary history. Through a close examination of manuscript collections centered on *Cligés*, the author delineates synchronic and diachronic shifts in the organization and presentation of Chrétien's individual manuscripts, while evaluating the roles that different scribes and compilers played in the formation of a Chrétien corpus and the development of a romance genre.

Keywords: French medieval romance; Chrétien de Troyes; *Cligés*; medieval literary history; manuscript culture; author corpus; romance genre; *chevalerie*; *clergie*.

CLERGIE, CLERKLY STUDIUM, AND THE MEDIEVAL
LITERARY HISTORY OF CHRÉTIEN DE TROYES'S ROMANCES

More than fifty years ago, Jean Frappier officially placed Chrétien de Troyes among the greats in French literary history in a monograph that would become the standard study of the man and his works.¹ While there is no doubt that Chrétien was French, despite some lingering questions about who the man really was, the question of whether his works should be classified as French or English national literature has been the object of intense critical discussion.² Although the linguistic, nationalistic, and genre-specific notions of modern literary history have sharpened the debate, attempts to classify vernacular medieval literature according to cycles specific to certain countries date back to Jean Bodel's articulation of the three matters of France, Britain, and Rome in his *Chanson des Saisnes* at the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

In the prologue to Chrétien's *Cligés* (c. 1176), however, the narrator proposes a different literary historical model, based on the cycle of *translatio studii*, the passage of literary patrimony from the ancients to the moderns, which offers an even earlier point of departure for tracing the development of medieval literary history.³ Whilst the narrator's conceptualization of this cycle has been widely recognized as a reformulation of the larger universal historical topos of *translatio studii et imperii*,⁴ it bears some distinguishing features. The narrator replaces the age-old concepts of *imperium* (imperial rule) and *studium* (ancient learning) in terms of the twelfth-century ideals of *chevalerie* (chivalry) and

clergie (clerical learning) and then narrows down their *translatio* from Greece to France, passing through Rome. The passage is worthy of quotation:

Que Grece ot de chevalerie
 Le premier los et de clergie,
 Puis vint chevalerie a Rome
 Et de la clergie la somme,
 Qui or est en France venue. (ed. Méla and Collet, ll. 31–35⁵)

[C]hivalry and learning first flourished in Greece; then to Rome came chivalry and the sum of knowledge, which now has come to France. (p.123⁶)

The geographical specificity of *translatio* and the reframing of the concepts of *imperium* and *studium* as *chevalerie* and *clergie* require some discussion especially in the context of *Cligés*. First, while it would be expected that a French-speaking poet would claim France as the heiress to a Graeco-Roman political and cultural hegemony, it is odd that he would chronicle a hero's journey from Greece to an Arthurian Britain with towns identifiable to those of contemporary twelfth-century England. Conflating these diegetical and extradiegetical elements in *Cligés*, some scholars came to recognize England as the seat of a political power and literary culture.⁷ Diametrically opposed to such a point of view, Jean Frappier and others have adamantly maintained that Chrétien had specifically mentioned France in the prologue, dismissing the wider context of late twelfth-century Europe which encompassed a linguistic and cultural sphere of France that stretched from

the Angevin British Isles to Norman Sicily to the Frankish crusader states in Palestine.⁸ Nonetheless, as it will be discussed later, the fictional English setting of Arthur's world in *Cligés* does not exclude a politically specific France or an ethnically specific Frankish identity.

Second, the narrator's reformulation of the Latin concepts of *imperium* and *studium* in terms of *chevalerie* (chivalry) and *clergie* (clerical learning) poses a new set of important questions, not the least of which concern the conceptual equivalence of terms. *Imperium* and *chevalerie*, on the one hand, are not exactly coterminous especially in the sense that the concept of chivalry would take in twelfth-century 'France'.⁹ In *Cligés*, for example, how could a Greek knight's journey to measure himself against the Knights of the Round Table at Arthur's court represent the devolvement of *imperium* rather than *chevalerie*, that is, military rather than political power? How would this journey represent such a transfer from Greece to France rather than to England?

Studium and *clergie*, on the other hand, may be conceptually equivalent, for both require a zealous pursuit of knowledge.¹⁰ Yet, what would a presumably Latin tale of chivalrous deeds borrowed from antiquity contribute to medieval knowledge (in the sense of 'Par les livres que nous avons | Les faiz des anciens savons' (ed. Méla and Collet, ll. 27–28; 'Through the books we have, we learn of the deeds of ancient peoples and of bygone days', p. 123)? Considering that the high level of learning and knowledge attained in twelfth-century scholastic and literary circles was due to the dedicated work of clerics, who translated classical works of whatever genre or source into the vernacular, the question above should be recast: What role did redactors, copyists, and compilers of the

manuscripts of Chrétien's romances, for example, have on the development of what one could call medieval literary history and specially that of Chrétien de Troyes's romances?

Reflecting the cleric's pursuit of learning and knowledge, *clergie* (despite its Greek etymology) is conceptually very close to the Latin *studium* in connoting the zeal and intellectual effort applied to the acquisition of knowledge, which sustained the work of monastic scribes and would later found the medieval university concept of *studium generale*.¹¹ Evoking an analogous scenario in the prologue to *Cligés*, the narrator claims that the source of the romance of Cligés lies in a book taken from Saint-Pierre's *aumaire* (library) in Beauvais.¹² Paronomastically, the term *aumaire* (*aumeire* or *almeire*) recalls the connection that existed between the monastic libraries and *scriptoria* through the figure of the *armarius*, the director of a monastic *scriptorium*, who provisioned clerics with the literary works to be copied. As the manuscript copies of Chrétien's romances testify, by the thirteenth century workshops, copy-shops, and market-stalls appeared, independent from ecclesiastical control, much like the one that the scribe Guiot advertises at the end of *Yvain*: 'Cil qui l'escrist guioz a non | Devant nostre dame de val | Est ses ostex tot a estal' (BN, MS f. fr. 794, fol. 105^r c; 'He who wrote it is named Guiot, and his market-stall is located in front of Notre-Dame-du-Val', my translation). By then, the work of professional copyists had become more complex requiring compilers, illuminators, and binders, each bringing, as we shall see, a different conception to the organization and presentation of the manuscript collection.

