

**Reflections of writing, rewriting, and
reading in twelfth-century French
literature: A study of *Guillaume de
Palerne* as a self-reflexive romance**

Eleanor Hodgson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of French
University of Sheffield

—July 2015—

Abstract

This thesis explores *Guillaume de Palerne* as a self-reflexive romance in which twelfth-century practices of writing, rewriting, and reading are reflected in the narrative. As a romance excluded from the main corpus of texts analysed in medieval studies, *Guillaume* suffered from critical neglect throughout much of the twentieth century. However, a recent rise in interest in this work has called for its integration into mainstream scholarship. This study develops this trend by examining the contribution that *Guillaume* can make to existing knowledge of romance production and reception.

Detailed analysis of *Guillaume* and its main themes is presented alongside discussion of the intertextual rewriting found within the text. Taking a bipartite form divided into four chapters, the first half of the study explores transformation, before moving on to the notions of doubling and correspondence, and finally to recognition. The thesis argues that the ‘intertextual game of romance’ played between poet and audience is reflected in the *Guillaume* narrative through the stress placed on transformation and recognition. By exploring doubling and correspondence, this analysis also highlights the relationship between transformation and recognition in the narrative, which in turn mirrors the partnership between poet and audience in romance creation.

With its primary focus on the text, this study is facilitated by an engagement with theoretical frameworks, particularly of intertextuality, that discuss medieval composition and reception, stemming both from medieval studies and from modern literary theory. The thesis argues for a holistic approach to examining texts such as *Guillaume*, stressing the importance of simultaneously exploring both the intra- and extra-diegetic spheres of this work. In so doing, it sheds new light on this overlooked text, and argues for acknowledgement of the place held by *Guillaume* in the development of French romance.

Contents

Acknowledgements	7
Introduction	9
Critical scholarship on <i>Guillaume de Palerne</i>	11
New critical ground and aims of the thesis	24
Theoretical framework and methodology	26
Chapter outlines.....	40
Chapter One: Women as catalysts of transformation	45
Melior	48
Queen Felise	68
Alixandrine.....	82
Conclusion.....	105
Chapter Two: Space as a catalyst of transformation	109
The straits of Messina	114
The forest.....	124
The ‘vergier’	140
Conclusion.....	164
Chapter Three: Doubling and Correspondence	169
Doubling and correspondence in the twelfth century.....	172
Alphonse and Guillaume as human/animal hybrids.....	185
The partnership between Alphonse and Guillaume	212
Conclusion.....	227
Chapter Four: Recognition and Reading	233
Recognition of the werewolf in <i>Guillaume</i> and <i>Bisclavret</i>	240
Recognition of Alphonse as wolf, beast, and werewolf.....	256
Animal-skin disguises and recognition at the Palermo palace.....	269
Recognition, reception, and the audience of <i>Guillaume de Palerne</i>	283
Conclusion.....	298
Conclusion	303
Bibliography	315
Appendix	347
Major Dramatis Personae discussed in this study	347
Plot summary.....	347

Acknowledgements

I owe a great deal of thanks to a number of people who have supported me during this research. Firstly, I would like to thank the Department of French at the University of Sheffield, where my interest in medieval French literature was sparked as an undergraduate, and where I have had an academic home for nearly nine years. The advice and encouragement given to me by colleagues has helped me to develop as a researcher, and their friendship has offered me valuable ‘down-time’ away from the thesis. I am also grateful to the Department for providing me with the Dorothy Mable Tingle Bursary, without which I would not have been able to undertake this project.

I also wish to express my thanks to fellow postgraduate students in the School of Languages and Cultures. I am very lucky to have had a network of people with whom to discuss work, and most importantly with whom to laugh and let off steam. I would also like to thank my close friends outside of the University, who have patiently listened when I have talked about this thesis, and who have supported me throughout the project.

Thanks must go to my two fantastic supervisors, Penny Simons and Helen Abbott. Although *Guillaume de Palerne* was unknown to Helen when I began this research, she has provided valuable support throughout the project, and for which I am very grateful. I will be forever thankful to Penny for encouraging me to continue with postgraduate study, for her academic guidance, and for her tireless enthusiasm and support that has helped me to tackle this undertaking.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their love and help throughout the past four years. My parents have always supported me, and I am truly grateful to them for encouraging me to pursue my interests, and for caring so much about what I do. And lastly, thanks to Alastair, whose patience and support has been invaluable, and who has helped me to get through this thesis ‘about an Irish werewolf’ with a smile.

Introduction

Guillaume de Palerne, an anonymous Old French romance of 9664 verses, has been identified as under-researched in the recent work of three medievalists. In 2011, Eley placed *Guillaume* within ‘a group of texts that have existed on the periphery of mainstream scholarship’.¹ In 2012, Ferlampin-Acher remarked that *Guillaume* is ‘un de ces romans médiévaux souvent oubliés par la critique’, an argument also presented in Simons’s work of the same year.² Although the text was first edited in 1876 and attracted some attention from nineteenth-century scholars including Gaston Paris and F. M. Warren, it suffered from a lack of critical scholarship throughout much of the twentieth century.³ When *Guillaume* was examined, critics most often turned to it as part of their analysis of an individual theme treated throughout a wider corpus of works, focusing in particular on the lycanthropic elements of the romance. To date only one monograph has been published with *Guillaume* as its sole subject of study, Dunn’s 1960 *The Foundling and the Werwolf*.⁴ The title of this volume highlights the dominant focus on the werewolf in critical analysis of *Guillaume*, further stressed by the work’s position in the category of ‘romans d’aventure et d’amour’ under the subsection ‘la survivance du merveilleux’ in the *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*.⁵

¹ Penny Eley, *‘Partonopeus de Blois’: Romance in the Making* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2011), p. 1. Eley aligned *Guillaume* with *Partonopeus de Blois*, the romances of Hue de Rotelande, and Aimon de Varenne’s *Florimont*, commenting on the neglect of these texts in critical scholarship.

² Christine Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, in *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Christine Ferlampin-Acher (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2012), pp. 7-112 (p. 7). Penny Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space in *Guillaume de Palerne*’, in *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: The Spatial Turn in Premodern Studies*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 407-31 (p. 409). Simons states that *Guillaume* is ‘relatively neglected by critics’.

³ *Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. by H. Michelant (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1876). Gaston Paris, ‘La Sicile dans la littérature française du moyen âge’, *Romania*, 5 (1876), 108-13 (p. 112); F. M. Warren, ‘Notes on the Romans d’Aventure’, *Modern Language Notes*, 13 (1898), 170-76 (p. 173).

⁴ Charles W. Dunn, *The Foundling and the Werwolf: A Literary-historical Study of ‘Guillaume de Palerne’* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960).

⁵ Alexandre Micha, ‘III. Romans d’aventure et d’amour: 1. La survivance du merveilleux’, in *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, ed. by Jean Frappier and Reinhold R. Grimm, 11 vols (Heidelberg: Winter, 1978), IV, pp. 454-57 (pp. 455-56).

However, many of the adventures that take place in *Guillaume* are unrelated to the werewolf and instead depict the amorous and military exploits of the eponymous hero. Indeed, much of the romance cannot be qualified as ‘merveilleux’, and Ferlampin-Acher notes that it is ‘atypique [...] dans la mesure où il n’est ni arthurien, ni antique’.⁶ Ferlampin-Acher hypothesises that the difficulty posed by classifying *Guillaume* within a single romance tradition has led to critical neglect, although Micha’s disparaging comments on the quality of the text as ‘une honnête moyenne’ indicate additional reasons for the dearth of *Guillaume*-focused analysis.⁷ Whatever the reason for the lack of scholarship dedicated to *Guillaume* during much of the twentieth century, the past fifteen years have seen a ‘mini renaissance’ in critical interest which suggests that the romance merits further study in order to examine elements beyond the figure of the werewolf.⁸

The recent work of Ferlampin-Acher and Simons has in particular begun to explore the intertextual sphere of *Guillaume*, and to question the way in which key aspects of the narrative reflect the compositional process of intertextual rewriting.⁹ These scholars engage with the critical trend of using close literary analysis as a tool for understanding poets’ approaches to composition. Critics have explored parallels between a work’s narrative and what is known about its production, referring to texts analysed in this manner as ‘self-reflexive’.¹⁰ The respective comments of Simons and Ferlampin-Acher regarding reflections of medieval compositional practices in *Guillaume* establish avenues for research that move beyond questioning the literary quality of the text or studying the treatment of lycanthropy in the narrative, as these critics look instead at how

⁶ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 7.

⁷ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 7; Micha, ‘III. Romans d’aventure et d’amour’, p. 456. Micha also states that the text is not the work of a ‘grand écrivain’. Alexandre Micha, ‘Introduction’, in *Guillaume de Palerne: Roman du XIII^e siècle*, ed. by Alexandre Micha (Geneva: Droz, 1990), pp. 7-38 (p. 38).

