



Simpson, J. R. (2020) Motion, contact and profanity in Rutebeuf's tales of 'Charlot Le Juif': (not) going there, (not) touching that. *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 56(4), 445- 467. (doi: [10.1093/fmls/cqaa001](https://doi.org/10.1093/fmls/cqaa001))

The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the publisher and is for private use only.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/150962/>

Deposited on 18 September 2019

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of  
Glasgow

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

# **Motion, Contact and Profanity in Rutebeuf's Tales of 'Charlot Le Juif': (Not) Going There, (Not) Touching That**

## Abstract

This article explores what we can learn about the context of thirteenth-century Paris from the relation between explicit and implicit in Rutebeuf's tales of Charlot the Jew. Dated to the 1260s, these two texts – 'La Disputaison de Charlot et du barbier de Melun' and 'Charlot le juif qui chia dans la peau du lièvre' – survive in Paris, BnF, ms. fr. 1635. In themselves, in relation to one another and in their manuscript context, these tales reveal much about the function of hints and hidden jokes as soundings of intercommunal tensions and polemic in the period between the Paris Disputation of 1240 and the outbursts of violence later in the century. The discussion of the text focuses on the representation of cultural and religious provocation, and especially Rutebeuf's possible adumbrating of sensitive issues not always addressed in explicit fashion. Charlot's seeming resistance to provocation in various regards may thus reflect a context in which Louis IX encouraged the lay population to take direct action in response to any perceived insults against Christianity from the Jewish population.

## Keywords

- Rutebeuf
- Old French literature
- anti-Semitism
- Paris
- comedy
- silence
- cultural provocation
- Nicolas Donin
- Talmud

‘Aussi vous di je’, fist li roys, ‘que nulz, se il ce n’est tres bon clerz, ne doit desputer a eulz. Mais l’omme loy, quant il ot mesdire de la lay crestienne, ne doit pas desfendre la lay crestienne ne mais de l’espee, de quoy il doit donner par mi le ventre dedens tant comme elle y peut entrer.’<sup>1</sup>

[The King said, ‘I tell you also that no one should enter into disputation with them, unless he is a most learned cleric. But a layman who hears Christianity being profaned should only defend the faith by the sword, which he should thrust into their bellies as far as he can.’]

A joke says what it has to say not always in few words but in *too* few words. [...] It may even actually say what it has to say by not saying it.<sup>2</sup>

Obviously, we speak to communicate. But also to conceal, to leave unspoken. The ability of human beings to misinform modulates through every wavelength from outright lying to silence.<sup>3</sup>

The poetry of Rutebeuf holds up an intriguing mirror to the social, religious and economic tensions simmering in Louis IX’s Paris – not least, its often brutal anti-Semitism.<sup>4</sup> With that in mind, this article focuses on the figure of Charlot le juif, who appears in ‘La Disputaison de Charlot et du barbier de Melun’ and ‘Charlot le juif qui chia dans la peau du lièvre’.<sup>5</sup> These tales, both dated to the mid-1260s, offer particular insights into a milieu echoing with earlier interfaith disputes. In ‘La Disputaison’, the narrator, out for a walk in the area of Saint Germain l’Auxerrois, finds the two parties trading insults and is called on to judge between them. In ‘Charlot qui chia’, Charlot attends a wedding with other jongleurs and is given a letter of introduction to squire Guillaume and travels to find him at Vincennes, where the nobleman announces he will reward him with something that cost him at least 100 sous. This turns out to be a hare pelt that was the only profit of a hunt that cost him a horse. The disgruntled minstrel defecates in it and returns it to Guillaume, claiming the squire must have forgotten something inside. Reaching in with his gloved hand, the squire finds revenge has been served warm.

The sense that banter with Jews was no laughing matter is perhaps reflected in their comparative scarcity in some genres. Although not so uncommon in moralising narrative dits, Jews figure relatively rarely in the fabliaux, where features elsewhere associated with them are mapped onto corrupt priests.<sup>6</sup> Thus,

in ‘Charlot qui chia’ even as Rutebeuf presents Charlot as a lone figure among a company of jongleurs, our central protagonist appears as something of a rare bird in the genre, reading perhaps slightly differently in this context compared to ‘La Disputaison’. Further questions about Charlot’s significance as a figure stem from manuscript context. Perhaps surprisingly, there is no close association between the two tales: ‘Charlot le juif’ survives only in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 1635 (fols 62v–63r), where it is separated from ‘La Disputaison’ (fols. 5v–6v) by some distance.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, it is unclear whether we are dealing with a recurring character or two instances of a type: moreover, although various critics have made the assumption, there is no reference to the protagonist of ‘La Disputaison’ being a jongleur.<sup>8</sup> That said, both bear witness to patterns of movement in and around Paris in the period and both focus on cheap-shot conflicts regarding exchange and value presumably characteristic of a daily drip-feed of micro-aggressive interaction.<sup>9</sup>

The problems and complexities of Rutebeuf’s works reflect wider issues in the study of the relations between literary discourses and the urban environments that shaped and inspired them.<sup>10</sup> Just as the confines of medieval London’s Square Mile moulded the capital’s demography and culture, so Philippe Auguste’s city walls, along with a steady increase in migration, gradually transformed thirteenth-century Paris.<sup>11</sup> Church and crown played major roles here: Henri Lefebvre presents the built environment of medieval cityscapes as pervaded by supernatural concerns, while the crown’s dominance was felt through taxation and church architecture – notably the ‘style rayonnant’ that characterised Parisian churches and other religious buildings from the period, a stylistic hegemony albeit belied by variation and idiosyncrasy.<sup>12</sup> Through the figure of Charlot, Rutebeuf explores not only physical mobility and contact in the city but also situations where participants and commentators alike might not have felt free to touch on particular issues, or, as the phrase has it, to ‘go there’ – explicitly at least.<sup>13</sup> Exploring situations dominated by awareness that, for Jews, to answer back in kind might be a fatal mistake, these ostensibly comic stories reflect on the limits of humour in a profoundly conflicted cultural landscape.<sup>14</sup>

My historical window here is framed primarily by two key moments. The first is the 1240 Disputation that followed Nicolas Donin’s presentation of his translation of the Talmud to Gregory IX.<sup>15</sup> For Hyam Maccoby what

distinguishes the Paris disputation from those later in Barcelona (1263) and Tortosa (1413–14) is the contrast between a seeming lack of calculation in Christian questioning and a clear sense of threat.<sup>16</sup> The second moment is the watershed marked by the 1290 accusations of desecration of the host centring on the parish of St Jean-en-Grève, north-west of the city.<sup>17</sup> At this point, even before the 1306 expulsion, the terrain of anti-Judaic hostility had changed definitively. In this urban space, daily interaction between neighbours reflected demarcations and conflicts of all kinds: gender, ethnicity, religion, as well as inequalities of wealth and status.<sup>18</sup> Jewish-Christian relations were similarly an important and evolving part of Paris' social fabric. The *Rue de la juiverie* found itself a focus both of economic activity and royal persecution, with successive expulsions under Philippe Auguste (1182) and Philippe le Bel (1306).<sup>19</sup>

Reflective of limitations to contact and understanding, anti-Semitic tensions in the Middle Ages seem fuelled by a volatile mix of contact and cultural fantasy in which the imagined prevalence of and potential for insults against Christianity played a significant role.<sup>20</sup> As explored by scholars such as Israel Jacob Yuval, ritual cursing of heretics and enemies, as well as visionary traditions of violent redemption, both long-standing components of Judaic cultures, may have served as particular focus in times of heightened persecution, as evidenced in Ashkenazic texts from the earlier thirteenth century.<sup>21</sup> Medieval Christians suspected such commemorations as little more than a mask for more specific hostilities. Accordingly, Lateran IV canon 68 forbade Jews from appearing in public for the last three days of Holy Week or Easter Sunday, ostensibly to prevent them from blaspheming in public. Polemic against Christianity was correspondingly scathing, with Mary denounced as a harlot and Jesus seemingly consigned to infernal punishment.<sup>22</sup> Likewise, particularly vitriolic versions of 'It is our duty to praise' (*Aleinu leshabei'ach*), railing against gentile impurity and false belief, survive from the period before 1240.<sup>23</sup> This prayer moved from being optional to serving as a standard conclusion to services, though, in texts of the *Aleinu* dating from after the Paris Disputation, the language appears more tempered.<sup>24</sup> In this regard, Donin's translating and sifting of the Talmud, felt on the Jewish side as a gross sacrilege, took issue with the oral interpretation that sought to explain problems posed by either the tone or content of Judaic writings, symptomatic here being his focus in questioning on the anti-gentile prayer 'Let there be no hope'.<sup>25</sup>

By contrast, Yehiel's responses to questioning by Donin – preserved in Nathan ben Official's later Hebrew account, the manuscript tradition and editorial history of which present numerous problems – highlight the importance of rabbinical teaching and guidance for avoiding misunderstanding.<sup>26</sup> One key moment in Donin's examination pertains to the comment in the Talmud that a certain Yeshua/ Jesus was to boil in excrement for all eternity. In response, Yehiel explains on the basis of comparative chronology that any identification with Christ is mistaken. Moreover, this was a common Jewish name:

The Rabbi answered, saying to the bitter gentile, 'Not every Louis who is born in France is king of France. Is it not possible that two men were born in a certain city with the same name and that both died the same death? There are many cases like this in the land.'