Focusing on *Érec* and particularly *Cligés*, given the narrator's ostentatious awareness of literary history in the prologue, this essay examines the role that clerkly cultures (redactors, scribes, copyists, and compilers) in different places and times, more and more

alert to the concept of author *corpora* and literary cycles, played in establishing the literary history of Chrétien's romances. This approach necessitates a preliminary discussion of the manuscripts of Chrétien de Troyes' romances that delineate a literary historical pattern seen from the point of view of the modern reader; a reader, *caveat lector*, who can examine several manuscripts at the same time, well aware that all these manuscripts were copied from different exemplars and by different scribes at different dates and locations. Among the earliest extant manuscript collections containing all five romances that offer a point of departure for this examination are Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale (BN), MSS fonds français (f. fr.) 1450 (localized to Picardy) and 794 (localized to Champagne), followed by later thirteenth-century author-based collections BN, MSS f. fr. 1420 (dated to the third quarter of the thirteenth century; localized to Ile-de-France) and 12560 (dated to the third quarter of the thirteenth century; partially localized to Ile-de-France¹³). See Table 1 below:

TABLE 1: Manuscripts of 'Cligés' used in this article

BN, MSS	13th century	Localization	Content and placement of Chrétien works* by collection
f. fr. 1450	2nd quarter	Picardy	<i>Roman de Troie, Roman d'Énéas, Roman de Brut, Dolopathos</i> É, P, C, Y, L as adjuncts to the <i>Roman de Brut</i>
f. fr. 794	2nd quarter	Champagne	É, L, C, Y headline the collection as a separate cycle <i>Athis et Prophlias, Troie, Brut, Empereurs de Rome, P, FC, SC</i>
f. fr. 1420	mid century	Ile de France	É and C
f. fr. 12560	3rd quarter	Ile de France Champagne	Y, L, C

*É= *Érec et Énide*, C= *Cligés*, L= *Lancelot*, Y= *Yvain*, P= *Perceval*, FC= *First Continuation*, SC= *Second Continuation*

Although it is now generally agreed that both manuscript collections date roughly to the second quarter of the thirteenth century, this examination takes into account the possibility, which some philologists have advanced, that BN, MS f. fr. 1450 precedes BN, MS f. fr. 794 by at least a quarter century.¹⁴ Such a chronology of production would support my hypothesis that the shift in the presentation of the romances now attributed to Chrétien de Troyes from adjuncts in Wace's *Roman de Brut* in BN, MS f. fr. 1450, in a pattern of organization that emphasized the notion of *translatio studii et imperii*, to that of an author-centred corpus in BN, MS f. fr. 794 reflects a discernable literary historical *mouvance* in the manuscript transmission of Chrétien's romances. The proposition of an earlier date for BN, MS f. fr. 1450 could offer to the modern reader unfamiliar with medieval literary historical cyclicality a more diachronous sense of the literary history of Chrétien's romances.

Notwithstanding, further examination of the patterns of presentation and organization of the romances in these two early thirteenth-century collections in relation that of late thirteenth-century author-based codices leads to the conclusion that scribes' different conceptions of their manuscripts may be the true catalysts of a larger diachronic process. Compared to the set of early thirteenth-century large-format compilations, the late thirteenth-century author-based manuscript collections BN, MSS f. fr. 1420 and 12560 exhibit considerable codicological changes in the manuscript transmission of Chrétien's romances which attest to the formation of the author's corpus and the formalization of the romance genre.

Because of the narrator's listing of the poet's previous compositions in the first lines of *Cligés*, the prologue itself constitutes a landmark of medieval literary history and has

played a decisive role in the early formation of a Chrétien corpus especially in the context of the first two romances, *Érec* and *Cligés*. The prologue situates the author and his work astride an established literary tradition and an inchoate oral vernacular French literary form only to set Chrétien and his *œuvre* further apart from the ancient matter by instituting a source for *Cligés* in the Arthurian material.¹⁵ Although the references to Ovidian sources and the Latin manuscript found at Saint-Pierre Church in Beauvais, upon which *Cligés* was purportedly drawn, echo the Latin locations of *translatio*, the reference to the matter of Britain in the very first line of the prologue, coupled with the announcement of a story of a hero of Arthurian lineage, may have raised the audience's horizon of expectation for an Arthurian tale in spite of the fact that he was half-Greek.

The opening reference to *Érec et Énide*, if not chronologically placed, is strategically located to engage the horizon of expectation of an audience of *Cligés* (c. 1176) familiar with the first romance (c. 1170).¹⁶ In *Érec et Énide*, Chrétien had set in place the chronotope that would characterize the prototypical beginning of his subsequent romances: an opening festive religious celebration, an Arthurian court setting, a recurring knightly hero, and the impulse for the romance hero's adventurous quest.¹⁷ The first line of *Cligés* enacts for the first time the horizon of expectation of an audience familiar with *Érec's* adventures at Arthur's court, his marriage to *Énide*, and the conflict between his knightly and marital duties.

The audience may have been ill prepared, however, for what turns out to be a story of a half-Arthurian, half-Greek knight set at the Greco-Byzantine court. The narrator's sudden switch to the account of the erstwhile adventures of the hero's father at Arthur's court might have been strategically used to provide a point of entry into the unconventional

mise en scene of an Arthurian hero in an oriental setting. Thus, this introductory part of the romance would finally correspond to the horizon of expectation set forth in the first line of *Cligés*. In terms of literary history, as it will be discussed later, this part of the story has a great deal to tell about how an audience's familiarity of certain cycles or genres such as genealogies, the matters of France, Britain, and Rome, or the *chansons de geste* might have affected the reception of Chrétien as well as the formation of the corpus of his romances and the development of the romance genre itself.