⁸ Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 409.

⁹ Their findings will be discussed in this Introduction.

¹⁰ Matilda Bruckner, ‘The Shape of Romance in Medieval France’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 13-28 (p. 13); Jean-Charles Huchet, ‘L’Enéas: un roman spéculaire’, in *Relire le “Roman d’Enéas”*, ed. by Jean Dufournet (Paris: Champion, 1985), pp. 63-81 (pp. 63-66); Roberta Krueger, ‘Introduction’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Krueger, pp. 1-10 (p. 6).

analysis of *Guillaume* can broaden our understanding of romance composition. This thesis will draw upon and develop the conclusions of these scholars by taking as its central focus an examination of *Guillaume de Palerne* as a self-reflexive romance. However, it will advance their work by examining how the processes of both composition and reception are reflected within the *Guillaume* narrative, thus engaging in greater depth with analysis of the romance as a self-reflexive text.

In order to present a comprehensive study of the *Guillaume* poet's reflections of the production and reception of his romance, I will first explore the four main areas of *Guillaume* criticism, which can be divided thus:

1. the manuscript tradition, adaptations, and translations;
2. dating of the romance;
3. analysis of the werewolf;
4. questions of intertextual rewriting.

My examination of the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume* will unify these different critical trends, whilst continuing the work undertaken by scholars in the past fifteen years. I will present new arguments for the reintroduction of *Guillaume* into the corpus of texts which, when analysed closely, can help us to understand medieval French romance.

Critical scholarship on *Guillaume de Palerne*

Manuscript tradition, adaptations, and translations

Guillaume de Palerne survives in only one manuscript, Paris Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 6565, in which it is preserved alongside Jean Renart's early thirteenth-century romance, *L'Escoufle*.¹¹ The author of *Guillaume* is unknown, and despite the compilation of the romance with *L'Escoufle*, the two works are not thought to have been composed by

¹¹ For information regarding this manuscript, including descriptions of the two miniatures relating to *Guillaume*, see the following: Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 18-21; Micha, 'Introduction', p. 7-8; and H. Michelant, 'Préface', in *Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. by H. Michelant, pp. i-xxii (pp. xii-xiv).

the same poet.¹² The first edition of *Guillaume* was completed by Michelant in 1876, and thirty years later Delp published a list of corrections to Michelant's transcription alongside a study of the language of *Guillaume*.¹³ However, further errors not addressed by Delp prompted Micha to publish a new edition of *Guillaume* in 1990.¹⁴

The existence of a single manuscript witness of the Old French verse *Guillaume* has led scholars to debate the success of the romance in the Middle Ages.¹⁵ However, *Guillaume* also exists in two translations and two prose adaptations, suggesting that the work was known well enough to be transmitted in later versions. In c. 1349-59 *Guillaume* was translated into Middle English verse at the request of Sir Humphrey de Bohun, and this version, entitled *William of Palerne*, was in turn reformulated into English prose in the early 1500s.¹⁶ A French prose translation of *Guillaume* was produced by Pierre Durand in the mid-1500s, of which an additional six prose versions survive.¹⁷ An Irish

¹² Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 18-32; F. M. Warren, 'The Works of Jean Renart, Poet, and Their Relation to *Galeran de Bretagne*, II.', *Modern Language Notes*, 23 (1908), 97-100 (p. 97).

¹³ *Guillaume* was published as part of the Société des Anciens Textes Français, under the direction of Gaston Paris. *Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. by H. Michelant (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1876). Delp notes the absence of a glossary in Michelant's volume, adding that 'la question de la langue y est à peine abordée'. She also provides seven pages of corrections. Wilhelmine E. Delp, *Etude sur la langue de Guillaume de Palerne, suivie d'un glossaire* (Paris: Protat, 1907), p. v and pp. 44-50.

¹⁴ All *Guillaume* quotations in this thesis are taken from Micha's edition, unless otherwise stated. *Guillaume de Palerne: Roman du XIII^e siècle*, ed. by Alexandre Micha (Geneva: Droz, 1990). Micha observed more than 300 errors in Michelant's transcription, not all of which were corrected by Delp. Micha, 'Introduction', p. 7.

¹⁵ Ferlampin-Acher states that the work's success was small ('mince'), yet Irene McKeehan described *Guillaume* as a "'best seller'" due to later translations and adaptations. Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 44-46; Irene Pettit McKeehan, '*Guillaume de Palerne*: A Medieval "Best Seller"', *PMLA*, 41 (1926), 785-809 (pp. 786-87).

¹⁶ See the following sources for information regarding the versions of *William*: Dunn, p. 5-6; Laura Hibbard, *Mediaeval Romance in England: A Study of the Sources and Analogues of the Non-Cyclic Metrical Romances* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1924), pp. 214-15; L. A. J. R. Houwen, "'Breme Beres' and 'Hende Hertes': Appearance and Reality in *William of Palerne*", in *Loyal Letters: Studies on Mediaeval Alliterative Poetry & Prose* (Groningen: E. Forsten, 1994), pp. 223-38 (pp. 223-24); William Henry Schofield, *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1925), p. 312; and Kate Watkins Tibbals, 'Elements of Magic in the Romance of *William of Palerne*', *Modern Philology*, 1 (1904), 355-371 (p. 355).

¹⁷ H. F. Williams, 'Les Versions de *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Romania*, 73 (1952), 64-77. The relationship between the verse and prose versions is explored in the following: Annie-France Garrus, 'Pierre Durand, lecteur de *Guillaume de Palerne*', in *Le Goût du lecteur à la fin du Moyen Age*, ed. by Danielle Bohler (Paris: Léopard d'or, 2006), pp. 307-12; Richard Trachsler, 'Du nouveau sur le garou? Observations sur le roman de *Guillaume de Palerne* médiéval et sa mise en prose', in *Le Moyen Âge par le Moyen Âge, même. Réception, relectures et réécritures des textes médiévaux dans la littérature française des XIV^e et XV^e siècles*, ed. by Laurent Brun et al (Paris: Champion, 2012), pp. 211-21.

translation of *Guillaume*, titled *Sir Uilliam*, is preserved in one manuscript (ms. Royal Irish Academy Stowe A. V. 2, ff. 132-208), and has been dated to the latter part of the sixteenth century (c. 1520-1600), although it has been suggested that the translation is taken from the English prose version rather than the original Old French romance.¹⁸ Perhaps due to the existence of the later English and French versions of the text, the original Old French verse romance remained untranslated into modern vernaculars until 2004, when Scoduto published a non-rhyming verse translation of *Guillaume*.¹⁹ It was not until 2012 that a modern French translation of the Old French romance was prepared and published by Ferlampin-Acher, complementing her further research on the text.²⁰

Dating the composition of *Guillaume de Palerne*

There are two contrasting approaches to dating medieval romance commonly used in critical scholarship: historicist, and intertextual. With regard to *Guillaume*, these methodologies have produced conflicting date ranges for the romance. Using the historicist approach, Dunn and Ferlampin-Acher have each argued for a different date of composition, and their conclusions merit critique. Ferlampin-Acher posits a completely new stand-point for the date of composition of *Guillaume*, opposing scholars' accepted

¹⁸ Cecille O'Rahilly, 'Introduction', in *Eachtra Uilliam: An Irish Version of William of Palerne*, ed. and trans. by Cecile O'Rahilly (Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1984), pp. vii-xxiv (pp. x-xi). See also Dunn, pp. 6-7.

¹⁹ *Guillaume de Palerne: An English Translation of the 12th-Century French Verse Romance*, trans. by Leslie A. Scoduto (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2004). Abridged translations of the romance were published in the early part of the twentieth century, such as E. M. Buxton's 'The Story of William and the Werwolf', published in the collection *Stories from Old French Romance*. E. M. Wilmot-Buxton, *Stories from Old French Romance* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, c. 1910), pp. 56-75. For information on these versions, see Dunn, p. 4.