Said the Queen, 'Why do you [Donin and the assembled clergy] make yourselves odious? See, it is to your own honour that he said that it does not mention your god sentenced to excrement. They did not speak of him thus, that he was sentenced to boil in excrement. But you seek to draw out your shame from his mouth? It is your shame that you draw out of his mouth.'

The Queen continued and said [to rabbi Yehiel], 'On your honour, are you telling the truth?'

The Rabbi answered, 'Yes! As I live and will return to my home, we never deemed that he [Jesus] was sentenced to boiling excrement nor spoke of him in such words.'<sup>27</sup>

As Piero Capelli points out, the problem with John Friedman's rendering here is that it is based on Samuel Grünbaum's inaccurate and bowdlerised edition of the deposition. For one thing, Grünbaum provides no indication of the extensive elaboration associated with the work's transmission and reworking in 'open' fashion, reflecting its status as a common good source in Hebrew polemic and apologetic. Moreover, the language of the versions is seemingly considerably more frank than that of Grünbaum's text, not least when it comes to scatological matters.<sup>28</sup> As a case in point, Capelli cites Donin's reference to Rashi's commentary on Isaiah, 46.1–2, glossed in the Talmud as a mockery against the Babylonian gods, Bel and Nebo. At this point in one manuscript, Rashi glosses in French that Nebo shat himself ('se conkia'). Interestingly in that regard, Naomi Seidman renders the Queen's intervention cited above slightly differently, a translation based on her own reading of the Hebrew:

‘Why do you want to raise a stink? Here he has said to your honours that they did not open their mouths against your God and never said that he was condemned to boiling excrement and you want to force your own humiliation from his mouth? And isn’t it shameful for you too to be talking about excrement?’<sup>29</sup>

From the translation choices here we might take it that the Hebrew text suggests, more or less directly, connections between physical soiling and vituperative speech in the context of a tradition whose evident delight in debasement crossed the language divide. Certainly, such an emphasis on excremental defilement, whether actual or symbolic, appears consonant with Jewish-Christian polemic more widely, not to mention comedy. In the fourteenth-century Czech farce, *Mastičkář* (*The Ointment Seller*), the Jew Abraham mistakenly buys a pot of excrement – that, when smeared on the buttocks, does nonetheless restore his son to life.<sup>30</sup> Anti-Semitic caricature associated Jews with excrement via traditions of Jewish defilement of religious objects and usurious dealing in ‘filthy lucre’.<sup>31</sup> Interestingly, the Queen’s rebuke shifts the terrain, casting the friars as the ones all too ready to sling mud – or worse – in a manner that ultimately rebounds on them.<sup>32</sup> Meanwhile, Judaic polemic also insisted on ritual cleanliness, and the impurity of Christian practices (such as the keeping of relics and the visiting of shrines) and beliefs (notably the central place in Christianity of Mary as mother of God).

Vernacular works are of particular interest in such a context not least because of Louis IX’s call for lay Christians to avenge affronts through immediate violence, a position that reflects ecclesiastical concerns regarding the vulnerability of the ‘illiterate’.<sup>33</sup> With Christians licensed to pounce on any suggestion of Jewish desecration, the question of what might be imputed or implied was of considerable moment, and it was in the language of the medieval Parisian street that violence was likely to erupt. In this respect, that there may be much to learn from the reticences in Rutebeuf’s evocations of relations in Paris, with Jews reluctant to challenge Christian abuse openly for fear of worse consequences. In that respect, for all the problems associated with arguments from silence or from any construction of textual or political unconscious, my focus here is on what may be being left unsaid. Here, the poet tacitly takes up what we might describe following Seidman as a double-agent position, Rutebeuf’s reticences – possibly reflecting conflicts and engagements within a

Christian milieu – mirroring the cultural specificity of Charlot’s stance. Sympathy here may spring from a consciousness on Rutebeuf’s part of pressures – loud or quiet – shaping an evolving cultural and urban landscape. Thus, Armand Strubel characterises Rutebeuf’s observation of the rise of the mendicants in Paris as an ‘occupation [qui] s’est faite en douceur, insidieusement et sans bruit’.<sup>34</sup> Strident as he could be on questions of corruption and hypocrisy, Rutebeuf laments instances where his moral critiques may have smacked of mere backbiting ‘*médiance*’.<sup>35</sup> Likewise, as Jacques Merceron observes, although Rutebeuf’s crusading poetry returns frequently to themes of debt and reward, there seems to be a glaring silence on the issue of indulgences, whether because he disagreed with them in principle or because as sources of controversy, they were a hostage to fortune in crusading propaganda.<sup>36</sup> In this regard, unspoken insinuations and codes might be everything, though we might wonder how attentive popular works in the vernacular would be to coded acts of revenge and defiance. However, for all we might expect Charlot’s veiled commentary to go unheeded, there is evidence to suggest that Rutebeuf, for whatever reasons, might have been lending a quiet ear.

### **(Not) Civil Cousins: ‘La Disputaison’**

Slaves, serfs, untouchables, the colonized and the subjugated ordinarily dare not contest the terms of their subordination openly. Behind the scenes, though, they are likely to create and defend a social space in which offstage dissent to the official transcript of power relations may be voiced.<sup>37</sup>

L’autrier .i. jor joeir m’aloie  
 Devers l’Ausuerrois saint Germain  
 Plus matin que je ne soloie,  
 Qui ne lief pas volentiers main.  
 Si vis Charlot enmi ma voie  
 Qui le Barbier tint par la main,  
 Et bien monstroient toute voie  
 Qu’il n’ierent pas couzin germain. (‘La Disputaison’, ll. 1–8)

[The other day to amuse myself I went for a walk over towards Saint Germain l’Auxerrois. It was earlier than was my wont as I don’t like



getting up early. I saw Charlot in my road who had the Barber by the hand. And they were making it clear in every way that they weren't family.]

The first stanza of 'La Disputaison' presents Rutebeuf as a strolling witness to the casual exchange of not so humorous insults. The ambiguity of jokes that are in truth no laughing matter is underscored by the holding of hands. As François Garnier illustrates, this gesture has a range of meanings, from affection to accusatory seizure.<sup>38</sup> Charlot and the Barber thus find themselves tied into a contest over terms of community and proximity. Or rather, it appears that Charlot inaugurates and maintains a relation ('Charlot [...] qui le Barbier *tint* par la main', ll. 5–6, emphasis added), insisting on a place he might otherwise be denied. Of course, the detail does not tell us who threw the first stone, a problem exacerbated by the seemingly blithe coincidence of the narrator wandering by just in time to catch the Barber's opening sally:

Il se disoient vilonie  
Et se getoient gas de voir:  
'Charlot, tu vas en compaignie  
Por crestientei desouvoir.  
C'est traïsons et felonie,  
Ce puet chacuns aparsouvoir.  
La toie lois soit la honie!  
Tu n'en as point, au dire voir.' (ll. 9–16)

[They were saying vile things to each other and truly laying it on with their jokes: 'Charlot, you only hang around in company to bring shame on Christianity. This is treachery and a crime – anyone can see it. A curse on your religion, though to tell the truth you don't have one.']

In response, the Barber targets Charlot's true place and purpose, his 'au dire voir' (l. 16) following on from the narrator's 'de voir' (l. 10) in the first signs of an insistent concern with truth and faithlessness. Seemingly only there to deceive, Charlot appears as a fifth columnist in a malign conspiracy evident to all, reflecting wider conceptions of Judaism as an anti-religion with no positive identity.

Significantly, even as Charlot is noted as being in the narrator's way ('enmi *ma voie*' l. 5, emphasis added), he prefaces his initial riposte by swearing on the *banlieue* where the Barber lives ('foi que doi la banlive | Ou vos avez *votre repaire*' ll. 17–18 emphasis added) rather than any common place that serves as

home to all parties. Of course, Edmond Faral and Julia Bastin's suggestion that Charlot might be indicating that the Barber's place lay outside the city among the lepers at Champ pourri points to another view of who is being excluded.<sup>39</sup> One way or another, there is no 'us' here. Following Giorgio Agamben, the biopolitical dimension of who is granted a place in the royal jurisdiction of the banlieue is made apparent when the narrator is called on to act as judge. At this point he dismisses the Jew as worthless ('Charloz ne vaut ne ce ne quoi', l. 93) and having no more faith than a cur living on carrion ('Il n'a creance ne foi | Nes c'uns chiens qui charoigne tire', ll. 95–96), the stock anti-Semitic insult pointing to a key asymmetry in terms of any human *droit de cité*.<sup>40</sup> But of course, such uncertainties of status and place tally with the vicissitudes of royal protection and banishment with which the Parisian Jewish population were faced in the thirteenth century.