Because Chrétien's romances first appeared amidst the matter of antiquity and the genealogical history of the kings of Britain, their generic specificity *qua* romances may have subsumed under the historiographical content of both BN, MSS. f. fr. 1450 and 794. As the codicological organization of MS f. fr. 1450 in particular indicates, some of Chrétien's romances may have been unrecognizable. In keeping with the organizing principle of *translatio studii et imperii*, the scribe intercalated Chrétien's romances in Wace's *Roman de Brut* (c. 1155) without quire breaks or rubrics as though they were an integral part of history of the kings of Britain.¹⁸ To achieve a seamless interpolation, the scribe removed the existing prologues to Chrétien's romances except that to *Cligés*. Despite the intervening *Perceval*, without its prologue, and a fragment of its *First Continuation*, the prologue to *Cligés* serves as a turning point between the coronation of Érec and Alexander's adventures at Arthur's court, both of which are privileged over the more romance-like focus on the psychological ruminations of the heroes and heroines in the first part of *Érec* and the second part of *Cligés*.

Much has been made about the extensive cuts the scribe made to the first part of *Érec*, which deals with hero's married life, and the second part of *Cligés*, which centers on Cligés

and Fénice's relationship.¹⁹ The number of omissions is relatively small, namely 355 lines in *Érec* and 127 in *Cligés*. The quantity is not as significant as the quality of the cuts. In the first romance, for example, the scribe eliminated the physical and moral portraits of Érec (ll. 2265–70) and that of Énide (ll. 2405–16, 2423–26, 2557–58, and 2573–75) and the nature of her submissive relationship to Érec (ll. 2749–52, 2789–94, and 2977–82).²⁰ In the second romance, the scribe suppressed the psychological nuances of Fénice's love for Cligés (ll. 3835–36, 4457–60, and 4481–88) and, most significantly, the passages where Fénice refuses Tristan and Yseult's adulterous model (ll. 5259–62), not to mention, the sadistic handling of Fénice's dead body (ll. 5959–63).²¹ By shortening his redaction of the first half of *Érec* and the second part of *Cligés*, the Picard scribe privileged parts of these two romances that had to do with royal histories at the expense of the more sentimental or psychological aspects of the romance genre.

Despite the connection that the narrator establishes between 'He who wrote *Érec and Énide*' and *Cligés* in the latter's prologue in BN, MS f. fr. 1450 (fol. 188^vb1), even the more experienced modern reader, not to say manuscript editor, was hard-pressed to understand some specific peculiarities of BN, MS f. fr. 1450. In his 1836–38 edition of the *Roman de Brut* in BN, MS f. fr. 1450, Antoine Le Roux de Lincy, found it difficult to explain the transitional line — 'Or commence oeuvre Crestien' — between the last line of *Cligés* (fol. 207^va) and the first one of *Yvain* (fol. 207^vb) which, devoid of a prologue proper, fuses seamlessly with the pseudo-historical nature of the *Brut*.²² As Le Roux de Lincy notes, these singularities of BN, MS f. fr. 1450

jettent quelque jour sur un point de notre histoire littéraire [. . .] que nous proposons seulement comme un doute [. . .] on sera porté à croire que ce dernier vers est une faute de copiste et qu'il faut lire: *Or ci fine oeuvre Crestien*; d'autant plus que, dans le prologue *d'Erec et d'Enide* [*sic*], Chrétien déclare formellement qu'il est l'auteur dudit roman d'Erec. [. . .] et si l'on réfléchit que ce prologue qui indique *Chrétien* comme auteur *d'Erec* manque dans quelques manuscrits (nommément dans celui-ci), on peut croire, d'après le vers cité plus haut, que Chrétien de Troyes n'aurait pas fait le roman de Cliges [*sic*], ni les traductions d'Ovide, ni le fameux *Tristan* dont parlent plusieurs littérateurs, sans qu'aucune bibliothèque d'Europe n'ait encore pu nous en fournir une copie.²³

The insertion of Chrétien's romances in the *Brut*, the scribal attribution of only *Yvain* to 'Crestiens', and the fact that the scribe privileged the epic parts of *Érec* and *Cligés* indicate that, at least for the medieval audiences of BN, MS f. fr. 1450, Chrétien's romances were received in the pseudohistorical framework of the *Roman de Brut*.²⁴ Therefore, the *Érec* and *Cligés* transmitted in this codex prove to be the least conducive to the early formation of a Chrétien corpus and to the establishment of a French literary history of Chrétien's Arthurian romances.

In BN, MS f. fr. 794, the self-proclaimed Champenois scribe, Guiot, conceived of Chrétien's works as a separate set and gathered the first four of them (*Érec et Enide*, *Le Chevalier de la Charrette*, *Cligés*, *Le Chevalier au Lion*) in a separate fascicle.²⁵ Although it appears that Guiot had intended Chrétien's works to follow the organizing principle of

translatio studii et imperii by placing his colophon after *Le Chevalier au Lion*, as the codicological examination of both the binding and the hand of the manuscript revealed,²⁶ the manuscript binder or compiler rearranged the order of the works in the codex. In lieu of the original first set, containing Alexander de Bernay's *Athis et Prophilias* (present second set), and original second set, shared by *Le Roman de Troie*, Wace's *Le Roman de Brut*, Calendre's *Les Empereurs de Rome*, and Chrétien's *Le Conte du Graal* (the present third set), the collection opens with Chrétien's *Érec et Énide*, *Le Chevalier de la Charrette*, *Cligés*, and *Le Chevalier au Lion*.²⁷ Guiot's gathering of Chrétien's first four romances in one fascicle and the compiler's arrangement of the order of the texts in this collection testifies to a distinct awareness of the romances as autonomous narratives independent of the organizing principle of *translatio studii*. On its own, the Guiot copy makes a clear gesture towards the recognition of Chrétien's Arthurian romances as a corpus of a similar cycle.