²⁰ *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Christine Ferlampin-Acher (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2012). Ferlampin-Acher's translation is based on Micha's edition of *Guillaume*. Her introduction includes textual analysis, and to date she has also published the following studies on *Guillaume*: 'Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?', *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes*, 15 (2008), 59-71; 'Les Métamorphoses du *versipellis* romanesque (*Guillaume de Palerne*, *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, *Perceforest*)', in *Littérature et folklore dans le récit médiéval*, ed. by Emese Egedi-Kovács (Budapest: Collège-Eötvös ELTE, 2011), pp. 119-34. I am also grateful to Ferlampin-Acher for sharing with me copies of her (unpublished) conference papers analysing *Guillaume*, including a paper presented at the ICLS International Congress in Lisbon, 2013.

date of c. 1190-1223 by suggesting that the romance originated in the 1270s with a *terminus ad quem* of 1280.²¹

Both scholars match known historical events with those of the narrative in order to provide evidence for dating *Guillaume*. Ferlampin-Acher aligns the figures of King Alphonse of Spain and his inheritor Prince Alphonse of Spain in the narrative with Alphonse X of Spain and his grandson, also called Alphonse, in the years 1275-1284, and supports her alternative chronology by suggesting parallels between events in the text and the political situation of Sicily in the 1260s.²² In particular, Ferlampin-Acher uses a reference in the narrative to an unidentified Pope Clement ('Pape Clemens uns apostoiles, / Qui fu entre les deus Grigoires', vv. 9355-56) as evidence for a later dating and a *terminus a quo* of no earlier than 1227.²³ This pope can be identified either as Pope Clement III (pope from 1187-1191) or as Pope Clement IV (pope from 1265-1268). However, the reference to Clement's papacy as 'between two Gregories' complicates identification of this figure. Clement III was immediately preceded by Gregory VIII (pope in 1187) and was followed by Gregory IX (pope from 1227-1241), and Clement IV was preceded by Gregory IX (although not immediately) and was later succeeded by Gregory X (pope from 1271-1276).²⁴ Both Ferlampin-Acher and Gaston Paris assert that the relative chronology of these historical figures renders it impossible for the work to have been composed before 1227, and the important role played by Clement IV in Sicily

²¹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 32-48. Warren dated the composition of *Guillaume* at c. 1188, and this date has been extended to c. 1220. Warren, 'Notes on the Romans d'Aventure', p. 173; and Micha, 'Introduction', p. 23. Dunn stresses an early date of composition due to the influence of *Guillaume* on *Escoufle*, composed c. 1200-1202. Dunn, p. 44, note 16. See also V. Frederic Koenig, 'New Studies on Jean Renart: The Date of the *Escoufle*', *Modern Philology*, 32 (1934-5), 343-52.

²² For example, Ferlampin-Acher highlights names from the narrative, such as Méliadus, and argues that they allude to prose romances of the thirteenth century. See Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 36-38.

²³ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 36 and p. 111. The same view was put forward by Gaston Paris in his review of the work of Boehmer. Gaston Paris, 'Compte-rendu: Romanische Studien, III, i (No. 10)', *Romania*, 7 (1878), 470-73 (p. 470); E. Boehmer, 'Abfassungszeit des *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Romanische Studien*, 3 (1878), 131. Ferlampin-Acher appears to be ignorant of Paris's comments, as she presents her argument as if it were an original statement.

²⁴ Dunn gives a summarised chronology of popes called Clement and Gregory in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. Dunn, p. 69.

suggests to Ferlampin-Acher an allusion to this figure and a date of composition after 1270.²⁵

In contrast, Dunn concludes that the text belongs to the closing years of the twelfth century.²⁶ He aligns historical events from 1191-97 with elements of the narrative, insisting upon ‘numerous parallels’ which suggest a date of c. 1194-97.²⁷ Although Dunn supports his argument with historical evidence, his comments regarding the conundrum of identifying pope Clement point to the fallibility of an historicist approach, and thus of Ferlampin-Acher’s contrasting conclusions. Dunn aligns *Guillaume*’s Pope Clement with Clement III, dismissing the consequently anachronistic comment regarding the two Gregories as ‘a half-hearted and imperfect attempt made by the romancer to find a rime [sic] with the word *apostoiles*’.²⁸ Indeed, he suggests that scholars ‘retain the identification with Clement III but ignore the reference to the two Gregories’.²⁹ These comments invalidate an historicist methodology, as Dunn in fact indicates that this approach is only successful if certain elements are omitted or placed to one side. By encouraging readers not to assume that the poet was selecting and referring to historical figures ‘capriciously’, Dunn inadvertently questions the authority of his historicist approach to dating *Guillaume*.³⁰

Under the aegis of an historicist approach to *Guillaume*, scholars such as Paris and Zingarelli have discussed the historical and geographical verisimilitude in the text, and others have sought to date the work by identifying the poet’s patroness, named in the text only as ‘la contesse Yolent / La boine dame, la loial’ (vv. 9656-7).³¹ Anthime Fourier

²⁵ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 36; Paris, ‘Compte-rendu’, p. 470.

²⁶ Dunn, p. 3 and p. 141.

²⁷ For a summary of this historical evidence, with references to explanations of each individual element in his monograph, see Dunn p. 141.

²⁸ Dunn, pp. 69-70.

²⁹ Dunn, p. 70.

³⁰ Dunn, p. 70.

³¹ Gaston Paris, ‘La Sicile dans la littérature française du moyen âge’, pp. 108-13; Nicola Zingarelli, ‘Il “Guillaume de Palerne” e i suoi dati di luogo e di tempo’, in *Miscellanea di archeologia, storia e filologia dedicata al Prof. Antonino Salinas nel LX anniversario del suo insegnamento accademico* (Palermo: Virzi, 1907), pp. 256-72.

identified three countesses named Yolande as the potential patroness of *Guillaume*: Yolande of Hainaut, daughter of count Baudouin IV of Hainaut and wife of the count of Saint-Pol (c. 1141-1223); Yolande, sister of Baudouin VI, who died in 1219; and Yolande of Nevers, countess of Bourgogne, who died in 1280.³² Using archival research, Fourier claimed that the patroness was Countess Yolande of Hainaut, noting that her unusually long life span creates ‘une marge chronologique assez large pour situer la composition du roman’ that provides a *terminus ad quem* of 1223.³³ In contrast, and in line with her belief in a later dating, Ferlampin-Acher argues that the patroness was Yolande of Nevers, countess of Bourgogne (died in 1280), supporting her argument with a perceived parallel between Queen Brande in the narrative and Yolande of Nevers, who was rumoured to have killed her stepson.³⁴ The conflicting identification of Yolande adds more weight to the argument that *Guillaume* cannot be accurately dated by an historicist approach, as the possibility of three different patronesses renders any identification uncertain.

The other methodological framework applied to dating *Guillaume* relies on situating the romance within its intertextual network. This approach does not depend on a supposed correlation between the narrative and known historical facts, but rather explores the intertextual conversations between *Guillaume* and works with a more certain date of composition. Walter states that ‘la date d’une œuvre, [...] c’est l’écart entre le moment où cette œuvre “reçoit” d’autres œuvres antérieures et le moment où cette œuvre est “reçue” par d’autres œuvres’, adding that ‘l’intertextualité permet [...] de fonder une chronologie

³² Anthime Fourier, ‘La “Contesse Yolent” de *Guillaume de Palerne*’, in *Etudes de langue et de littérature du Moyen Age offertes à Felix Lecoy par ses collègues, ses élèves et ses amis* (Paris: Champion, 1973), pp. 115-23.

³³ Fourier, pp. 116-23. Fourier presented new information to claim that Yolande was still alive in 1223. This identification was supported by evidence of Yolande’s interest in literature, and parallels between what is known of her life and events depicted in *Guillaume*. This identification was given in Pierre Durand’s prose version of *Guillaume*. See Boehmer, p. 131.

³⁴ Ferlampin-Acher suggests that the poet dedicates *Guillaume* to this countess to provide a warning about her actions, or to rehabilitate the memory of her, as highlighted by the forgiveness of Brande’s treacherous actions in the narrative. Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, pp. 38-43.

relative des œuvres'.³⁵ This approach is used by Eley and Simons in their reassessment of the dating of *Partonopeus de Blois*.³⁶ Eley and Simons argue that the close intertextual links between *Partonopeus* and the *Roman de Troie* suggest a date of c. 1170 (rather than the previously accepted c. 1182-85), stating that 'a work that explicitly takes issue with it [the *Roman de Troie*] would be composed fairly soon afterwards, at a point when the original was still in vogue'.³⁷

If the same approach is applied to *Guillaume*, then the result is a date range in the latter part of the twelfth century. Scholars have identified intertextual rewriting of several intertexts in *Guillaume* which date from c. 1150-1190, including works by Chrétien de Troyes and Marie de France, Bérout and Thomas's *Tristan* romances, *Partonopeus de Blois*, and several of the *romans d'antiquité*.³⁸ Warren also identifies links between *Guillaume* and the 'older romantic' school of composition (1150-1180), as highlighted by echoes of the *romans d'antiquité* and earlier romance compositions in the poet's manipulation of the theme of love through monologues and 'formal speeches'.³⁹ In other studies, Warren discusses the possible influence that the text held over Guillaume de Lorris's *Roman de la Rose*.⁴⁰ However, his reflections on this intertextual relationship contrast with the work of Ferlampin-Acher, whose belief in a later dating leads her to argue that *Guillaume* was in fact influenced by the *Rose*.⁴¹ These conflicting views of influence between *Guillaume* and the *Roman de la Rose* highlight the importance of the

³⁵ Philippe Walter, 'Tout commence par des chansons... (Intertextualités lotharingiennes)', in *Styles et Valeurs: Pour une histoire de l'art littéraire au Moyen Age*, ed. by Daniel Poirion (Paris: CDU et SEDES, 1990), pp. 187-209 (pp. 189-91).