Where might Rutebeuf – or anyone else – be going here? Although 'La Disputaison' is set in central Paris, it implicitly ranges more widely, though where these references are going can appear rather uncertain, even as other claims or the nature of connections seem hard to gauge. As the argument unfolds, it is no clearer whether Charlot has been in the service of the king's children (ll. 57–60) than whether the Barber has been on crusade (ll. 37–40). Thus, a seemingly casual stroll leads us to a crossroads of views on the value of pilgrimage. Where we might understand Charlot as tending is a perplexing question to which the Barber betrays a tantalising answer. Taken literally, Charlot attributes the Barber's roseola to his habit of visiting shrines (l. 24). Indeed, the comment may reflect Judaic positions on the role of place and motion in popular religious practice, notably prescriptions against syncretist trafficking with unclean relics.<sup>41</sup> However, as Michel Zink points out, the jibe about Lazarus breaking his truce (l. 21) may hint that the condition is venereal, leprosy commonly regarded as being transmitted sexually.<sup>42</sup> As Zink notes, his swearing on 'Gemma' ('Sainte Jame' l. 25) may be an epithet for Mary, but can also refer to Leocadia, some of whose remains were enshrined at the relatively recently founded priory dedicated to her at Vic-sur-Aisne, approximately 100km northeast of Paris.<sup>43</sup> Perhaps Charlot is not so far from stating that neither the local nor the general cult has the power to cure. Then again, another insult may be lurking: Charlot's advice to stop visiting shrines may function both as a coded suggestion that the Barber has (literally) been frequenting

prostitutes and/or (figuratively) that he has been engaging in religious practices Judaism regarded as unclean. Interestingly, the Barber continues with an affirmation of Mary's virginity ('Ou virginitez n'est maumise' l. 29) by way of a follow-up to his implication that if Charlot was united in accordance with the law of Caiaphas, then this is no genuine marriage. Charlot's response in the following stanza (ll. 33–40) follows a similar pattern but does not engage on the same ground, obliquely directing attention further afield if anything and dismissing his opponent as barber in name only, as someone who is all talk and should go do his 'crusading' somewhere else.

The scattergun of disparate elements continues in the Barber's response:

'Charlot, tu as toutes tes lois:  
Tu iez et juis et crestiens,  
Tu iez chevaliers et borjois,  
Et, quant tu veus, clers arciens.  
Tu iez maqueriax chacun mois,  
Ce dient bien li ancien,  
Tu faiz sovent en ton gabois  
Joindre .ii. cus à .i. lien.' (ll. 41–48)

[‘Charlot, you are all things to all men: you are a Jew and a Christian, a knight and a burgher, and – when it suits you – a scholar of the Arts. You’re a pimp every month of the year. As the ancients so rightly put it, with your blarney you tie two arses with a single string.’]

The characterisation of Charlot as a jack-of-all-trades fraudster operates by an insidious logic of association. Religion here seems to extend into all aspects of life, the Jew mockingly credited with multiple 'lois', encompassing both faith identity and social standing(s). Where previously Judaism was not really a religion, now Charlot is not really Jewish. This is part of the poem's central trope: to be everything is to be nothing. In this faithless duck-and-dive, Charlot is cast as pimping both others and himself. The Barber's trolling on issues of identity and sexual propriety counterpoints his fishing for insults against Mary via repeated claims that Charlot does not believe in the Virgin (ll. 29–30; ll. 75–76).

With Christian sensitivities focused on sexualised polemic, it may be that Rutebeuf presents the Barber as steering Charlot towards key lines in the sand. Neither being scholars, the Barber nor the narrator are not there to debate, but to

listen for blasphemy and act accordingly. However, in Rutebeuf's scenario, the Jew seems to stand back from taking the bait and remains focused on an *ad hominem* roasting, targeting his opponent's relentless bile (ll. 49–56) and scabby appearance (ll. 65–72). Yet, while Charlot's taunts about the Barber's pockmarks/ roseola may seem like small beer, they could be understood as allusion to more strident Judaic denunciations of Christian impurity or the very vehemence of his attack may be designed to keep the discussion on a personal terrain.

In that sense, to describe the tale as 'a disputation' might seem something of an aggrandisement.<sup>44</sup> Indeed, unlike Rutebeuf's 'Débat du croisé et du décroisé' (or, to give it its rubricated title in fr. 1635, 'La Desputizons dou croisié et dou descroisié'), which frames a debate between two knights ('De ce pristrent a *desputeir*' l. 32, emphasis added), the only nod to formality is in the rubricated title ('La Desputisons de Charlot et dou Barbier de Melun' fol. 5v).<sup>45</sup> Such a contrast is revealing. In 'Le Débat', Rutebeuf presents himself as riding purposefully along, preoccupied with the defence of Acre (ll. 2–12), when he finds himself outside a walled house in whose garden he overhears the discussion mentioned. In spite of his chivalric stylings here, the narrator does not presume to join the company, but only eavesdrops from outside (ll. 21–24). In 'La Disputaison', by contrast, the narrator appears among equals, on foot like his characters and no more a scholar than them – just as this time the language of disputation remains the far side of the wall between text and paratext. Such a disjuncture, whereby not everyone was permitted to enter the lists of theological discussion, is of course reflected elsewhere. A case in point from Joinville is the anecdote with which Louis IX prefaces his comment, cited earlier, on the role of the laity in defending Christianity from insult. The King's account centres on a knight's intervention in a disputation at Cluny between a priest and a rabbi:

Et [le chevalier] li fist une demande qui fu tele: 'Mestre, [...] je vous demande se vous creez que la Vierge Marie, qui Dieu porta en ses flans et en ses bras, enfantast vierge, et que elle soit mere de Dieu.'

(52) Et le juif respondi que de tout ce ne croit il riens. Et le chevalier li respondi que mout avoit fait que fol, quant il ne la croit ne ne l'amoit, et estoit entré en son moustier et en sa meson. 'Et vraiment', fist le chevalier, 'vous le comparrez.' Et lors il hauça sa potence et feri le juif les l'oÿe, et le porta par terre. Et les juis tournerent en fuie et enporterent leur mestre tout blecié: et ainsi demoura la desputaison. (Joinville, ¶¶. 51–52)

[And the knight questioned the rabbi as follows: ‘Master, [...] I ask you whether you believe that the Virgin Mary, who carried God in her womb and her arms, gave birth as a virgin and that she is the mother of God.’ And the Jew replied that he did not believe any of this. At that, the knight answered that he had replied very foolishly indeed, when he entered her house and church although he did not believe in her or love her. ‘And truly you will pay for this’, said the knight. Then he picked up his staff, struck the Jew by the ear and knocked him to the ground. And the Jews fled, taking the badly injured rabbi with them. Thus ended the disputation.]

While the King’s concluding comment on the open-and-shut nature of the exchange may have a flicker of irony to it, the knight’s action and point are evidently presented as entirely legitimate. Countering the priest’s disapproval of his peremptory brutality, the knight counters that common folk who heard the debate might have ‘misunderstood’ the Rabbi’s words and been lured away from Christianity. Accordingly, the layman’s tactic is to insist on the *credo* question which seemingly precludes all further discussion. Such shockingly rapid escalation points to a climate of hostility in which Jews may well have developed strategies for both minding and veiling their responses.

### **Setting a Hare (and a Jew) Running: ‘Charlot qui chia...’**

Bon est le lievre dont cent soulz couste la pel.<sup>46</sup>

[It’s a rare hare whose pelt costs 100 sous.]

There are, moreover, others who work at nothing, but behave in an extravagant fashion [nihil operantur sed curiose agunt]; these do not have a fixed domicile but follow the courts of great men and dishonour and reproach absent men to please others. Such are damnable [...] and such are called wandering songsters because they work only at eating and slandering [ad nihil aliud utiles sunt ad devorandum et malidicendum].<sup>47</sup>

Moving away from the city itself, in ‘Charlot le juif qui chia dans le pel du lievre’ the action centres on Vincennes, then residence of the Count of Poitiers. As is apparent from the opening vignette of the hare hunt, this is a story very much concerned with movement, not least when it comes to giving people (and animals) the run-around:

Por ce le di qu'a Aviceinnes  
 Avint, n'a pas un an entier,  
 A Guillaumes le penetier.  
 Cil Guillaumes dont je vos conte,  
 Qui est a mon seigneur le conte  
 De Poitiers, chassoit l'autre jour  
 Un lievres qu'il ert a sejour.  
 Li lievres, qui les chiens douta,  
 Molt durement se desrouta,  
 Asseiz foi et longuement,  
 Et cil le chassa durement;  
 Asseiz corrut, asseiz ala,  
 Asseiz guenchi et sa et la,  
 Mais en la fin vos di ge bien  
 Qu'a force le prirent li chien.  
 Pris fu sire Coars li lievres.  
 Mais li roncins en ot les fievres,  
 Et sachiez que mais ne les tremble:  
 Escorchiez en fu, ce me cemble.  
 Or pot cil son roncins ploier  
 Et metre la pel essoreir.  
 La pel, se Diex me doint salu,  
 Couta plus qu'ele ne valu.  
 Or laisserons esteir la pel,  
 Qu'il la garda et bien et bel  
 Jusqu'a ce tens que vos orroiz. (ll. 12–37)

[And so I tell you what befell Guillaume the bread-bearer at Vincennes, not a year ago. The Guillaume of our tale – who is in the service of the Count of Poitiers – went hunting for a hare the other day when he had nothing else to attend to. The hare, who feared the dogs, went greatly out of its way. He fled as far and for as long as he could, and the squire chased him hard. He ran so fast, covering the ground and dodging here and there. Yet, in the end, I tell you true, the dogs took him by force. Sir Coart the hare was caught. But it was the nag that caught the fever, and know that he no longer shivers: he was skinned for it, so it seems. Now was the squire free to weep for his nag and hang the skin out to cure. The pelt, as may God save me, cost more than it was worth. Now let us leave the skin, which he kept safe and sound until the time you will hear about.]