In the context of BN, MSS f. fr. 1450 and 794, a definitive attribution of this corpus of narratives to Chrétien de Troyes had not yet been established.²⁸ As noted earlier, the scribe of BN, MS f. fr. 1450 had removed the prologue to *Érec* along with its attribution to 'Crestiens de Troies' in his copy of the first romance. While in BN, MS f. fr. 794 the prologue to *Érec* lists the usual signature (fol. 1^r a9), the one to *Cligés* did not yet contain the line 'Dont cest romanz fist Crestiens' (ed. Méla and Collet, 1. 23) that would first appear in BN, MS f. fr. 1420 (fol. 30^r a23) and 12560 (fol. 83^v a23) as part of an added couplet that would establish the Chrétien corpus and characterize these late thirteenth-century manuscript collections as author-based.²⁹

It would not be until after the mid-thirteenth century that scribes would literally create a space for titles, announcing the name of the romance hero.³⁰ BN, MS f. fr. 12560 is the

first of Chrétien's author-based codices in which scribes began to write 'below top line', leaving the top ruled line for the names of titular heroes.³¹ *Le Chevalier au Lion*, *Le Chevalier de la Charrette*, and *Cligés* in this codex are the first to bear rubricated incipits which would redirect the attention of aural and particularly ocular readers not only to a recognizable genre — the romance — but to its protagonist.³² In the upper margin of the first folio of *Cligés* in BN, MS f. fr. 12560 the incipit bears for the first time what we consider today the title of the romance: 'Ici comence li romanz de Cliges' (fol. 83^v a (above the top line)). From this point on, *Cligés* assumes the position as the main hero and incarnates the literary form of the romance itself, not as a genealogical narrative, but rather as the story of a hero between two dynastic origins and cultural identities, presenting itself as the point of departure for the romances of assimilation and miscegenation and the epigonal tradition of Arthurian romances that would both follow in its wake.³³

Not only do the scribes of BN, MSS f. fr. 1420 and 12560 attribute the *corpora* in these codices to a certain Chrétien but also recognize 'France' as the fictional setting of the Arthurian kingdom. In a passage where Alexander exhorts his son Cligés to measure himself against the knights of the Round Table, the scribes of BN, MS f. fr. 12560 situate the *François* in Arthur's world:

'Biaus fiuz Cligés, ja ne savras

Conoitre combien tu avras

De proesce ne de vertu

Se a la cort le roi Artu

Ne te vas esprover einço[i]s

Et as Bretons et as *François*'. (ed. Méla and Collet, ll. 2561–66, my emphasis)

'My dear son, Cligés, you will never know the extent of your valour and might if you do not go to test yourself against the Bretons the *French* at King Arthur's court'. (p. 154, my emphasis)

In the same passage in BN, MS f. fr. 794, Guiot refers to the *Einglois*:

'Biax filz Cligés, ja ne savras

Conuistre con bien tu vaudras

De proesce ne de vertu,

Se a la cort le roi Artu

Ne te vas esprover einçois

Et as Bretons et as *Einglois*'. (ed. Micha, ll. 2565–70, my emphasis)

'My dear son, Cligés, you will never know the extent of your valour and might if you do not go to test yourself against the Bretons and the [*English*] at King Arthur's court'. (p. 154, my emphasis)

It seems thus that the 'France' that the narrator envisages in the prologue as the heiress of *chevalerie* and *clergie* should include both the *Einglois* and *François*. In BN, MS f. fr. 794, Guiot refers to a linguistic, cultural, and sociopolitical sphere of France that went beyond the royal domain and included the English (*Einglois*) besides Arthur's subjects (the

*Bretons*³⁴), which would sound fictionally plausible, for according to Wace, Arthur's court is located in England.³⁵ In BN, MS f. fr. 12560, the first copyist, who writes in Francien, refers to a similar sphere of France that included the *François*, for 'La France est un des domaines d'Arthur', as Gregory and Luttrell note,³⁶ in spite of the fact that Arthur's world is almost exclusively located in towns identifiable with those of contemporary England.

This comparison invites another interpretation of the final location of *chevalerie and clergie*. If one agrees that in the first instance Alexander's pilgrimage to Arthur's court does not fulfil the requirements of the transfer of *chevalerie*, for Arthur's Britain stands as its primordial centre; in the second, Cligés's return to Arthur's court tells us a different story. Whereas Alexander comes to England to be knighted by King Arthur, having disdained a home-grown brand of *chevalerie* for the world-renown Arthurian kind, Cligés is knighted by his uncle Alis in Greece before he ever leaves for Arthur's court to fulfil his father's last wishes.³⁷ He arrives at Arthur's court incognito and, during the episode of the Oxford tournament, Cligés does not reveal his identity until he had defeated the Knights of the Round Table. When, at the end of the tournament, King Arthur sends Gauvain to bring the unknown knight to court, all the defeated knights praise Cligés's prowess, by drawing attention to the fact that they had lost theirs:

'Tot autresi com [li] solauz

Estaint les esteiles menues,

[. . .]

Ausi *estaignent* et abaissent

Nos proeces devant les voz,

Si soleent estre les noz

Molt renomees par le monde'. (ed. Méla and Collet, ll. 4944–51; my emphasis)

'Just as the sun outshines those tiny stars [. . .], so our fame fades and dwindles before yours, though ours was widely renowned throughout the world'. (p. 184)

These lines echo the Greeks' and the Romans' lost fame and their dying embers, which the narrator deploras at the end of the prologue:

Dex l'avoit as altres prestee,

Que des Grezois ne des Romains

Ne dit an mais ne plus ne mains,

D'eus est la parole remese

Et *esteinte* la vive brese. (ed. Méla and Collet, ll. 40–44; my emphasis)

God merely lent it to the others: no one speaks any more of the Greeks or Romans; their fame has grown silent and their glowing ember has gone out. (p. 123)

In both BN, MSS f. fr. 794 and 12560, the Knights of the Round Table, who represent Arthurian *chevalerie*, lose both the tournament and the dominion of *chevalerie* just as the *Grezois* and the *Romains* of the prologue lost theirs. As the concept of *translatio* implies, the devolution of either *imperium* or *studium* is the consequence of 'sinful misuse of that

dominion'.³⁸ When relating the tournament episode, the narrator intimates that it was believed that no one could defeat the best Knights of the Round Table (ed. Méla and Collet, ll. 4610–13) and that this sense of uncontested valour may have been detrimental to their upkeep of *chevalerie*.³⁹ Depending on the manuscript, either the *Einglois* (BN, MS f. fr. 794) or the *François* (BN, MS f. fr. 12560) could be considered the final recipient of *chevalerie*. That the French were indeed the final title holders of *chevalerie* is confirmed by the fact that, in both of these two manuscript versions of this episode, the losers address a 'French' Cligés, '[v]estuz a guise de François' (ed. Méla and Collet, l. 4926; ed. Micha, l. 4934). From the chronological point of view that a literary historian would take, it could be said that according to the latest version of the story, the French would retain the seat of *chevalerie* and *clergie*, as the narrator's prayer to God foreshadowed in the prologue (ed. Méla and Collet, l. 36).