³⁶ Penny Eley and Penny Simons 'The Prologue to *Partonopeus de Blois*: Text, Context and Subtext', *French Studies*, 49 (1995), 1-16. I will return to the debate surrounding the dating of *Partonopeus* in Chapter One. See in particular, pp. 48-49.

³⁷ Eley and Simons, 'The Prologue to *Partonopeus de Blois*', p. 11.

³⁸ Ferlampin-Acher observes references in *Guillaume* that 'renvoient à des textes "classiques" du XII^e siècle'. Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 111.

³⁹ Warren, 'The Works of Jean Renart', p. 97.

⁴⁰ F. M. Warren, 'A Byzantine Source for Guillaume de Lorris's *Roman de la Rose*', *PMLA*, 31 (1916), 232-46; F. M. Warren, 'On the Date and Composition of Guillaume de Lorris's *Roman de la Rose*', *PMLA*, 23 (1908), 269-84 (p. 282). Sinclair explored *Guillaume* as a source for the fourteenth-century French prose epic *Tristan de Nanteuil*. K. V. Sinclair, 'Guillaume de Palerne, A Source for *Tristan de Nanteuil*', *Mediaeval Studies*, 25 (1963), 362-66.

⁴¹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 80-81 and pp. 101-04.

questions surrounding the dating of *Guillaume* that will be raised by the intertextual analysis presented in this thesis. Although establishing the exact date of *Guillaume*'s composition is not the primary concern of this study, the methodological approach that I will adopt will engage with questions of determining the chronology of the romance in relation to contemporary works rewritten by the poet. Analysis of *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive text will be grounded in close study of rewriting, and will explore the intertextual network in which the romance is situated. In examining intertextual links, such as those hitherto unobserved between *Guillaume* and other *romans d'antiquité*, this study will thus also provide evidence to situate the work within an intertextual network concurrent with and indicative of its most likely time of composition.

The werewolf in *Guillaume*

The most dominant criticism of *Guillaume de Palerne* has focused on the figure of the werewolf in the romance, Alphonse. Indeed, Ferlampin-Acher observes that 'on parle plus de *Guillaume de Palerne* dans les études sur la lycanthropie que dans les travaux sur le roman médiéval'.⁴² However, analysis of the *Guillaume* werewolf predominantly takes the form of a few paragraphs, or at most a few pages, in which scholars examine the poet's treatment of themes of lycanthropy and metamorphosis in comparison with texts from a wider corpus. This corpus is most often made up of Old French werewolf texts (Marie de France's *Bisclavret* and the anonymous *Melion*) as well as other medieval works, such as Gerald of Wales's *Topographia Hibernica* and the tale *Arthur and*

⁴² Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 48. Note that Chapter Three will engage fully with the literature relating to the werewolf, which I have summarised in the following section.

Gorlagon.⁴³ Brief comments relating to Alphonse are found in Smith's 1894 study of the werewolf in literature, and Ménard offered further analysis of this figure in his examination of medieval and ancient werewolf narratives.⁴⁴ Similarly, Harf-Lancner referred to *Guillaume* in passing as part of her examination of the theme of illusory metamorphosis in medieval texts, focusing instead on other works, such as *Bisclavret*.⁴⁵ More in-depth analysis of the *Guillaume* werewolf is found in the work of Dubost and [redacted] from the 1990s, who both emphasised the positive characterisation of this figure as a guardian angel.⁴⁶ What is more, although some of his comments on the text are in places erroneous, Douglas was the first to note the close association made between the werewolf and the animal-skin disguises of the eponymous hero and his 'amie', stating that they demonstrate 'strong elements of lycanthropy'.⁴⁷

The parallel between Guillaume's disguises and Alphonse was explored more fully in the early 2000s, as Bynum (2001) and Pairet (2002) developed analysis of *Guillaume* to include commentary of the eponymous hero, as well as highlighting links between the romance and Gerald of Wales's *Topographia Hibernica*.⁴⁸ Bynum's comments formed part of her analysis of metamorphosis and identity in medieval texts,

⁴³ Marie de France, 'Bisclavret', in *Lais de Marie de France*, trans. by Laurence Harf-Lancner and ed. by Karl Warnke (Paris: Livre de Poche, 1990), pp. 116-33; 'Melion', in *'Melion' and 'Biclarel': Two Old French Werewolf Lays*, ed. and trans. by Amanda Hopkins (Liverpool: Liverpool Online Series Critical Editions of French Texts, 2005), pp. 51-82; Gerald of Wales, 'De mirabilibus nostri tempis. Et primo, de lupo cum sacerdote loquente', in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Volume 5, Topographia Hibernica, et Expugnatio Hibernica*, ed. by J. S. Brewer, James F. Dimock, and George F. Warner (London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), pp. 101-07; Gerald of Wales, *The History and Topography of Ireland*, trans. by John J. O'Meara (London: Penguin Books, 1982), pp. 69-72; and George Lyman Kittredge, *Arthur and Gorlagon* (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1903).

⁴⁴ Kirby Flower Smith, 'An Historical Study of the Werewolf in Literature', *PMLA*, 9 (1894), 1-42; Philippe Ménard, 'Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge', in *Symposium in honorem prof. M. de Riquer* (Barcelona: Edicions del Quaderns Crema, 1984), pp. 209-38 (pp. 214-15).

⁴⁵ Laurence Harf-Lancner, 'La Métamorphose illusoire: des théories chrétiennes de la métamorphose aux images médiévales du loup-garou', *Annales Economies Sociétés Civilisations*, 40 (1985), 208-26.

⁴⁶ Francis Dubost, *Aspects fantastiques de la littérature narrative médiévale (XII^{ème} - XIII^{ème} siècles): L'Autre, l'Ailleurs, l'Autrefois* (Geneva: Editions Slatkine, 1991), pp. 561-63; Adam Douglas, *The Beast Within: Man, Myths and Werewolves* (London: Orion, 1993), pp. 119-22.

⁴⁷ Douglas, p. 121. Douglas incorrectly states that Alphonse provides the lovers with both sets of disguises.

⁴⁸ Caroline Walker Bynum, *Metamorphosis and Identity* (New York: Zone Books, 2001), pp. 108-09; Ana Pairet, *Les Mutacions des fables: figures de la métamorphose dans la littérature française du Moyen Âge* (Paris: Champion, 2002), pp. 65-68.

and similarly Pairet's discussion of *Guillaume* was integrated into her study of medieval figures of metamorphosis. Both critics examined the notions of disguise and transformation in *Guillaume*. Bynum observed that the romance 'plays with the idea that an appearance is a skin put on over, that bodies lurk under skins', and Pairet commented on 'le jeu de masques sur lequel est construite l'intrigue' and the 'fausses métamorphoses' in the narrative.⁴⁹ Noacco continued this trend in 2007 with comments on the themes of appearance and identity in relation to the werewolf in *Guillaume*, although her study is predominantly focused on *Melion* and *Bisclavret*.⁵⁰ More recently, Small has added to this critical discourse, exploring the way in which the poet manipulates the notion of skin and metamorphosis in his depiction of the werewolf and of Guillaume in disguises.⁵¹ However, of these recent studies it is the work of Pairet that examines *Guillaume* most fully, in particular through her analysis of the relationship between Guillaume and the werewolf. Pairet argues that Alphonse acts as the 'double', or 'doublure', of Guillaume in the romance, and this statement is one that I will develop in this thesis.⁵²

The figure of the werewolf has been treated in more in-depth analysis by American scholar Sconduto.⁵³ Sconduto's studies discuss identity and appearance through the *Guillaume* poet's subversion of 'the traditional opposition between man and beast', yet her analysis focuses most clearly on the portrayal of the werewolf as a chivalric knight, who she argues 'embodies the Christian concept of selfless service to others' and

⁴⁹ Bynum, *Metamorphosis and Identity*, pp. 108-09; Pairet p. 67.

⁵⁰ Cristina Noacco, 'La Dé-mesure du loup-garou: un instrument de connaissance', *Revue de langues romanes*, 111 (2007), 31-50 (especially p. 45).

⁵¹ Susan Small, 'The Medieval Werewolf Model of Reading Skin', in *Reading Skin in Medieval Literature and Culture*, ed. by Katie L. Walter (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 81-97.