In a sign that the game is very much afoot, the passage is dense in echoes of sound or form, its syntax twisting and turning, dodging around interpolated

elements, and doubling back on itself in inversions impossible to capture elegantly in translation.<sup>48</sup> To give a brief account of the effect, patterns of repetition (both lexical and phonetic) combine with discourse markers that express contrast or discontinuity, working mimetically to echo the hare's desperate evasive action, the doomed creature living up to one form of its Latin name *lepor*, which also refers to qualities of wit and invention. Of course the cold fact that agility does not prevail here is a sign that hares more generally are not endowed with what Judith Butler terms 'grievable life': it is the lot of some animals to die without their struggles and squeals counting for much.<sup>49</sup> In that sense, the hare's ethical stock is allied with the worth of its pelt.<sup>50</sup> Charlot will turn out to be of the same view, judging from his sardonic remarks on the trouble the squire so kindly went to on his behalf. And indeed, part of Rutebeuf's joke may be that his wry poetic celebration of the hare's evasion is the most ennobling ornament to be had from the matter. The hare's uncertain value is bound up with other issues of utility and profit. It is killed in the bois de Vincennes, a royal preserve whose managed character renders it analogous to the managed sovereign space of the *banlieue*. As a further marker of extraneity, the killing is part of aristocratic leisure, a 'séjour' from the normal run of productive activity. Though here the economics of courtly extravagance seem to have run awry, even by their counterintuitive standards. Even as aristocratic hunting served perhaps more to affirm status than keep the court fed, a day yielding one measly hare at a full economic costing of more than 100 sous smacks of a rather mismanaged identity performance.

Relations between spaces and texts are also apparent in the referential back and forth with the Renardian topos of Coart's terror at the sound of Noble's angry roaring in 'Le Jugement de Renart':

Onc n'i ot si hardi beste,  
 Ors ne sengler, que poor n'et  
 Quant lor sire sospire et bret.  
 Tel poor ot Coars li levres  
 Que il en ot deus jors les fevres. (ll. 356–60)<sup>51</sup>

[There was no beast so bold, whether bear or boar, who was not afraid when their lord sighed and roared. Coart the hare was so scared, he had a fever for two days.]

Cunningly, Rutebeuf's series of twists and displacements appear modelled on the hare's own leaps: it is the horse rather than him who gets the shivers. Yet, by way of a cruel doubling back, the common cure is that both die and are skinned. At this point, there seems to be a confusion, though: was the pelt hung out to dry ('Charlot le juif', l. 32) that of the hare or the horse? Even as the audience might wonder momentarily what was being palmed off in this literary legerdemain, the shared fate of the two creatures says something both about how fleetness of either tongue or foot may be of fleeting value, with Rutebeuf's foxily hare-brained allusion providing a labouring intertextual counterpart to the bounding syntactic plays preceding it.

As with the hare, so it transpires with Charlot that inspired footwork is no guarantee of a charmed existence – never mind the more plodding business of legwork. This draws in details thrown out apparently in passing, such as the narrator's observation on Charlot's status and appearance: 'Each had a master, except for Charlot, who was not the most handsome lad' ('Chacun ot maitre, nes Chaloz, | Qui n'estoit pas moult biaux valloz.' ll. 69–70). This seemingly gratuitous comment invites reflection on beauty and effect: that the jongleurs are not timid ('lainiers' l. 63) suggestschutzpah and assumed entitlement serve as passport here rather than eloquence and charm. However, 'beauty' here may be other than skin-deep, reflecting a lack of sophistication, qualities reflected in the artfully worked hare prologue, the polished letters of introduction ('bien saellees et bien dites' l. 74), not to mention the 'beautiful people' making up the guest-list at the aristocratic wedding ('assez ot de bele gent | [...] bele et gent' ll. 49–50) and who are noted as exiting ('La bone gent c'est departie' l. 59) before the entertainers speak their piece – perhaps behind the backs of those who have left, following Thomas of Chobham's characterisation of wandering minstrels (see above). That Charlot happens to be singled out from among a throng of wandering jongleurs living up to unfriendly stereotype as ungratefully *médisant* may have particular resonance for medieval Jewish cultures. Although there is evidence from orthodox commentators such as the thirteenth-century Jacob Anatoli that profane music was perceived as a disreputable foreign influence, suggestions survive that Jewish musical and musicological cultures viewed themselves in the shadow of their Christian neighbours, such as this observation from Abraham Bedersi:



Where are the marvels of Jewish knowledge and poetry? Yesterday they were found in Provençal and the Christian tongue [=Latin]. You may gather mannah in the poetry of Folquet and his colleagues, and camphor and spikenard from the mouth of Cardenal.<sup>52</sup>

Although Bedersi is here of course speaking about poets rather than performers and the South rather than the North, his regrets at the loss of elegance that leaves Jewish poetic cultures as poor cousins to both troubadours and Latinists may find a seemingly pedestrian *oil* cousin in the foot-sore Charlot. Thus, in a world of jongleurs already marginal to the canons of aesthetics and spiritual worth, our vagabond schnorrer appears not only less assuredly native to his professional mantle than his Christian *confrères* but also perhaps even exiled from some more exalted cultural terrain.<sup>53</sup> Never mind that David was a minstrel: beauty is something then either tragically lost in the diaspora or associated with poignant moments, such as the victims of the 1171 Blois pogrom singing the ‘Aleinu’ prayer.<sup>54</sup> Most composers of vernacular religious drama and lyric, not to mention fabliaux and romance, probably had elements of a Christian clerical education. However, it is less clear how many may have hailed from a Judaic background, speculations about influences in the romances of Chrétien de Troyes being a puzzle in point.<sup>55</sup> Beyond Mahieu le Juif, it is likewise unclear how many Jewish or Jewish convert entertainers might have been plying their trade between faith communities, especially in the relative cultural diversity of Paris and its environs.<sup>56</sup>

Walking and exchange are one and the same in this text. Just as *faire marcher* in modern French means to give someone the run-around, so both Charlot texts explore the purpose of movement around Paris, as well as the extent to which such perambulations bring any profit – material, spiritual or otherwise. ‘Charlot qui chia...’ revolves around a place simultaneously outside the centre and politically key: Louis IX famously dispensed justice sitting under an oak tree in the bois de Vincennes. However, Charlot is here seeking an underling of the count of Poitiers rather than the king. The complex network of feudal hierarchy and aristocratic patronage is traced in the specific *démarches* undertaken by people like Charlot. Yet, while their mock-investiture seems sealed in charter-like letters of recommendation, ostensibly betokening a reward awaiting them on condition they take the necessary steps to seek it, the squire’s cheapskate subversion of Charlot’s promissory note underscores that this venture was

certainly not a case of taking money to the bank. Such physical and hierarchical proximity contrasts interestingly with ‘La Disputaison’, where the Barber mocks Charlot’s claims to be in the service of the king’s children (‘Tu te faiz aux enfans le roi.’ l. 58). However, the potentially demeaning character of motion is apparent in Charlot’s retort to the Barber that it is better to be thought a pimp than actually employed as a mere errand boy (‘Se sui por maqueriaux *tenus*, | L’en vous *retient* a va-li-dire.’ ll. 56–57 emphasis added).<sup>57</sup>

In their fascination with poetic motion, exchange and game playing Rutebeuf’s texts also explore more extreme misdirections, swerves of thought and language here being perhaps taken a step further as the humour directs us to things not said in so many words. One matter not explicit are the (inter)cultural overtones attaching to Guillaume’s gift. As noted in Leviticus 11.6 and Deuteronomy 14.7, hares are classed as unclean (Lat. ‘*inmundus*’): perhaps this particular rabbit was pulled out of the hat on this occasion not simply because of the gag about the hundred sous.<sup>58</sup>

La pel dou lievre rova querre  
Por cui il fist maint pas de terre.  
Cil l’aportent grant aleüre,  
Et Guillaumes de rechief jure:  
‘Charlot, se Diex me doint sa grace  
Ne se Diex plus grant bien me face,  
Tant me cousta com je te di.’  
‘Hom n’en avroit pas samedi,  
Fait Charlos, autant au marchié,  
Et s’en aveiz mainz pas marchié:  
Or voi ge bien que marcheant  
Ne sont pas toz jors bien cheant.’ (ll. 91–102)

[Guillaume] sent for the hare pelt for which he had gone so far out of his way. They brought it straight away, and Guillaume swore once again: ‘Charlot, as God give me grace, and may He never do me greater favour, I swear this cost me as much as I tell you.’ ‘You wouldn’t get that much for it on a Saturday at market’, said Charlot. ‘And you’ve had to go well out your way for it. I see now that merchants don’t always fall on their feet.’]