Besides the references to the author's literary *translatio* of Ovidian works, the Tristan and Iseult legend, and the unidentifiable Latin manuscript source of *Cligés* in the prologue, *clergie* represents the work of clerks and their contributions to the formation of a Chrétien corpus and to the development of the literary history of his works. While the theme of *chevalerie* dominates the early transmission of *Cligés*, it does so because the story of Alexander's chivalrous quest, which modern readers have regarded as a distracting introduction to the main story proper,⁴⁰ appears to have been the subject matter that the Picard scribe privileged in his copy of *Cligés* in BN, MS f. fr. 1450. The characterization of Alexander as a '*chanson de geste* hero transplanted into the courtly world'⁴¹ may have very well corresponded to the horizon of expectation of medieval audiences interested in

romans antiques or in the dynastic deeds of the kings of Britain to which the scribe subsumed the first part of the romance of Cligés.

While Guiot and the compiler of BN, MS f. fr. 794 understood *Cligés* and the other Arthurian tales to be a corpus and established their literary priority independently of a pre-established tradition or authorial attribution, it turned out to be the scribes of the author-based BN, MSS f. fr. 1420 and 12560 that established a Chrétien corpus between *Érec* and *Cligés* and ascribed the romance genre to a Crestiens (de Troies). Within this attributive context the copyist of BN, MS f. fr. 12560 also draws attention to the victorious eponymous hero who, dressed as a Frenchman, embodies the French dominion of *chevalerie*. The *Einglois* and the *Bretons*, whom one may associate with Arthur and the knights of the Round Table, ultimately fall into the ranks of the *Grezois* and the *Romains* as losers of *chevalerie* and, in BN, MS f. fr. 12560, the *François* would live up to narrator's claim in the prologue.

The transfer of *chevalerie* and *clergie* from Greece, Rome, and England to France is due to the *studium* (the zealous pursuit of knowledge), according to the Latin sense of the word, of a clerkly culture who played an important role in establishing the literary history of the romances of Chrétien de Troyes. Lastly, from the point of the modern reader who looks at these manuscripts in their totality, well aware that all these manuscripts come from different areas and had different filiations and scribes, the Arthurian romances emerge from the non-descript status of *faits divers*, cut and pasted to fit the pseudo-historical literary genre of the *Roman de Brut* in the BN, MS f. fr. 1450, to that of a corpus of a similar cycle in the Guiot copy, and finally to the status of an author corpus in the author-based collections BN, MSS f. fr. 1420 and 12560. In these later renditions, the

scribes restore those important passages that show the individuality and sentimentality of the heroes and heroines in *Érec* and *Cligés*, which the scribe of BN, MS f. fr. 1450 and, to some extent, Guiot (in BN, MS 794) had eliminated.⁴² These scribes thus played a decisive role in re-establishing the importance that Chrétien de Troyes accorded to the psychological and social realities of what was to be known as the romance genre.

Notes

¹ *Chrétien de Troyes: l'homme et l'œuvre* (Paris: Hatier-Boivin, 1957), p. 5.

² For a comprehensive study of Chrétien de Troyes's identity, see Sarah Kay, 'Who was Chrétien de Troyes?', *Arthurian Literature*, 15 (1997), 1–35. Concerning the national identity of the Arthurian romance, see Jean Frappier and Erich Köhler's discussion in *Chanson de geste und höfischer Roman. Heidelberger Kolloquium. 30. Januar 1961* (ed. by Pierre Le Gentil and others, (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1963), pp. 31–36 (pp. 31 and 35)), where Jean Frappier contests Köhler's claim that Plantagenet's England was the heiress of *chevalerie* and *clergie* with the remark that Chrétien had specifically mentioned 'France' in the prologue, which Köhler did not find surprising since Henry II was after all a vassal of the King of France. More recently after the publication of her 1978 doctoral thesis (*Der arthurische Versroman von Chrestien bis Froissart. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung* (Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1980)), Beate Schmolke-Hasselmann has also made the radical claim that 'much of what we have considered to be medieval French literature is in fact English literature in French', as Keith Busby bravely puts it in his foreword to the English translation (*The Evolution of Arthurian Romance: The Verse Tradition from Chrétien to Froissart*, trans. by Margaret and Roger Middleton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. xi–xlvi (p. xi)).

³ For other views of *translatio studii* as a medieval literary cycle, see Sara Sturm-Maddox and Donald Maddox, 'Cyclicity and Medieval Literary Cycles', in *Transtextualities: Of Cycles and Cyclicity in Medieval French Literature*, ed. by Sara Sturm-Maddox and Donald

Maddox (Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1996), pp. 1–14; and Jane H. M. Taylor, ‘The Sense of a Beginning: Genealogy and Plenitude in Late Medieval Narrative Cycles’, in *Transtextualities*, ed. by Sturm-Maddox and Maddox, pp. 93–123 (pp. 104–08).