⁵² Pairet, p. 66. Miranda Griffin is also working on analysis of *Guillaume* as part of a corpus of texts that question human and animal transformation. This work formed the basis of a paper presented at the ICLS conference in Cambridge, April 2012, entitled 'The Beast Without: Animals and Clothing in Werewolf Romance', in which she commented on the disguises of the hero and heroine alongside the transformation of the werewolf.

⁵³ Leslie A. Sconduto, 'Blurred and Shifting Identities: The Werewolf as Other in *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Romance Languages Annual*, 11 (1999), 121-26; *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf: A Literary Study from Antiquity through the Renaissance* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2008) (especially pp. 90-126, 'Guillaume de Palerne or a Lesson in Noble Sacrifice'); and 'Rewriting the Werewolf in *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Cygne: Bulletin of the International Marie de France Society*, 6 (2000), 23-35.

who is presented as ‘an exemplar for all to follow’.⁵⁴ Scoduto’s work marks a renewed interest in the text that has been developed in American scholarship, as evidenced by Schiff’s study of the Old French and Old English versions of *Guillaume*, and by the recent special edition of *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes* dedicated to the romance under the direction of Kay and McCracken.⁵⁵ Although the three essays in this collection do not focus solely on the figure of the werewolf in *Guillaume*, their approach to the romance through ‘the lens of animal studies’ evidences the continued interest in the romance that is piqued by the secondary hero and the lovers’ skin disguises.⁵⁶

Intertextual rewriting in *Guillaume*

Moving away from the figure of the werewolf, the work of Dunn goes beyond an exploration of Alphonse in *Guillaume*, and instead examines the ‘curious mixture of material in the romance’.⁵⁷ Dunn primarily analyses folkloric influences on the work, yet he also comments on intertexts rewritten by the anonymous poet, including the work of both Marie de France and Chrétien de Troyes.⁵⁸ Although his intertextual analysis is somewhat limited, it nevertheless stresses the importance of exploring multiple and contrasting elements of the text other than the werewolf, an approach that was in fact adopted in the early 1900s in a study which examined *Guillaume* as part of a corpus of

⁵⁴ Scoduto, ‘Blurred and Shifting Identities’, p. 126; Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 126.

⁵⁵ Randy P. Schiff, ‘Cross-Channel Becomings-Animal: Primal Courtliness in *Guillaume de Palerne* and *William of Palerne*’, *Exemplaria*, 21 (2009), 418-38; Sarah Kay and Peggy McCracken, ‘Introduction: Animal Studies and *Guillaume de Palerne*’, *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 24 (2012), 323-30.

⁵⁶ Bridget Behrmann, “‘Quel beste ceste piax acuevre’: Idyll and the Animal in *Guillaume de Palerne*’s Family Romance’, *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 24 (2012), 331-46; Peggy McCracken, ‘Skin and Sovereignty in *Guillaume de Palerne*’, *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 24 (2012), 361-75; and Hartley R. Miller, “‘Hey, you look like a prince!’ Ideology and Recognition in *Guillaume de Palerne*’, *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 24 (2012), 347-60. The essays are grouped together under the title ‘*Guillaume de Palerne* in the lens of animal studies’.

⁵⁷ Dunn, p. 25.

⁵⁸ Dunn, pp. 86-111. Dunn focuses on the folkloric motif of the ‘Romulus Type’ narrative, which combines the motifs of the Fair Unknown and the Wolf’s Fosterling. He also observes links with *Guillaume* and several Old French texts, including the *Chanson de Roland*, *Cligès*, *Yvain*, and *Partonopeus de Blois*. Dunn, p. 60 and pp. 125-39.

‘romans idylliques’.⁵⁹ The work of Lot-Borodine was unconnected from the figure of the werewolf, as the scholar instead engaged with intertextual material related to the theme of love in the romance, such as the *Roman d’Eneas* and *Cligès*.⁶⁰ Lot-Borodine compared and contrasted the narrative with other *romans idylliques*, such as *Floire et Blanchefleur* and *Aucassin et Nicolette*, and in fact reproached the *Guillaume* poet for having introduced the werewolf into the romance, stating that it unnecessarily distracts attention away from the work’s idyllic nature.⁶¹ Comparison of *Guillaume* with the model of the ‘roman idyllique’ is continued in the work of Behrmann and of Vuagnoux-Uhlig, and the latter’s development of Lot-Borodine’s study offers particular focus on the female figures of the romance.⁶² Other scholars have also examined elements of *Guillaume* which do not relate to the werewolf, such as Brown-Grant’s comments on consent to marriage in the romance, Mieszkowski’s analysis of the figure of the confidante and go-between, Alixandrine, and other critics’ comments on the dream sequences in the romance.⁶³

Observation of the wide range of material rewritten in *Guillaume* and the existence of studies that do not focus on Alphonse and werewolf narratives have led two scholars to explicitly address the broad question of intertextual rewriting in *Guillaume*. Ferlampin-Acher provides perceptive analysis of many of the links between *Guillaume* and several Old French texts, and her research is complemented by the work of Simons, whose insightful examination of allusions to *Partonopeus de Blois* in *Guillaume* offers

⁵⁹ Myrrha Lot-Borodine, *Le Roman idyllique au moyen âge* (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1913), pp. 233-65.

⁶⁰ Lot-Borodine, *Le Roman idyllique*, pp. 244-45.

⁶¹ Lot-Borodine, *Le Roman idyllique*, pp. 1-7 and pp. 238-39.

⁶² Behrmann analyses the portrayal of the relationship between *Guillaume* and Alphonse as creating an ‘idyll’, and Vuagnoux-Uhlig focuses in particular on female characters in her study of *Guillaume* as a ‘roman idyllique’. Behrmann, pp. 331-37; Marion Vuagnoux-Uhlig, *Le Couple en Herbe: ‘Galeran de Bretagne’ et ‘L’Escoufle’ à la lumière du roman idyllique médiéval* (Geneva: Droz, 2009), pp. 171-83.

⁶³ Rosalind Brown-Grant, *French Romance of the Later Middle Ages: Gender, Morality, and Desire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 90-91; Gretchen Mieszkowski, *Medieval Go-betweens and Chaucer’s Pandarus* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 86-89; Yvan G. Lepage, ‘Bestiaire des songes médiévaux’, in *Le Récit de rêve: Fonctions, thèmes et symboles*, ed. by Christian Vandendorpe (Québec: Nota bene, 2005), pp. 75-95; Alain Corbellari, ‘Onirisme et bestialité: Le Roman de *Guillaume de Palerne*’, *Neophilologus*, 86 (2002), 353-62.

new understanding of the range of intertextual material manipulated by the poet.⁶⁴ The work of these critics provides the basis for a fruitful line of enquiry into *Guillaume* that focuses on intertextual rewriting. Their studies are linked by a common observation of the importance of intertextual analysis for understanding the poet's compositional techniques, as both scholars independently suggest that the romance doubles its method of composition within a narrative which focuses on transformation and duality. For Ferlampin-Acher, *Guillaume de Palerne* is 'hanté par la dualité' and presents 'une dialectique opposant le dedans et le dehors' with which the poet questions notions of appearance and identity and invites the audience to peel back the outer layer of the narrative to see the intertexts hidden underneath.⁶⁵ Simons's analysis of *Guillaume* draws similar conclusions, as she explores the way in which the werewolf and the lovers' animal-skin disguises emphasise the notions of hybridisation and transformation that form the rewriting process adopted by the poet.⁶⁶ Her study argues that the fusion of two story models and other intertextual material in *Guillaume* is akin to the transformations experienced by Guillaume, Melior, and Alphonse.⁶⁷ What is more, Simons develops the idea that the poet stresses the existence of rewritten material by reshaping intertexts 'in such a way that the original form is discernible', mirroring this rewriting in the hybrid figures in the narrative (the werewolf and the lovers in animal disguises) that highlight coexistence of old and new forms.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ See Ferlampin-Acher, 'Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?' for her preliminary analyses of *Guillaume*'s intertexts, which are developed throughout the introduction to her translation, Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 84-108; Simons analyses the links between *Guillaume* and several intertexts, focusing predominantly on *Partonopeus de Blois*. Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', pp. 423-31.

⁶⁵ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 108 and p. 80. Ferlampin-Acher also notes that the audience are encouraged to interpret the text on multiple levels and to 'soulever la peau de bête au sens propre du terme'. Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 80-81.

⁶⁶ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 431.

⁶⁷ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 431. The two main story models fused in the narrative, that of the foundling and that of the werewolf, are explored in Dunn's analysis of *Guillaume*.

⁶⁸ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 418; p. 431.