The punchline will be that Guillaume gets his gloves dirty rather than his hands, perhaps suggesting that the real comic target is Guillaume’s self-satisfied underhandedness. Starting us in that direction, and ostensibly playing along

with his superior's taunting joke, the jongleur seems to compound his own humiliation, ironically commiserating with his so-called patron for the trouble he went to. However, Charlot's remark that it is Guillaume who would not make much from the pelt at market (ll. 98–102) perhaps foreshadows the nature of his imminent revenge. There are other cues. In what may be a series of slurringly laboured puns, the rhyme of ll. 99–100 'marchié' ('market') / 'marchié' ('walked') sets up a potential double understanding of the noun 'marcheant' ('merchants') in l. 101. Behind Charlot's comment on markets and merchants lurks his resentment at having been wrongfooted in his quest for patronage. In similar wise in ll. 101–02 we see 'cheant'(l. 102) from *cheoir* set up as a play on verbs ending in *-chier*. Charlot thereby anticipates and heralds the payback due a man who does not have ears to hear, and moreover flips the identification back to himself as the one who has been insultingly palmed off in return for having gone out of his way. But the text seems to suggest further puns, in that 'bien ch[e/i]ant' decodes the end of the previous line as an antonymic 'mar ch[e/i]ant' – perhaps even setting up in absentia a cod-epic reaction from Guillaume to what he found in the skin: *Charlot – mar chiastes...!* ['Charlot, it was a great wrong that you shat...']. Of course, tongue-twisting of this kind potentially assumes a wider significance in the context of the celebration of Purim, where the Talmud exhorts the faithful to become so drunk that the difference between the Hebrew phrases 'cursed be Haman' and 'blessed be Mordecai' becomes entirely slurred.<sup>59</sup>

But, of course, in spite of all the build-up, Rutebeuf does not actually use the verb *chier*:

Por li rendre la felonie,  
 Fist en la pel la vilonie.  
 Vos savez bien ce que vuet dire. (ll. 114–16)

[To repay him his base deed, he did the vile thing in the pelt. You know what that means.]

The euphemistic noting from the outside of the thing in the pelt as 'vilonie' is then counterpointed paratextually in that the verb *chier* only figures – as with the term 'La Disputaison' – in the rubricated title in fr. 1635. Accordingly, the central comic transgression is not handled directly or 'literally', but by artful circumlocution. This device amplifies the comic climax where Charlot's schtick

exposes the squire's smugly shitty trick, with Guillaume's soiled glove becoming an everted double of the pelt. Accordingly, the relation of paratext to text serves as further mirror to the final revenge, the profane 'chia' sticking to the outside of the tale. Interestingly, the basic inside-outside binary is teased out into a comic slow-motion unfolding of a tripartite process: the act plainly stated in paratext ('chia') finds itself veiled in Charlot's anticipatory puns and concealed at the moment itself ('vilonie').

How much further might we go with this? Moving beyond the immediate horizon, other aspects of fr. 1635's organisation may set audiences hunting for missing words and hidden obscenities. Accordingly, the text that follows in fr. 1635 is 'Le Dit du pet au vilain' (fols 63r–63v), whose conclusion runs thus:

Rutebuez ne seit entremetre  
Ou l'en puisse arme a vilain metre,  
Qu'ele a failli a ces .II. regnes;  
Or voist chanteir avec les reines,  
Que c'est li mieudres qu'il i voie;  
Ou el teigne droite la voie,  
Por sa penitence aligier,  
En la terre au peire Audigier;  
C'est en la terre de Cocuce,  
Ou Audigiers chie en s'aumuce. (ll. 67–76)

[Rutebeuf cannot offer answers as to where to put a peasant's soul when it is excluded from both these realms. Let it go sing with the frogs – that's the best he can suggest – or else, in order to lighten its penance, let it go straight to the kingdom of Audigier's father. It is in land of Cocuce, where Audigier shits in his fur hood.]

The nod here is to the scatological mock-epic *Audigier*.<sup>60</sup> Here the sequencing of Rutebeuf's oeuvre in fr. 1635, with the text of 'Le Pet...' possibly supplying an antecedent for 'Charlot le juif' through recall of Audigier defecating in his fur hood, a parallel that emphasises the role of contamination in comic logic. Further potential connections could even be teased out in context: 'Le Pet' is followed by 'Li Dis de maitre Guillaume de Saint Amour comment il fu escilliez' (fols 64r–64v): Rutebeuf's defence of the unjustly accused William, a prominent figure in his anti-Mendicant works, casts the theologian as spotless where in 'Charlot le juif' the squire of the same name was soiled. But, of course, there is more than one Guillaume in France. In similar vein, the often

paradoxical tensions between sexuality and euphemism, secular innocence and debased religiosity played out in ‘Li Diz de freire Denize le Cordelier’ (fols 60r–62r) might likewise admit of further detailed comment.

Charlot’s revenge is perhaps a distinctively Jewish joke in that it silently and slyly recognises and returns the insulting profanation that goes hand-in-glove with his pig-in-a-poke reward. Accordingly, rather than simply signalling fearful reluctance to offer open complaint, Rutebeuf’s allusive framing of Charlot’s gesture asserts a right to speak in a veiled manner, redressing the profaning cross-cultural exposure that also happened to be one of the principal resentments on the Judaic-rabbinical side in the 1240 Disputation. That Rutebeuf has Charlot’s gesture follow the prophylactic logic of Judaic strategies in the controversy triggered by Donin and accord Guillaume the courtesy of not covering the Christian personally in filth may echo the claims and denials about potty-mouthed mud-slinging clearly understood as a key component in intercommunal dispute and polemic relating to Judaic practices and traditions.<sup>61</sup> In this regard, Rutebeuf grants Charlot a victory where the Christian has a reason to be glad that the gloves remain on.

## Conclusions

‘Why are you telling me that you are going to Cracow and not to Lemberg, when you’re really going to Cracow?’<sup>62</sup>

We know that Christians and Jews spoke with one another on a daily basis and that [...] they did so in French. [...] [E]ven if words exchanged between Christians and Jews were civil, and even where Jews appeared to place their trust in the Christian authorities, there were undercurrents of suspicion. [Jews] were justifiably distrustful of Christian silences and secretive speech, because these could indicate plotting.<sup>63</sup>

Famously cited and discussed by Sigmund Freud, the mischievous Jewish joke about misdirection bears witness to quasi-paranoiac suspicions of surface meaning that mirror strategies honed in a densely microaggressive intercultural environment. As Kirsten Fudeman (above) highlights in her rich and incisive discussion of the events and memory of the 1171 Blois pogrom, such distrust of language and wariness of speaking out loud is strongly apparent in medieval Jewish sources. The run-arounds and bluffs of Rutebeuf’s portraits of Charlot

highlight the consequences of having to survive by one's wits in circumstances where jokes and silences are starting to wear thin. In that regard, his handling of the exclusionary logics and casual bile of anti-Semitic tensions and insults may reflect polemics closer to home. As Jacques Merceron highlights, in the years running up to 1260 – insofar as it is possible to deduce any kind of biographical picture from his works – Rutebeuf faced particular problems, perhaps stemming from his earlier support of the secular masters in their conflict with the Dominicans and Franciscans.<sup>64</sup>

As I remarked earlier, as an observer of anti-Semitic interaction, Rutebeuf's position may be more ambivalent than amused. Similarly conflicted Christian positions are attested elsewhere, as Barbara Newman highlights in discussing the *Passio judaeorum pragensium*, a cento that cannibalises biblical texts, particularly accounts of the crucifixion, to construct an account of the 1389 pogrom.<sup>65</sup> One aspect Newman finds surprising is John's relatively even-handed treatment of events:

Though no friend of the [Jewish] victims, the author nonetheless casts them in the role of the suffering Christ, enabling a potential sympathetic reading that undermines his overt anti-Judaism. By the same token, John the peasant idealizes the perpetrators with one hand even as he mocks their brutality and greed with the other. So here, too, a both/and reading is possible.<sup>66</sup>

While concessions to the other faith might reflect nothing more exalted than Christian intolerance being overshadowed by class antagonism, as Newman highlights in the unexpectedly mobile and ambivalent oppositions and identifications evident in works like the *Passio*. For her, this is the distinctive character of the 'literary' positions of Christian writers on Judaism and anti-Semitism, an ambivalence and mobility we perhaps also detect in Rutebeuf's tales of wandering interactions around Paris.

Newman's exploration foregrounds difficulties inherent in handling persecution, not least with regard to pervasive assumptions about the power of cultural mechanisms:

The reading I propose aims to situate the *Passio* in its historical context and to grapple with its paradoxes as a double-edged parody. Due to the morally problematic nature of the text, however, I necessarily read against the grain in a way I have tried not to do elsewhere in this book.<sup>67</sup>

Following Miri Rubin's comments in *Gentile Tales* (indeed, the phrase 'reading against the grain' is Rubin's), Newman places deliberate emphasis on the evidence of Christians resisting or questioning calls to persecution.<sup>68</sup> Christians could of course be quick to capitalise on surges of anti-Semitic violence both to cancel debts to Jewish lenders and to steal goods for later ransoming back to their owners. Moreover, allegations of Jews pressuring debtors to supply them with the Host or other religious objects for use in desecration rituals show Christian exclusions fostering Christian paranoia.<sup>69</sup> However, while in such a context one might conclude that Newman's reparative bent potentially underplays the routine character of anti-Semitic violence as well as the pervasiveness of the logics driving it, in highlighting instances where Christians were not simply blind to potential contradictions in their use of biblical texts, Newman remains attentive to the irreducible complexities of past attitudes and situations.