⁴ For standard interpretations of the medieval concept of *translatio studii et imperii*, see Ernst R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. by Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), pp. 28–30; Jacques Le Goff, *La Civilisation de l’Occident médiéval* (Paris: Arthaud, 1967), pp. 218–19; Adriaan G. Jongkees, ‘*Translatio studii*: les avatars d’un thème médiéval’, in *Miscellanea mediaevalia in memoriam Jan Frederik Niermeyer* (Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1967), pp. 41–51; Faith Lyons, ‘Interprétations critiques au XX^e siècle du prologue de *Cligès*: la *translatio studii* selon les historiens, les philosophes et les philologues’, *Œuvres et Critiques*, 5.2 (1980–81), 39–44; Philippe Walter, ‘Transfert culturel et métissage de l’imaginaire: vers une théorie des mutations culturelles’, *Analele Universitații București–Istorie*, 46 (1997), 49–59 (p. 51); and Dominique Boutet, ‘De la *translatio imperii* à la *finis saeculi*: progrès et décadence dans la pensée de l’histoire au Moyen Age’, in *Progrès, réaction, décadence dans l’Occident médiéval*, ed. by Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Laurence Harf-Lancner (Geneva: Droz, 2003), pp. 37–48 (p. 43). For recent re-evaluations of the literary topoi in *Cligés* and in the Arthurian epigonal tradition, see Sharon Kinoshita, ‘The Poetics of *Translatio*: French-Byzantine Relations in Chrétien de Troyes’s *Cligés*’, *Exemplaria*, 8.2 (1996), 315–54; Ibidem, *Medieval Boundaries: Rethinking Difference in Old French Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), chap. 3; Ibidem, ‘*Cligés* in the Medieval Mediterranean’,

Arthuriana, 18.3 (2008), 48–61. For an equally important re-examination of *translatio* in Chrétien de Troyes's romances in the context of Islamic culture from Northern Spain see Michelle Reichert, *Between Courtly Literature and Al-Andalus: 'Matière d'Orient' and the Importance of Spain in the Romances of the Twelfth-Century Writer Chrétien de Troyes* (New York: Routledge, 2006), chap. 2.

⁵ References to *Cligés* come primarily from Bibliothèque nationale (BN), MS fonds français (f. fr.) 12560 and Charles Méla and Olivier Collet's edition in *Chrétien de Troyes: romans suivis des 'Chansons', avec, en appendice, 'Philomena'*, ed. by Michel Zink (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1994) to which I juxtapose the BN, MS f. fr. 794 and Alexandre Micha's edition of *Cligés* in *Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes édités d'après la copie de Guiot (Bibl. nat. fr. 794)*, ed. by Mario Roques, 5 vols (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1952–1975), II (1957). References are also made to Foerster's edition of *Cligés* in *Christian von Troyes. Sämtliche erhaltene Werke, nach allen bekannten Handschriften*, ed. by Wendelin Foerster and Alfons Hilka, 5 vols (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1884–1932), I (1884), and to Stewart Gregory and Claude Luttrell's edition of *Cligés* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1993). To avoid any referential confusion, all quotations from these editions are followed by references to the editors' names and line numbers.

⁶ *Cligés*, in *Chrétien de Troyes, Arthurian Romances*, trans. by William W. Kibler and Carleton W. Carroll (London: Penguin, 1991), p. 123. Unless otherwise stated, page references come from this edition and appear parenthetically in the text.

⁷ See, for example, Walter Schirmer and Ulrich Broich, *Studien zum literarischen Patronat im England des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1962), p. 199; Reto R.

Bezzola, *Les Origines et la formation de la littérature courtoise en Occident (500–1200)*, 3 vols (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1944–63), III: *La Société courtoise: littérature de cour et littérature courtoise*, I (1963), p. 310; Erich Köhler, *L’Aventure chevaleresque: idéal et réalité dans le roman courtois*, trans. by E. Kaufholz (Paris: Gallimard, 1974), chap. 1; Beate Schmolke-Hasselmann, *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, chap. 1; Ibidem, ‘Henri II Plantagenêt, roi d’Angleterre, et la genèse d’*Érec et Énide*’, *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, 24 (1981), 241–46; Constance Bullock-Davis, ‘Chrétien de Troyes and England’, in *Arthurian Literature I*, ed. by Richard Barber (Woodbridge, UK: Brewer, 1982; repr. 1987), pp. 1–61; Carleton W. Carroll, ‘Quelques observations sur les reflets de la cour d’Henri II dans l’œuvre de Chrétien de Troyes’, *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, 37 (1994), 33–39; Kristen L. Over, *Kingship, Conquest, and ‘Patria’: Literary and Cultural Identities in Medieval French and Welsh Arthurian Romance* (New York: Routledge, 2005), pp. 76–77.

⁸ See ‘Discussion’, in *Chanson de geste*, ed. by Le Gentil and others, pp. 31–32 and p. 35.

⁹ From the millennium to the late twelfth century, *chevalerie* (knighthood) would evolve from a purely military art to become a significant sociopolitical entity with specific ethical roles. For further reading on the subject see, for example, Georges Duby, ‘Les Origines de la chevalerie’, in *Hommes et structures du Moyen Age: recueil d’articles* (Paris: Mouton, 1973), pp. 325–41; Ibidem, *La Société aux XI^e et XII^e siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris: SEVPEN, 1971), chaps iv and ix; Tony Hunt, ‘The Emergence of the Knight in France and England 1100–1200’, *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 17 (1981), 93–114; and Glyn S. Burgess, ‘The Term “Chevalerie” in Twelfth-Century French’, *Medieval Codicology, Iconography, Literature, and Translation: Studies for Keith Val Sinclair*, ed. by Peter R. Monks

and Douglas D. Owen (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 343–58. Concerning Chrétien’s use of *chevalerie* within the context of a twelfth-century ideological and sociological worldview, see Köhler, *L’Aventure chevaleresque*, pp. 48–51; Jean Flori, ‘Pour une histoire de la chevalerie: l’adoubement dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes’, *Romania*, 100 (1979), 21–53; Barbara N. Sargent-Baur, ‘Promotion to Knighthood in the Romances of Chrétien de Troyes’, *Romance Philology*, 37 (1983–84), 393–408; Jean Flori, ‘La notion de chevalerie dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes’, *Romania*, 114 (1996), 289–315; and Douglas Kelly, ‘Chrétien de Troyes’, in *The Arthur of the French: The Arthurian Legend in Medieval French and Occitan Literature*, ed. by Glyn S. Burgess and Karen Pratt (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2006), pp. 135–85 (pp. 167 and 171). For clever readings of *Cligés* through the prism of a chivalric ethos, see Gregory Heyworth, ‘Love and Honor in *Cligés*’, *Romania*, 120 (2002), 99–117; and recently, Douglas Kelly, ‘Honor, Debate, and *Translatio imperii* in *Cligés*’, *Arthuriana*, 18.3 (2008), 33–47.