Analyses of intertextual rewriting in *Guillaume* undertaken by Ferlampin-Acher and Simons emphasise the way in which this method of composition is mirrored in the notions of transformation and doubling at the heart of the narrative. These critics also allude to the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume*, a term used in passing by Simons. Simons notes that the poet's approach to rewriting functions as 'a self-reflexive commentary on the process of rewriting itself', yet she does not develop her remarks.⁶⁹ Neither scholar has fully explored *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive romance, even though their work indicates that this is a fruitful area for research. The foundations that they have laid down in intertextual analysis of *Guillaume* and the preliminary comments that they have made on the self-reflexive nature of the text are the foundation upon which my approach to the romance is based.

New critical ground and aims of the thesis

This thesis develops a fresh understanding of the self-reflexivity of *Guillaume de Palerne* by building on the recent work that explores intertextual rewriting in the romance. A self-reflexive text does not only mirror its status as a fictional product within its narrative, it also reproduces 'its own processes of production and reception'.⁷⁰ While Ferlampin-Acher and Simons have noted echoes between transformation in the *Guillaume* narrative and intertextual rewriting, they have not sought to identify whether the poet similarly reflects the process of reception within the text. This is particularly striking, as critics have observed 'the close relationship between the production and consumption of medieval literature'.⁷¹ If the poet's approach to romance composition is mirrored in the text through emphasis of transformation, hybridity, and duality, is romance reception also embedded in the narrative?

⁶⁹ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 418.

⁷⁰ Linda Hutcheon, *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox* (London: Methuen, 1980), p. xii.

⁷¹ Robert S. Sturges, 'Textual Scholarship: Ideologies of Literary Production', *Exemplaria*, 3 (1991), 101-31 (pp. 124-25).

In order to develop this study of *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive text, more evidence is first needed to support the arguments of Ferlampin-Acher and Simons regarding the doubling of intertextual rewriting in the narrative. Further analysis of the intertextual sphere of the romance will facilitate examination of the extent to which the theme of transformation is manipulated throughout the narrative to reflect the poet's approach to composition. This analysis will rely on an exploration of doubling and correspondence in *Guillaume*, themes touched on in the work of Ferlampin-Acher, but which, as this thesis seeks to suggest, hold greater influence over the romance than has been hitherto acknowledged. Doubling and correspondence are manipulated in *Guillaume* through the presentation of doubles in the narrative which reflect one another and which work in partnership together. This thesis will question whether this same relationship is extended through the work to bring together the romance's form and content, and ultimately the poet and his audience.

In order to examine *Guillaume* as a work that reflects its processes of production and reception within its narrative, this thesis will explore the manipulation of three themes in the romance: transformation, doubling and correspondence, and recognition. Critics have observed that transformation in the narrative mirrors the poet's compositional approach through rewriting, and I will explore additional examples of the emphasis placed on transformation. However, I will also explore how the manipulation of doubling and correspondence foregrounds the relationship between poet and audience. Although these notions have been neglected in *Guillaume* scholarship, they are central to analysis of *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive text in which the narrative doubles and corresponds with the text's extra-diegetic frame. What is more, doubling and correspondence are perceived between transformation and recognition. These themes work in partnership in the narrative, echoing the partnership between the poet and audience in the production and reception of the text.

However, even though close analysis of the treatment of recognition allows us to understand his reflection of the *Guillaume* audience's role in the narrative, this theme has also been underexplored by critics. Recognition in fact unifies the main areas of existing critical scholarship on the romance. This notion is a key element of the portrayal of the werewolf, who must be recognised as a transformed man in order to trigger the positive ending of the romance. Recognition is also central to understanding the date of *Guillaume*, as recognising intertextual allusions allows us to date the composition of this romance by situating it within its most likely intertextual network.

By exploring transformation, doubling and correspondence, and recognition in *Guillaume*, this study will respond to a significant lacuna in the existing research on the romance. Above all, I will question the way in which the *Guillaume* poet composes a self-reflexive text that echoes its processes of production and reception. This thesis seeks to reveal how the audience of *Guillaume* are invited to engage in recognition of the intertextual material transformed in the text and to understand the part they play in the creation of romance. Analysis of *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive romance will allow us to better understand the work of this often overlooked poet, yet it will also highlight the way in which this work provides a lens through which to examine the evidence offered by such texts regarding romance reception and production at the end of the twelfth century.

Theoretical framework and methodology

This thesis takes as its focal point close reading of *Guillaume de Palerne* and analysis of the key themes of transformation, doubling and correspondence, and recognition in order to examine the romance's self-reflexive nature. These themes will provide the focus for the four individual chapters of the thesis. With the dominant emphasis on transformation in *Guillaume* offering extensive avenues for analysis, this theme will be explored in the first two chapters, building on the work of Ferlampin-Acher and Simons. The third chapter will examine doubling and correspondence in

Guillaume, and the final chapter will turn to analysis of recognition. The four chapters will engage with approaches to analysis of twelfth-century romance composition and reception developed by critics such as Kelly, Bruckner, and Eley, using current understanding of literary practice contemporary to *Guillaume* in order to explore the contribution of the romance to this developing genre.

The dominant compositional process adopted by the *Guillaume* poet and mirrored in the narrative of his self-reflexive romance is intertextual rewriting, the analysis of which offers an appropriate paradigm for approaching *Guillaume*. Intertextual rewriting refers to the poet's selection and transformation of existing material in an era when originality was achieved by reformulating known texts, rather than by presenting an entirely new work.⁷² In the Middle Ages it was believed that only God could create a work *ex nihilo*, and medieval writers therefore 'did not and [...] could not think of their works as creations'.⁷³ Instead, writers 'invented' their texts, aligning with the definition of 'invention' as finding material to reconfigure, rather than producing a work from nothing.⁷⁴ Poets studied the *artes poeticae*, texts from which we are able to reconstruct

⁷² See comments in the following: Daniel Poirion, 'Écriture et ré-écriture au Moyen Age', in *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 109-18 (p. 117); Barbara N. Sargent-Baur, 'Rewriting *Cligès*', in *"De sens rassis": Essays in Honor of Rupert T. Pickens*, ed. by Keith Busby, Bernard Guidot, and Logan E. Whalen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), pp. 577-88 (p. 577); Michel Stanesco, 'Le Texte primitif et la parole poétique médiévale', in *Ecriture et modes de pensée au Moyen Age (VIII^e-XV^e siècles)*, ed. by Dominique Boutet and Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Presses de l'École Normale Supérieure, 1993), pp. 151-55 (p. 154); Monica L. Wright, *Weaving Narrative: Clothing in Twelfth-Century French Romance* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), pp. 11-13.

⁷³ Douglas Kelly, 'Introduction', in *The Medieval 'Opus': Imitation, Rewriting, and Transmission in the French Tradition*, ed. by Douglas Kelly (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 1-11 (p. 5).

⁷⁴ Kelly observes that composition is 'anchored in topical invention' in which 'the author identifies (invention) those places (topoi) which he or she can elaborate upon (amplification)'. Douglas Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion: Description, Rewriting, and Authorship from Macrobius to Medieval Romance* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 38.

their approach to composition in the twelfth century.⁷⁵ These works emphasise the importance of invention (*inventio*), which became the basic principle at the heart of romance composition, as ‘*inventio* et “composer une œuvre littéraire” aient été considérés comme synonymes’.⁷⁶ Poets adapted Cicero’s definition of the rhetorical technique of *inventio* to the context of composition.⁷⁷ For poets such as the anonymous *Guillaume* author, *inventio* signified the process of identifying material with which to compose an entire text, and romance production was thus a ‘creative reworking of other materials’ that demonstrated the ‘art of reshaping through rewriting’.⁷⁸

Rewriting strategies taught in medieval classrooms were adapted by poets to enable them to reformulate existing material and create an original composition.⁷⁹ These techniques have been the subject of study by medievalists, and the work of Kelly in particular has shed light on the principle of allusion with which poets stressed the

⁷⁵ Kelly has in particular explored poets’ use of the *artes poeticae*: Douglas Kelly, *The Art of Medieval French Romance* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), p. 32; *The Arts of Poetry and Prose* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1991); and ‘Topical Invention in Medieval French Literature’, in *Medieval Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric*, ed. by James J. Murphy (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), pp. 231-51 (especially p. 233). See also the following: Aubrey E. Galyon, ‘Introduction’ in Matthew of Vendôme, *The Art of Versification*, trans. by Aubrey E. Galyon (Ames, IA: The Iowa State University Press, 1980), p. 3-22; and Karen Pratt, ‘Medieval Attitudes to Translation and Adaptation: the Rhetorical Theory and the Poetic Practice’, in *Medieval Translator II*, ed. by R. Ellis (London: Queen Mary and Westfield College, 1991), pp. 1-27.

⁷⁶ Ernstpeter Ruhe, ‘*Inventio* devenue *troevemens*: la recherche de la matière au moyen âge’, in *The Spirit of the Court*, ed. by Glyn S. Burgess and Robert A. Taylor (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1985), pp. 289-97 (p. 289).