With that in mind, how far do we have to read against the grain to wonder if there might be some ambivalence inhering in Rutebeuf's treatment of jibes and cheap shots against Jews? Between his presence as joking judge in 'La Disputaison' and as externally observing fellow jongleur in 'Charlot qui chia...', it seems hard to gauge where Rutebeuf either stands or is going in these tales. In 'La Disputaison', we see Charlot possibly dance around issues best left untouched, the narrator's perfunctory *médiance* of the Jew as a worthless cur uncertainly juxtaposed with his reprise of the protagonist's jibe about the Barber's complexion, thereby possibly leaving us on a mocking note of hollow praise rather than any emphatic anti-Judaic position. Likewise, allowing a wandering minstrel the last laugh in a story where we see a direct (but not too direct) rendering back to the would-be prankster of how it feels to be palmed off with an unclean gift may betoken something more than the professional solidarity of someone who had evidently known his thankless share of fruitless pursuit. Perhaps not so far removed from such reflections on dealings, whether even-handed, underhanded or offhanded, in 'La Repentance Rutebeuf', the poet frets that unless Mary intervenes on his behalf at Judgement, there will be no undoing the deal he shook on: 'mon marchié pris a *paumoier*' (l. 12 emphasis added).<sup>70</sup> Even as the imagery here provides a more sober echo of the scatological handling of 'Charlot qui chia...', it also points to commonalities between personal reckonings and the handling of business between faiths.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jean de Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*, ed. and trans. by Jacques Monfrin, *Lettres Gothiques* (Paris: Le Livre de Poche, 2002), ¶. 52 – translations are mine based on Monfrin.

<sup>2</sup> Theodor Lipps, cited in Sigmund Freud, *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*, ed. by Angela Richards, trans. by James Strachey, Penguin Freud Library, 6 (London: Penguin, 1991), p. 44.

<sup>3</sup> George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 46.

<sup>4</sup> On anti-Semitic representation in the Middle Ages see notably Ruth Mellinkoff, *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Later Middle Ages, vol. 1: Text*, California Studies in the History of Art, 32 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford: University of California Press, 1993); Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1999) and Debra Higgs Strickland, *Saracens, Demons and Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003). On Paris and Louis IX particularly see Sara Lipton, *Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the 'Bible moralisée'* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: California University Press, 1999).

<sup>5</sup> For edition, see *Rutebeuf: oeuvres complètes*, ed. and trans. by Michel Zink, *Lettres Gothiques*, rev. edn (Paris: Livre de Poche, 2001). For 'La Disputaison', see Zink, pp. 781–91; for 'Charlot le juif qui chia en le pel dou lievre', see Zink, pp. 793–801. The texts of the editions by Achille Jubinal (*Œuvres complètes de Rutebeuf, trouvère du XIIIe siècle*, rev. edn, 2 vols [Paris: Paul Daffis, 1874]), Edmond Faral and Julia Bastin (*Œuvres complètes de Rutebeuf*, Société des Anciens Textes Français, 2 vols [Paris: Picard, 1959–1960]) and Zink are accessible via the site <<http://www.rutebeuf.be>> [accessed 31 January 2019]. Translations are mine after Zink. On the theme of the city in Rutebeuf's work, see notably Armand Strubel, 'Le Poète, le jongleur et la ville: la thématique urbaine dans la poésie de Rutebeuf', *Memini: travaux et documents*, 11 (2007), 5–22 and Nancy Freeman Regalado, 'Two Poets of the Medieval City: Rutebeuf and Villon', *Yale French Studies*, 32 (1964), 12–21. See also Jean Dufournet's collected studies in *L'Univers de Rutebeuf*, *Medievalia*, 56 (Orléans: Paradigme, 2005).

<sup>6</sup> Daron Burrows, *The Stereotype of the Priest in the Old French Fabliaux: Anticlerical Satire and Lay Identity* (Oxford and Bern: Peter Lang, 2005).

<sup>7</sup> 'La Disputaison' also survives in Paris, BnF, MS fr. 837 (fol. 323r–v) and fr. 24432 (fol. 35v–36v). In its context in fr. 24432, the complexities of interfaith dialogue and conflict in this text stand in intriguing counterpoint to the evidence of intracommunal critique and exhortation evident in the moralising *dits* associated with Jehan de Saint Quentin. On Jehan's work in this regard, see James R. Simpson, 'Melly and Merlin: Locating Little Voices in Paris BnF fr. 24432', in *The Other Within: Imposing, Imposed and Self-Imposed Identities in Old French Narrative*, ed. by Adrian Tudor and Kristin Burr (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, [forthcoming]). On 'Charlot qui chia...', see Francesco Montorsi, 'Quelques pistes de réflexion pour une étude scatologique', *Questes*, 21 (2011) [special issue: *Grivoiserie, pornographie, scatologie*], 35–54.

<sup>8</sup> Pace Sung-Wook Moon, who characterises both Charlot and the Barber as jongleurs (see 'Les Mouches blanches, qui piquent-elles? Rutebeuf sous la neige avec les "Ribauds de Grève"', *Questes*, 34 [2016], 55–84, p. 68).

<sup>9</sup> On Paris and urban environments, see particularly here David Nicholas, *The Growth of the Medieval City: From Late Antiquity to the Early Fourteenth Century*, History of Urban Society in Europe (London: Longman, 1997) as well as Bronislaw Geremek, *The Margins of Society in Late Medieval Paris*, trans. by Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

<sup>10</sup> For a recent overview of themes and approaches in the study of medieval urban environments, see Caroline Goodson, Anne E. Lester and Carol Symes 'Introduction', in *Cities, Texts, and Social Networks, 400–1500: Experiences and Perceptions of Medieval Urban Space*, ed. by Caroline Goodson, Anne E. Lester and Carol Symes (Farnham and Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 1–17. On urban literary cultures in the later Middle Ages, see the various contributions in *Europe: A*



---

*Literary History, 1348–1418*, ed. by David Wallace, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) – on Paris, see Stephen Nichols, ‘Paris’, I, pp. 11–42.

<sup>11</sup> Barbara A. Hanawalt, *Ceremony and Civility: Civic Culture in Late Medieval London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017). On medieval Paris, see notably Raymond Cazelles, *Paris de la fin du règne de Philippe Auguste à la mort de Charles V* (Paris: Hachette, 1972), also Philippe Lorentz and Dany Sandron, *Atlas de Paris au Moyen Age: espace urbain, habitat, société, religion, lieux de pouvoir* (Paris: Parigramme 2006). On the impact of Philippe’s construction of the city walls as well as the character of ‘le style rayonnant’, see particularly Meredith Cohen, ‘Metropolitan Architecture, Demographics and the Urban Identity of Paris in the Thirteenth Century’, in *Cities, Texts, and Social Networks*, pp. 65–100.

<sup>12</sup> Henri Lefebvre, *La Production de l’espace* (Paris: Anthropos, 1974).

<sup>13</sup> For a key discussion of the implicit and ‘textual unconscious’ in the field of medieval studies, see Paul Strohm, *Theory and the Premodern Text*, *Medieval Cultures*, 26 (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), pp. 165–81 [chapter ‘What can we know about Chaucer that he didn’t know about himself?’].

<sup>14</sup> On the perspectives on language, speech and social relations that might be gleaned from Jewish accounts from medieval France in this regard, see particularly Kirsten A. Fudeman, *Vernacular Voices: Language and Identity in Medieval Jewish Communities*, *Jewish Culture and Contexts* (Philadelphia and Oxford: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), notably pp. 60–88 [chapter: ‘Speech and Silence, Male and Female in Jewish-Christian Relations: Blois 1171’]. On the place of Jews in medieval theatre, see Elisa Narin van Court, ‘Socially Marginal, Culturally Central: Representing Jews in Late Medieval English Literature’, *Exemplaria*, 12 (2000), 293–326 and Michael Jones, ‘“The Place of the Jews”: Anti-Judaism and Theatricality in Medieval Culture’, *Exemplaria*, 12 (2000), 327–58.

<sup>15</sup> For sources relating to the 1240 disputation, see *The Trial of the Talmud: Paris, 1240*, ed. and trans. by John Friedman, Jean Connell Hoff and Robert Chazan, *Medieval Sources in Translation*, 53 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2012) – for Friedman’s translation of the disputation of Rabbi Yehiel see pp. 126–68. Most renderings and citations derive from Samuel Grünbaum’s deeply flawed edition, *Sefer wikkuah Rabbenu Yehi’el mi-Paris* (Thorn: Dombrowski, 1873). An earlier ‘paraphrase’ of Yehiel’s deposition can be found in Hyam Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial: Jewish-Christian Disputations in the Middle Ages*, rev. edn (Washington DC and London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilisation, 1993). On the textual tradition and its problems, see Piero Capelli, ‘Il Wikkhuah Rabbenu Yehi’el: problemic di storia del testo’, *Sacra Doctrina*, 51, (2008), 144–66 as well as his ‘Editing Thirteenth-Century Polemical Texts: Questions of Method and the Status Quaestionis in Three Polemical Works’, *Henoch*, 37:1 (2015), 43–52 (on the problems associated with the manuscript versions and editions of Yehiel’s deposition, see pp. 46–49). For a recent re-evaluation of accounts and perspectives, see Judah Galinsky, ‘The Different Hebrew Versions of the “Talmud Trial” of 1240 in Paris’, in *New Perspectives on Jewish-Christian Relations: In Honor of David Berger*, ed. by Elisheva Calebach and Jacob J. Schacter, Brill Reference Library of Judaism, 33 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 109–40. On the interrelation of translation and cultural difference in that context, see Naomi Seidman, *Faithful Renderings: Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2010).