¹⁰ I use *clergie* to refer to the work of clerks (redactors, scribes, copyists, and compilers) who played an important role in the transmission of vernacular literature. In his discussion of the etymology of *clergie* (< Latin *clericus* < Greek κληρος [clergos]), Walther von Wartburg notes that the various secondary functions clerics exercised (scholar, clerk, etc.) explain the fact that in the Middle Ages the clergy alone dominated scholastic education and that, without the work of clerics, very few writings would have survived (*Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 25 vols (Bonn: Klopp, 1928–2002), II (1940), 775).

¹¹ For a discussion of the concept of *clergie* as it applied to the cathedral schools and later to the more and more secular medieval educational establishments, bearing Chrétien’s use

of the term in mind, see Karl D. Uitti and Michelle A. Freeman, *Chrétien de Troyes Revisited* (New York: Twayne, 1995), chap. 2. For the wider context that *clergie* would take in late medieval France under the name of *studium generale*, see Astrik L. Gabriel, *The Paris Studium: Robert of Sorbonne and His Legacy: Interuniversity Exchange Between the German, Cracow and Louvain Universities and that of Paris in the Late Medieval and Humanistic Period. Selected Studies* (Notre Dame, IN: United States Sub-commission for the History of Universities, University of Notre Dame, 1992); and *Medieval Education*, ed. by R. B. Begley and J. W. Koterski (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005).

¹² Although it is true that the library of the Saint-Pierre had been well furnished by the donations of the grammarian Roscelin, ‘les volumes de Boèce, Juvénal, Macrobe, Ovide, Priscien, Stace et Virgile, [. . .], avaient sans doute disparu de la bibliothèque du chapitre de Beauvais [. . .] de même que les récits auxquels Chrétien de Troyes avait emprunté le sujet de son roman de Cligés’ (Henri A. Omont, *Recherches sur la bibliothèque de l’église cathédrale de Beauvais* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1914), pp. 12–13).

¹³ According to Alexandre Micha, the whole manuscript is written in Francien (*Prolégomènes à une édition de Cligés* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1938), pp. 9–10); Alexandre Micha, ‘Introduction’, in *Cligés*, ed. by Micha, pp. iii–xxviii (p. xix). Charles Méla and Olivier Collet claim that two different scribes copied the manuscript. The first copyist wrote in Francien from the beginning (fol. 83va) to folio 101rb. In *Cligés* (ed. by Méla and Collet) that comprehends line 1 to 3104, at which point the second scribe intervenes in a western dialect first in folio 101^r b (*Cligés*, ed. by Méla and Collet, ll. 3105–15), then from

folio 110^v a to 115^v b (Ibid., ll. 4675–5592), and finally from folio 117^v b to 122^r b (Ibid., ll. 5769–6702).

¹⁴ Wendelin Foerster, ‘Einleitung’, in *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Foerster and Hilka, I (*Cligés*, 1884), 1–lxxvi (pp. ii and vi); Alexandre Micha, *La Tradition manuscrite des romans de Chrétien de Troyes*, 2nd edn (Paris: Droz, 1966), pp. 33, 37, and 268–69; and William Roach, *Continuations of the Old French ‘Perceval’ of Chrétien de Troyes*, 5 vols (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949), I, xvi.

¹⁵ Scholars have nonetheless tentatively found sources for most of them in both the matter of antiquity and the matter of Bretagne. ‘[L]es commandemens d’Ovide’ and ‘[L]’art d’amors’ have been respectively identified as Ovid’s *Remedia amoris* and the *Ars amatoria*; ‘[L]e mors de l’espaule’, as the *Pyramus and Thisbe* episode in *Metamorphoses* (Book IV); ‘[D]e la hupe et de l’aronde et dou rousignol la muance’ as Philomela’s episode in *Metamorphoses* (Book VI), ‘Philomena’ in the *Ovide moralisé* (ed. by Cornelis de Boer, 5 vols (Amsterdam: Johannes Müller, 1915–38), II (1920), 2217–3684). For a review of source studies based on the matter of Britain, see for example, ‘*Cligès et Tristan*’, *Romania*, 33 (1904), 465–89; Gaston Paris, *Cligès*, in *Mélanges de littérature française du Moyen Age*, ed. by M. Roques (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1910), pp. 229–327; Jean Frappier, *Le Roman breton: Chrétien de Troyes ‘Cligés’* (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire, 1952), pp. 14–18 and 25–103; Alexandre Micha, ‘Tristan et Cligès’, *Neophilologus*, 36 (1952), 1–10; and Michelle A. Freeman, ‘Transpositions structurelles et intertextualité: le “Cligès” [*sic*] de Chrétien’, *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 50–61. All in all, these first few lines have greatly contributed to the literary history of Chrétien de Troyes’s works.

¹⁶ Keith Busby, 'The Characters and the Setting', in *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy, Douglas Kelly, and Keith Busby, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987), I, 57–89 (pp. 88–89); and Schmolke-Hasselmann, *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, pp. 41–55.

¹⁷ Beate Schmolke-Hasselmann, 'Untersuchungen zur Typik des arthurischen Romananfanges', *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, n.s., 31 (1981), 1–13 (p. 12); Emmanuèle Baumgartner, *Le Récit médiéval, XII^e–XIII^e siècles* (Paris: Hachette Supérieur, 1995), p. 43; Danièle James-Raoul, *Chrétien de Troyes: la griffe d'un style* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2007), pp. 260–318; and Levilson C. Reis, 'From Aural Reception to Visual Paratext: The Reader in the Manuscripts of Chrétien de Troyes's Romances', *Neophilologus*, 94 (2010), 377–89 (p. 382 n. 9).