⁷⁷ Cicero defined *inventio* thus: ‘*inventio est excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similibus quae causam probabilem reddant*’ [‘invention is the discovery of valid or seemingly valid arguments to render one’s cause plausible’]. Cicero, *De inventione; De optimo genere oratum; topica*, trans. by H. M. Hubbell (London: William Heinemann, 1949), pp. 18-19. For more information on the importance of Cicero in the Middle Ages, see the following: John C. Rolfe, *Cicero and his Influence* (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1963), p. 121; and James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), p. 9.

⁷⁸ Kelly, ‘Topical Invention in Medieval French Literature’, pp. 232-23; Nicolette Zeeman, ‘The schools give a license to poets’, in *Criticism and Dissent in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Rita Copeland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 151-80 (p. 151); Bruckner, ‘The Shape of Romance in Medieval France’, p. 13.

⁷⁹ Kelly, ‘Introduction’, p. 3. See also: Anne Berthelot, *Histoire de la littérature française du Moyen Age* (Paris: Nathan, 1989), pp. 9-11; Kelly, *The Art of Medieval French Romance*, pp. 6-7; Donald Maddox, ‘Intratextual Rewriting in the *Roman de Tristan* of Beroul’, in “*De sens rassis*”, ed. by Busby, Guidot, and Whalen, pp. 389-402 (p. 389).

presence of pre-existing works within their compositions.⁸⁰ Kelly focuses on the way in which medieval poets' understanding of how to imitate and reformulate others' work was informed by ancient rhetoric and contemporary *artes poeticae*. Treatises such as Matthew of Vendôme's *Ars Versificatoria* (c. 1175) and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria nova* (c. 1210) comment on *imitatio*, the process of alluding to and rewriting an existing text, as one of the three basic principles of poetic composition.⁸¹ Following the work of the ancient rhetorician Macrobius, Kelly explains that *imitatio* combines *mutuatio* (the extraction and transfer of material) and *mutatio* (the relocation and transformation of material).⁸² Rewriting as *inventio*, *imitatio*, *mutatio* and *aemulatio* (improving upon existing material) is evidenced in the first French romances, the *romans d'antiquités* (composed c. 1150-1165), whose poets deliberately altered and adapted the Latin texts that they translated for their vernacular audiences.⁸³ The compositional technique of

⁸⁰ For example, see Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, 'Repetition and Variation in Twelfth-Century French Romance', in *The Expansion and Transformations of Courtly Culture*, ed. by Nathaniel B. Smith and Joseph T. Snow (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1980), pp. 95-114. Alongside numerous articles, Kelly has published three monographs analysing romance composition and the arts of poetry and prose: *The Art of Medieval French Romance* (1992); *The Conspiracy of Allusion: (1999)*; *The arts of poetry and prose* (1991).

⁸¹ Matthew of Vendôme, *The Art of Versification*, trans. by Galyon. Although the *Poetria Nova* dates from c.1210, its widespread popularity (more than fifty-seven witnesses survive) suggests that the principles it offered were commonly accepted by poets in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova*, trans. by Margaret F. Nims (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1967). For comments on both works, see: Edmond Faral, *Les Arts poétiques du XIIIe et du XIIIe siècle: Recherches et documents sur la technique littéraire du moyen âge* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1924), p. 14; Ernest Gallo, 'The *Poetria nova* of Geoffrey of Vinsauf', in *Medieval Eloquence*, pp. 68-84 (p. 68); Douglas Kelly, 'Theory of Composition in Medieval Narrative Poetry and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria Nova*', *Medieval Studies*, 31 (1969), 117-48 (p. 117). According to Geoffrey, the three practices of romance composition were 'ars – a thorough knowledge of the rules; *imitatio* – the study and imitation of great writers; and *usus* – diligent practice'. Margaret F. Nims, 'Introduction', in Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova*, pp. 9-12 (p. 9).

⁸² Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion*, pp. xi-xiii, pp. 9-10, and p. 60.

⁸³ The poets of the *Roman de Thèbes*, *Roman d'Eneas*, *Roman de Troie*, and the shorter narratives *Piramus et Tisbé*, *Philomena*, and *Narcisus et Dané*, all created 'translations' of influential works of antiquity. For introductory material on these texts, see: Wagih Azzam, 'Le Printemps de la littérature: La 'translation' dans 'Philomena' de Crestiens li Gois', *Littérature*, 74 (1989), 47-62 (p. 56); Raymond J. Cormier, *One Heart One Mind: The Rebirth of Virgil's Hero in Medieval French Romance* (University, MS: Romance Monographs, 1973); Edmond Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1913); Jean-Charles Huchet, *Le Roman médiéval* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1984), p. 10; Aimé Petit, *Naissances du roman: Les Techniques littéraires dans les romans antiques du XIIIe siècle* (Geneva: Editions Slatkine, 1985), pp. 7-13; Eugène Vinaver, *The Rise of Romance* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971); Maurice Wilmette, *Origines du roman en France: l'évolution du sentiment romanesque jusqu'en 1240* (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1941).

rewriting developed throughout the twelfth century alongside a growing corpus of vernacular texts from which poets could extract material to transform.⁸⁴ Indeed, Kelly observes that poets strove to allude to multiple and varying texts within their compositions as the potential for originality was found in the ‘*mixtura quadam*’ [‘certain mixture’] of material.⁸⁵ The *Guillaume* poet combines the inherited practices of *inventio* and *imitatio* to create his romance, drawing on a large body of texts from which he extracted material (*mutuatio*) that he then transformed (*mutatio*). It is the notion of transforming existing texts that I will examine in this thesis, as it is my contention that the poet reflects this compositional approach in the narrative of *Guillaume*.

Medieval romances such as *Guillaume* interact with the works that they consciously allude to and rewrite, and the notion of dialogue between texts aligns medieval rewriting with the concept of intertextuality. This ‘modern’ literary term was coined in 1967 by the semiotic literary theorist Julia Kristeva, who combined the etymological elements ‘inter’ and ‘text’ to refer to the relationship between different texts, whether they are examples of written or oral discourse.⁸⁶ Kristeva developed Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism that examined the plurality of voices, styles, and influences found in any one text, and observed that ‘tout texte se construit comme mosaïque de citations, tout

⁸⁴ Baumgartner comments on the ‘emprunts divers’ found in the *Roman de Troie*, composed only fifteen years after the earliest French romance (*Roman de Thèbes*, c. 1150), and Kelly alludes to the ‘body of works’ that emerged, from which poets such as Chrétien de Troyes could draw on elements to rewrite. Emmanuèle Baumgartner, ‘Benoît de Sainte-Maure et l’œuvre de Troie’, in *The Medieval ‘Opus’*, ed. by Kelly, pp. 15-28 (p. 25); Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion*, pp. 117-18.

⁸⁵ Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion*, p. 63. Kelly cites Macrobius to illustrate poets’ approach to rewriting: ‘we ought somehow to imitate the bees, who fly about gathering from flowers, then arrange what they have gathered, dividing it up among the wax cells. In this way they transform various kinds of nectar to a single flavour in a certain blend which is unique to them’.

⁸⁶ Julia Kristeva, *Semeiotikè: recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris: Seuil, 1969), p. 146. The essay in which Kristeva first discusses intertextuality is republished from an earlier article: ‘Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman’, *Critique*, 239 (1967), 438-65. See comments in: Anne-Claire Gignoux, *Initiation à l’intertextualité* (Paris: Ellipses, 2005), p. 7; Mary Orr, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003), p. 1; Paul Zumthor, ‘Intertextualité et mouvance’, *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 8-16 (p. 8).

texte est absorption et transformation d'un autre texte'.⁸⁷ Twenty years later, Genette used Kristeva's work as the foundation for his notion of 'transtextualité', a concept he split into five separate elements that each examine distinct types of intertextual relationship.⁸⁸

The over-arching concept of intertextuality privileges the notion of a network of relationships between texts over a strict linear model of source and imitation. Focus is placed on the interaction between works and 'leur rôle dans le texte', rather than on establishing the exact origin of each source alluded to by a poet.⁸⁹ Riffaterre highlights the fluid nature of this relationship, stating that 'il suffit pour qu'il y ait intertexte que le lecteur fasse nécessairement le rapprochement entre deux ou plusieurs textes'.⁹⁰ Theorists stress that texts are formed in an intertextual relationship with other works that they reread, rewrite, and redistribute within their own 'discursive' textual space, yet also with the works that they in turn influence.⁹¹

The discursive space foregrounded by the intertextual dialogue between texts has been aligned with the contact created between works through rewriting in medieval romance. The term 'intertextuality' was quickly adopted by medievalists and applied to their examination of the links between works whose composition was grounded in the

⁸⁷ Kristeva, *Semeiotikè*, p. 85. Sollers expanded on Kristeva's work the year after it was published, noting that 'tout texte se situe à la jonction de plusieurs textes dont il est à la fois la relecture, l'accentuation, la condensation, le déplacement et la profondeur.' Philippe Sollers, 'Ecriture et révolution', in Tel Quel, *Théorie d'ensemble* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1968), pp. 67-79 (p. 77). For an accessible analysis of Bakhtine's dialogism and the way in which it influenced Kristeva, see Gignoux, pp. 9-18.