<sup>16</sup> Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial*, p. 34.

<sup>17</sup> On the 1290 accusations, see notably Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*, *The Middle Ages*, rev. edn (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999 [2004]), pp. 40–48.

<sup>18</sup> On poverty in Paris see notably Sharon A. Farmer, *Surviving Poverty in Medieval Paris: Gender, Ideology and the Daily Lives of the Poor* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002).

<sup>19</sup> Robert Chazan, *Medieval Jewry in Northern France: A Political and Social History* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974). On the 1182 expulsion, see notably William Chester Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989). On the cultural impact of the expulsions, see Susan Einbinder, *No Place of Rest: Jewish Literature, Expulsion, and the Memory of Medieval France* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

---

<sup>20</sup> On Jewish polemic in the period, see particularly Hanne Trautner-Kromann, *Shield and Sword: Jewish-Christian Polemics against Christianity and the Christians in France and Spain from 1100 to 1500* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993). On Jewish violence and polemic against Christians, see Elliott Horowitz, *Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006). T.C.G. Thornton, 'The Crucifixion of Haman and the Scandal of the Cross', *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 37 (1986), 419–26.

<sup>21</sup> For an overview, see 'Polemics, Anti-Christian', in *Medieval Jewish Civilisation: An Encyclopedia*, ed. by Norman Roth (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), pp. 525–33. See also Israel Jacob Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. by Barbara Harshav and Jonathan Chipman (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 2006).

<sup>22</sup> See *The Trial of the Talmud*, p. 135–40.

<sup>23</sup> Yuval, pp. 92–134.

<sup>24</sup> See Yuval, pp. 194–95 and William Chester Jordan, 'Marian Devotion and the Talmud Trial of 1240', in *Religionsgespräche im Mittelalter*, ed. by B Lewis and E Niewöhner (Wiesbaden, 1992), pp. 61–76.

<sup>25</sup> For the Disputation discussion of the prayer and cursing more generally, see *The Trial of the Talmud*, pp. 153–58.

<sup>26</sup> For discussion of the various Hebrew versions, see Galinsky, 'The Different Hebrew Versions' and Maccoby, pp. 19–38. Read against Strohm's reflections on textual and cultural unconsciousnesses, Maccoby's comments imply potentially questionable suppositions regarding Yehiel's motivations. See also Friedman's remarks on the translation difficulties posed by the text in *Judaism on Trial*, p. viii.

<sup>27</sup> Translation cited from Friedman and others, *The Trial of the Talmud*, p. 140.

<sup>28</sup> Capelli, 'Editing', p. 48.

<sup>29</sup> Seidman, p. 136.

<sup>30</sup> For discussion of *Mastičkář*, see Newman (p. 188).

<sup>31</sup> See Lipton, pp. 36, 84.

<sup>32</sup> Interestingly, the later discussion regarding Gehimmon (see *The Trial of the Talmud*, pp. 153–55) makes no mention of Tzoah rotachat, the region of punishment by boiling reserved for the worst sinners against Judaism. Blanche of Castile's firm but protective stance here seemingly assimilates her to the figure of Esther, who helped Mordecai thwart Haman, the Queen appearing as a 'double agent', to use Naomi Seidman's term (see Seidman, pp. 1–36). Her discussion of translation and interculturality here draws on her account of her father's careful playing of his go-between role as an advisor to Jewish refugees and survivors of the camps at the end of WW2.

<sup>33</sup> Lipton, pp. 76–77.

<sup>34</sup> Strubel, p. x.

<sup>35</sup> Regalado, pp. 88–96

<sup>36</sup> See notably Jacques E. Merceron, 'Rutebeuf marchand de croisades et le système de la comptabilité spirituelle: le dit et le non-dit', *Romania*, 131 (2013), 381–408.

<sup>37</sup> James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), p. xi.

<sup>38</sup> See François Garnier, *Le Langage de l'image au Moyen Age: signification et symbolique*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, (Paris: Le Léopard d'Or, 1982), pp. 198–208. On hand gestures, see additionally Garnier, *Le Langage de l'image au Moyen Age II: la grammaire des gestes* (Paris: Le Léopard d'Or, 1982), pp. 99–143.

<sup>39</sup> See Faral and Bastin, note to ll. 17–18.

<sup>40</sup> See Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. by Daniel Heller-Roazen, Meridian: Crossing Aesthetics (Stanford: University of Stanford Press, 1998), p. 110. On the ban mile in historical context, see Nicholas, pp. 210–12. Terminology varied, the area around Toulouse being referred to less ambiguously as a 'salvetat' or safe haven.

<sup>41</sup> On Judaic attitudes to relics and shrines see Ephraim Shoham-Steiner, '“For a Prayer in that Place Would Be Most Welcome”: Jews, Holy Shrines and Miracles – A New Approach', *Viator*, 37 (2006), 369–95. See also Julia M.H. Smith, 'Portable Christianity: Relics in the Medieval West (c. 700-c. 1200)', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 181 (2012), 143–67.

<sup>42</sup> Zink, pp. 782–83, note 1.

---

<sup>43</sup> See Zink, pp. 784–85, note 1. Leocadia’s remains were removed from Oviedo in the eleventh century, after which they were kept for a time at the abbey of Saint-Ghislain in the county of Hainaut. The church at Vic sur Aisne has her lower jaw. The saint is celebrated in Gautier de Coinci’s *Les Miracles de Notre Dame*, on which see Katherine A. Duys, ‘Performance Through the Eyes of a Medieval Poet: A Guide for the Perplexed’, in *Acts and Texts: Performance and Ritual in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. by Laurie Postlewaite and Wim N. M. Hüsken, Ludus: Medieval and Early Renaissance Theatre and Drama (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002), pp. 183–216 (especially pp. 199–208).

<sup>44</sup> On the institutional context, see Olga Weijers, *La ‘Disputatio’ à la Faculté des arts de Paris (1200–1350 environ): esquisse d’une typologie*, Studia Artistarum, 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995).

<sup>45</sup> For text, translation and dating of ‘Le Débat’, see Zink, pp. 895–917. Zink’s base text is that of fr. 1635 (fols 10r–11v). The poem survives in two other manuscripts.

<sup>46</sup> *Proverbes français antérieurs au XVe siècle*, ed. by Joseph Morawski, Classiques Français du Moyen Age (Paris: Champion, 1925), item 284. The proverb in question is preserved in Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. 1429.

<sup>47</sup> Thomas of Chobham, *Summa confessorum*, ed by F. Broomfield, Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia, 25 (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1968), p. 291; trans. after Regalado, pp. 89–90. Earlier citation and discussion (including Léon Gautier, Edmond Faral, Helen Waddell and Regalado) follows the reading ‘sed criminose agunt’. The reading as per Broomfield’s edition is an allusion to 2 Thessalonians: ‘Audivimus enim inter vos quosdam ambulare inquiete, nihil operantes, sed curiose agentes’ [‘For we have heard there are some among you who walk disorderly, working not at all, but curiously meddling.’] (2 Thessalonians 3.11). For the sense of ‘curiose’ (adv.) see *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. As regards the reading ‘criminose’, I am very much indebted to one of the readers for the present essay who very kindly supplied the following explanation: ‘The reading ‘sed criminose agunt’ [...] appears to derive from mss. BnF lat. 3518 and 3529A. The text from these witnesses was reproduced by Barthélemy Hauréau in “Notice sur un pénitentiel attribué à Jean de Salisbury”, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et d’autres bibliothèques*, 24:2 (1876), 269–87 (pp. 284–85). The text reproduced by Hauréau seems to have become the basis for much of the subsequent comment on Thomas of Chobham’s remarks on performers; it was subsequently reproduced in E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), II, pp. 262–63.’

<sup>48</sup> Albert Junker, ‘Über dem Gebrauch des Stilmittels der “annominatio” bei Rutebeuf’, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 69 (1953), 223–46. Pierre Kunstmann, ‘L’Annominatio chez Gautier: vocabulaire et syntaxe’, in *Gautier de Coinci: Miracles, Music, and Manuscripts*, ed. by Kathy M. Krause and Alison Stones, Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe, 13 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), pp. 101–12.

<sup>49</sup> Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Power of Mourning and Violence* (New York and London: Verso, 2006) and also *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* (New York and London: Verso, 2009).

<sup>50</sup> See particularly Aleks Pluskowski, ‘The Castle and the Warren: Medieval East Anglian Fur Culture in Context’, in *East Anglia and its North Sea World in the Middle Ages*, ed. by David Bates and R. Liddiard (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), pp. 152–73. More generally, see also his earlier contributions: ‘Communicating through Skin and Bone: The Appropriation of Animal Bodies in Medieval Western Seigneurial Culture’, in *Breaking and Shaping Beastly Bodies: Animals as Material Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Aleks Pluskowski (Oxford: Oxbow, 2007), pp. 32–51 and also ‘The Zooarchaeology of Medieval Christendom: Ideology, the Treatment of Animals and the Making of Medieval Europe’, *World Archaeology*, 42:2 (2010), 201–14.