¹⁸ Gervais de la Rue (1751–1835) was the first modern reader to take stock of this interpolation in a footnote in the bottom margin of folio 139^v of the manuscript. For modern reactions to this interpolation see also Antoine Le Roux de Lincy, 'Description des manuscrits', in *Le Roman de Brut*, ed. by Antoine Le Roux de Lincy, 2 vols (Rouen: Edouard Frère, 1836–38), I, (1836), pp. xvii–lxviii (p. xxxi–xxxiii); Micha, *Tradition manuscrite*, pp. 269–70; and Terry Nixon, 'Catalogue of Manuscripts', in *Les Manuscrits de Chrétien de Troyes / The Manuscripts of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Keith Busby and others, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993), II, 1–85 (p. 31).

¹⁹ See Micha, *Tradition manuscrite*, pp. 297–308; Lori Walters, 'Le Rôle du scribe dans l'organisation des manuscrits des romans de Chrétien de Troyes', *Romania*, 106 (1985), 303–25 (p. 305); and Sylvia Huot, *From Song to Book: The Poetics of Writing in Old French*

Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 30–32 (p. 31).

²⁰ *Érec*, ed. by Foerster, in *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Foerster and Hilka, III (1890).

²¹ *Cligés*, ed. by Foerster, in *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Foerster and Hilka, I. Foerster further notes that lines 5259–60 in *Cligés* were interpolated in manuscripts APCR (*‘interpolirt in APCR’* (*Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Foerster and Hilka, I, 215), which means that they were missing in BN, MS f. fr. 1450 (R)), as Gregory and Luttrell have also noted: ‘32–42 *manquent dans SBT*’ (*Cligés*, ed. by Gregory and Luttrell, p. 189 (n. 32–42 in their critical apparatus)).

²² In *Cligés*, Foerster notes that after ‘Or commence oeuvre Crestien *und es folgt darauf Yvain*’ (*Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Foerster and Hilka, I, 280 (n. 6784 in his critical apparatus)).

²³ Le Roux de Lincy, p. xxxii.

²⁴ On this hypothesis, see also Micha, *Tradition manuscrite*, pp. 297–308; Walters, pp. 312–13; and Huot, p. 31.

²⁵ Mario Roques, ‘Le Manuscrit fr. 794 de la Bibliothèque nationale et le scribe Guiot’, *Romania*, 73 (1952), 177–79 (p. 179); and Nixon, p. 29.

²⁶ Roques, p. 182.

²⁷ Stewart Gregory and Claude Luttrell, ‘Manuscripts of *Cligés*’, in *Les Manuscrits de Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Busby and others, I, 67–95 (pp. 75–76); Nixon, p. 29; Walters, p. 314.

²⁸ Referring to BN, MSS fr. 1450 and 794, Sarah Kay claims that ‘in the case of “Chrétien de Troyes” the construction of an author corpus seems to have started early. The works

now accepted as his canon (the five romances) are associated together in two manuscripts' (p. 2 n. 6). For a revision of the early formation of the Chrétien corpus, see Levilson C. Reis, 'Odd Couple(t)s: (The) Guiot (Copy) and (the) Chrétien (Corpus)', *French Studies Bulletin*, 112 (2009), 61–63.

²⁹ See Reis, 'Odd Couple(t)s', p. 62.

³⁰ Gregory and Luttrell, 'Manuscripts of *Cligés*', p. 80.

³¹ Nixon, p. 7 n. 8. N. R. Ker brought attention to the change in the scribal practice of writing 'above the top line' starting in the mid-thirteenth century ('From "Above Top Line" to "Below Top Line": A Change in Scribal Practice' (*Celtica*, 5 (1960), 13–16).

³² Nixon, p. 80; Kelly, p. 135; Reis, 'Reader in the Manuscripts', p. 389.

³³ In the first instance, see Kinoshita (*Medieval Boundaries*, pp. 76–104 and 176–99); in the second, see Schmolke-Hasselmann (*Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, pp. 31–40) for a discussion of the rewriting of this theme in Chrétien's epigonal tradition.

³⁴ Although the term *Breton* generally denominates the inhabitant of Brittany (cf. *Cligés*, ed. Méla and Collet, ll. 440 and 576), Gérard Taverdet proposes that 'les Bretons sont plus particulièrement les sujets du roi Arthur (Gr4296)'. Taverdet's reference is to *Le Conte du Graal (Perceval)*, ed. by Félix Lecoy, 2 vols (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1973–75), I (1973), 4296. In *Perceval*, *li Breton* refer to Kay, Perceval, and Sagremors.

³⁵ See Gregory and Luttrell, 'Notes critiques', in *Cligés*, ed. by Gregory and Luttrell, pp. 245–317 (p. 275).

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ As Barbara N. Sargent-Baur has aptly remarked, *Cligés* is the first of Chrétien's characters to be knighted alone and by someone other than Arthur (pp. 395–96).

³⁸ Curtius, p. 29.

³⁹ Christine Ferlampin-Acher, 'Les Tournois chez Chrétien de Troyes: l'art de l'esquive', in *Amour et chevalerie dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes: actes du colloque de Troyes (27–29 mars 1992)*, ed. by Danielle Queruel (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1995), pp. 161–89 (pp. 174–75).

⁴⁰ Paris, p. 309; Norris J. Lacy, *The Craft of Chrétien de Troyes: An Essay on Narrative Art* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), p. 81; and Peter Haidu, *Aesthetic Distance in Chretien de Troyes Irony and Comedy in 'Cligès' and 'Perceval'* (Geneva: Droz, 1968), p. 64.

⁴¹ Haidu, p. 109.

⁴² It must be duly noted that to some extent Guiot also tried to sanitize some passages in *Érec* (ed. by Foerster, in *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Foerster and Hilka, III, 903–06, 1831–34, 1307–12, and 6462–67) and *Cligés* (ed. by Foerster, in *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Foerster and Hilka, I, 1357–62, 1749–52, 5357–60, and 6343–46) by eliminating, as Keith Busby notes, descriptions of gory details, violence, or physical and emotional interactions between heroes and heroines (*Codex and Context: Reading Old French Verse Narrative in Manuscript*, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002), I, 93–97).