<sup>51</sup> For text, see *Le Roman de Renart*, ed. and trans. by Jean Dufournet and Andrée Méline, 2 vols (Paris: GF-Flammarion, 1985). Rutebeuf of course makes extensive reference to Renart materials: see Jean Dufournet, ‘Rutebeuf et le *Roman de Renart*’, *L’Information littéraire*, 1 (1978), 7–15 and Aurélie Barre, ‘Le Renard de Rutebeuf’, *Cahiers de recherches médiévales*, 14 (2007), 253–66.

<sup>52</sup> For edition, see Haim Schirmann (ed.), *HaShirah ha’Ivrit biSefarad uveProvans* (Hebrew Poetry from Spain and Provence), 4 vols (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik; Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1960), IV, p. 467. Translation cited from Catherine Léglu, ‘Toulouse’, in *A Literary History of Europe 1348-*

---

1415, ed. by David Wallace, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), I, pp. 140–55. ‘Folquet might indicate Folquet de Lunel, Falquet de Romans or Folquet de Marselha.

<sup>53</sup> In that respect, we might see Charlot’s position as a counterpart to the ambivalent treatment of the relation between beauty and truth evident in Bedersi’s writings, not least the kind of aesthetic and philosophical stripping Einbinder sees in his use of the pantogram form (on this, see Einbinder, pp. 21–22, 39–45).

<sup>54</sup> See Israel Jacob Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. by Barbara Harshav and Jonathan Chipman (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 2006), pp. 192–93. See Susan Einbinder, *Beautiful Death: Jewish Poetry and Martyrdom in Medieval France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

<sup>55</sup> On possible Judaic influences or resonances in Chrétien’s romances, see Joan Helm, ‘*Eric and Enide: Cosmic Measures in Nature and the Hebrew Heritage*’, in (ed.) *Medieval Numerology: A Book of Essays*, ed. by Robert L. Surles (New York: Garland, 1993), pp. 53–76. For a recent exploration of relations between Judaic and vernacular literary cultures in medieval France, see notably Hanna Liss, *Creating Fictional Worlds: Peshah? Exegesis and Narrativity in Rashbam’s Commentary on the Torah*, *Studies in Jewish History and Culture*, 25 (Leiden: Brill, 2011)

<sup>56</sup> Mahieu le Juif is associated with two songs, ‘*Por autrui movrai mon chant*’ (see ‘*Chanter m’estuet*’: *Songs of the Trouvères*, ed. by Samuel N. Rosenberg and Hans Tischler [London and Boston, Faber, 1981], pp. 403–04) and the more popular ‘*Par grant franchise me convient chanter*’ (for discussion see Samuel N. Rosenberg, ‘*French Songs in Occitan Chansoniers: Mahieu le Juif in ms. O (Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, vaticani latini 3208)*’, in ‘*De sens rassis*’: *Essays in Honor of Rupert T. Pickens*, ed. by Keith Busby, Logan E. Whalen and Bernard Guidot, Faux Titre [Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2005], pp. 567–76). For an overview of discussions and problems regarding the identification of Jewish troubadour and trouvère figures, see Einbinder (notably pp. 19–29). For sources and references in relation to Jewish musical cultures and practice, see Higinio Anglès, ‘*La Musique juive dans l’Espagne médiévale*’, *Yuval Studies of the Jewish Music Research Centre*, 1 (1968), 48–64 [various reprints]. For more recent discussion see, *The New Oxford History of Music (Part 3 Vol. 1): Music as Concept and Practice in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by Reinhard Strohm and Bonnie J. Blackburn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 16–29.

<sup>57</sup> From Zink’s note to l. 56, it seems that Rutebeuf may be presenting the distinction as more apparent than real, René d’Anjou’s later *Livre du cuer d’amour espris* indicating that the term *va-li-dire* and *maquereau* are synonyms.

<sup>58</sup> Thus: ‘*lepus quoque nam et ipse ruminat sed unguam non dividit*’ (Leviticus, 11.6) [‘The hare also: for that too cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof.’] and ‘*de his autem quae ruminant et unguam non findunt haec comedere non debetis camelum leporem choerogyllium quia ruminant et non dividunt unguam inmunda erunt vobis*’ (Deuteronomy 14.7) [‘But of them that chew the cud, but divide not the hoof, you shall not eat, such as the camel, the hare, and the cherogril: because they chew the cud, but divide not the hoof, they shall be unclean to you.’].

<sup>59</sup> See Newman, p. 196.

<sup>60</sup> For edition, see *L’Épopée pour rire: Le Voyage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et Constantinople et Audigier*, ed. and trans. by Alain Corbellari, Champion Classiques. Moyen Age, 45 (Paris, Champion, 2017). On the text in this connection, see notably Rosanna Brusegan, ‘*Cocuce: la troisième voie de Rutebeuf dans Le Pet au vilain*’, in ‘*Plaist vos oïr bone cançon vaillant?*’: *mélanges de langue et de littérature médiévales offerts à François Suard*, ed. by Dominique Boutet, Marie-Madeleine Castellani, Françoise Ferrand and Aimé Petit, *Travaux et recherches*, 2 vols (Lille: Conseil scientifique de l’Université Charles-de-Gaulle, 1999), I, pp. 133–40 along with Chloé Chalumeau, ‘*La Scatologie dans Audigier: de la chanson de geste au fabliau*’, *Questes*, 21 (2011), 55–71 and also Herman Braet, ‘*Audigier, de la dissonance comme moyen de dérision*’, in ‘*Si a parlé par moult ruiste vertu*’: *mélanges de littérature médiévale offerts à Jean Subrenat*, ed. by Jean Dufournet, *Colloques, congrès et conférences sur le Moyen Âge*, 1 (Paris: Champion, 2000), pp. 83–90.

<sup>61</sup> One possible resonance here might be the account of the tensions between David and Saul relating to 1 Samuel 24/ 1 Kings 24. Saul in hiding in the Engadi desert goes into a cave to relieve himself; David cuts the hem from his garment; a discussion ensues between them about their conflict. Saul submits himself to David’s judgement; David recognises Saul’s divine mandate. Thus insofar as Charlot is presented with an unclean object and soils his putative lord in return, Rutebeuf’s scenario

---

inverts the Old Testament one. Though I am not aware of any references to comment on the episode in Judaic/ Judaic-Christian polemic (for instance, there is nothing immediately suggestive in Peter Comestor's treatment of the episode in his *Historia scholastica*), it is not impossible that something might emerge in that connection. Moreover, the episode is highlighted in illustrations in the *Bible historiale* and elsewhere (see for example BL Egerton MS 3277 [= the Bohun Psalter-Hours], as well as Oxford, Exeter College, MS 47 [= the Bohun Psalter]). However, these instances are rather later than the present context: Guyart de Moulins' text is dated to 1297, and the Bohun MSS are both c. 1370. There is certainly discussion of the passage that relates it to temporal conflicts and arguments against regicide in war (notably discussed by William of Ockham). On the Bohun illuminations, see Lucy Freeman Sandler, 'Worded and Wordless Images: Biblical Narratives in the Psalters of Humphrey de Bohun', in *The Social Life of Illumination: Manuscripts, Images and Communities in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by Joyce Coleman, Mark Cruse and Kathryn A. Smith, Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe, 21 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 83–120.

<sup>62</sup> On the joke and Freudian commentary related to it, Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, Phronesis (London and New York: Verso, 1989), p. 197.

<sup>63</sup> Fudeman, pp. 87–88.

<sup>64</sup> Merceron, pp. 381–82.

<sup>65</sup> On the *Passio* and its context, see notably Barbara Newman, *Medieval Crossover: Reading the Secular against the Sacred* (New York: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013), pp. 167–222. 'Passio judaeorum pragensium', in Paul Lehmann, *Die Parodie im Mittelalter*, rev. edn (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1963), pp. 211–26. Newman's discussion uses the more recent critical edition of Eva Steinová, 'Passio judaeorum pragensium': *Kritická edícia Pašiji pražských židov* (unpublished M.A. thesis, Brno, 2010).

<sup>66</sup> Newman, p. 185.

<sup>67</sup> Barbara Newman, *Medieval Crossover: Reading the Secular against the Sacred* (New York: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013), p. 181.

<sup>68</sup> See Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, p. 3.

<sup>69</sup> On Judaic strictures on lending, see particularly Robert Chazan, *Fashioning Jewish Identity in Medieval Western Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), esp. pp. 298–313 for his discussion of *Sefer ha-Berit*.

<sup>70</sup> 'La Repentance Rutebeuf' survives in fr. 837, fr. 1635, fr. 24432 and also Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, MS 9411-26. Zink's base text is that of fr. 1635, though with some interventions, notably in l. 12, where the other versions have 'mau marchié'. Although this emendation provides for readier sense in context, the original reading of fr. 1635, cited above, is certainly not incomprehensible. As in 'Le Miracle de Theophile', it is down to Mary to break the (bad) bargain that has been struck, though there the term used by Mary is 'barate' ('Le Miracle', l. 595).