⁸⁸ Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la Littérature au second degré* (Paris: Seuil, 1982), pp. 7-14. Genette defines 'intertextualité' as the evident links between texts, better known as allusion, citation, or plagiarism, and is placed alongside 'paratextualité' (links between the text and its own subsections), métatextualité (a text that comments critically on another text), architextualité (the relationship between the text and its genre), and 'hypertextualité' (the links between a text and a preceding text which it transforms) to form the over-arching principle of 'transtextualité'.

⁸⁹ Peter Dembowski, 'Intertextualité et critique des textes', in *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 17-29 (p. 20).

⁹⁰ Michael Riffaterre, 'Sémiotique intertextuelle: l'interprétant', *Revue d'esthétique*, Vol. 1-2 (1979), 128-50 (p. 131), cited in Gignoux, p. 42. See also: Graham Allen, *Intertextuality* (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 1; 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 (p. 148).

⁹¹ Intertextuality and textual space are discussed in the following: Roland Barthes, 'Théorie du texte', in *Encyclopedia universalis* (Paris: Encyclopedia Universalis France, 1973), pp. 370-74 (p. 372); Jonathan Culler, 'Presupposition and Intertextuality', *Modern Language Notes*, 91 (1976), 1380-1396 (pp. 1382-3); Philippe Sollers, 'Niveaux sémantiques d'un texte moderne', in Tel Quel, *Théorie d'ensemble*, pp. 273-81 (p. 279).

principles of *inventio*, *imitatio*, and *mutatio*. Bruckner notes the relevance of the term ‘intertextuality’ to medieval literary studies, stating that it may be considered ‘indispensable for our representation and analysis of what medieval writers and readers are doing’ as it ‘clearly fills a need in our critical usage’.⁹² Medievalists have explored the intertextual networks created by poets’ conscious rewriting of pre-existing material, highlighting the way in which the apparently ‘modern’ term in fact defines a compositional approach practised in the Middle Ages that was based upon the study of ancient poetics and rhetoric.⁹³ Indeed, intertextuality has become a dominant trend in the analysis of medieval French romance. The term not only foregrounds poets’ use of rewriting for composition, but also the importance of considering the interaction between the poet and audience (or author and reader) of any given work, as ‘le concept d’intertextualité est lié à ceux de production et de réception’.⁹⁴

Literary theorists stress the importance of the reader’s role in perceiving intertextual allusions, arguing for a reassessment of the balance given in literary criticism to this figure in textual production. In particular, Barthes argued for an end to what he believed was the tyrannical reign of the author over literary works and their readers in critical scholarship, calling for the ‘naissance du lecteur’ and the subsequent ‘mort de l’auteur’.⁹⁵ Although scholarship on medieval romance does not advocate eclipsing the figure of the author from view, it nevertheless emphasises the importance of the

⁹² Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, ‘Intertextuality’, in *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes* ed. by Norris J. Lacy, Douglas Kelly, and Keith Busby, Vol. I (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987), pp. 223-65 (p. 223). See also: Norris J. Lacy, ‘Motif Transfer in Arthurian Romance’, in *The Medieval ‘Opus’*, ed. by Kelly, pp. 157-68 (p. 157); Norris J. Lacy, ‘Introduction’, in *Text and Intertext in Medieval Arthurian Literature*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy (New York: Garland, 1996), pp. vii-ix; Marie-Rose Logan, ‘L’Intertextualité au carrefour de la philologie et de la poétique’, *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 47-49; Friedrich Wolfzettel, ‘Zum Stand und Problem der Intertextualitätsforschung im Mittelalter (aus romanistischer Sicht)’, in *Artursroman und Intertextualität*, ed. by Friedrich Wolfzettel (Giessen: Wilhelm Schmitz, 1990), pp. 1-17 (pp. 4-6).

⁹³ Zumthor, ‘Intertextualité et mouvance’, p. 9 and p. 15.

⁹⁴ Gignoux, p. 9.

⁹⁵ Roland Barthes, ‘La Mort de l’auteur’, in *Œuvres complètes*, ed. by Eric Marty, 3 vols (Paris: Seuil, 2002), III, pp. 40-45 (p. 45). See also Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, ‘Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality’, in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, ed. by Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 3-36 (p. 21).

audience's role for text reception and production.⁹⁶ Scholars have focused in particular on the relationship between audience and poet through their participation in the 'intertextual game of romance', a term first used by Bruckner.⁹⁷ Indeed, Bruckner observes that it is the 'public qui fait fonctionner l'intertextualité dans les textes du Moyen Age'.⁹⁸ The diffusion and reception of romances such as *Guillaume* occurred predominantly in an oral sphere.⁹⁹ Therefore, analyses of the interaction of the listening audience with the poet's text (as performed by a narrator) highlight the vital role played by those receiving the text: 'le public doit reconnaître, se concentrer sur le jeu des répétitions et des changements qui se jouent entre textes'.¹⁰⁰

Although medievalists' investigations into rewriting in French romance draw on the general critical principles of intertextual analysis, the practice of conscious rewriting particular to the medieval context differentiates this methodological approach from the overarching concept of intertextuality. Elsewhere in literary criticism, scholars underline the autonomy of the reader's perception of intertextual influences, noting that 'l'intertexte est l'ensemble des textes que l'on peut rapprocher de celui que l'on a sous les yeux, l'ensemble des textes que l'on retrouve dans sa mémoire à la lecture d'un passage donné'.¹⁰¹ This definition of an intertext has caused critics to comment not only on the power held by the reader to independently interpret intertextual allusions not created or intended by the author, but also to observe the potentially problematic nature of

⁹⁶ The role of the audience will be explored in Chapter Four. See in particular the section 'Recognition, reception, and the audience of *Guillaume de Palerne*', pp. 283-298.

⁹⁷ Bruckner 'Intertextuality', p. 230. See also Paul Zumthor, 'Le Texte-fragment', *Langue française*, 40, (1978), 75-82 (p. 81).

⁹⁸ Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, 'En guise de conclusion', *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 104-08 (p. 107).

⁹⁹ Much research was undertaken in the twentieth century to investigate the context of medieval romance reception. It is agreed that due to the dominantly illiterate nature of the romance audience, works were circulated. The most influential studies regarding orality and French romance are those of Zumthor. See: Paul Zumthor, *La Poésie et la voix dans la civilisation médiévale* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1984); and Paul Zumthor, *La Lettre et la voix de la « littérature » médiévale* (Paris: Seuil, 1987). Oral dissemination of texts will be discussed in more detail in the final chapter of this thesis. See pp. 295-97.

¹⁰⁰ Bruckner, 'En guise de conclusion', p. 107. Zumthor similarly observes the contact between poet and audience. Paul Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris: Seuil, 1972), p. 42.

¹⁰¹ Michael Riffaterre, 'L'Intertexte inconnu', in *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 4-7 (p. 4).

intertextuality.¹⁰² Each reader will establish different intertextual connections with an individual text, and intertextuality thus becomes ‘aléatoire, toujours fonction de la culture de lecteur’.¹⁰³

However, although it can be argued that all intertextual allusions run the risk of being ignored or interpreted differently by individual readers or audience members, analysis of the ‘game’ of intertextuality within the context of medieval rewriting provides a framework that gives scholars increased understanding of the audience’s ability to engage with the intertextual network of a particular text. Medievalists assert that poets alluded to specific intertexts which formed part of their audience’s ‘cultural baggage’, rewriting these works in a manner that encouraged and facilitated recognition of the intertextual nature of romance.¹⁰⁴ Critics comment on the way in which audiences took pleasure in the recognition of intertextual allusions and poets’ transformation of existing material.¹⁰⁵ For example, Kelly makes the following observation: ‘les lecteurs avertis, ne prendraient-ils pas plaisir à considérer cette intertextualité, eux qui sauraient apprécier l’intention du premier auteur tout en considérant l’intérêt, sinon le génie du second?’¹⁰⁶

Medieval rewriting shares elements of the concept of intertextuality, such as an emphasis of the reader’s role and the notion of texts working in a discursive relationship with one another, although the two terms are not entirely synonymous.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, other areas of literary theory that focus on relationships between texts are related to yet distinct

¹⁰² Laurent Jenny observes that ‘ce qui peut varier [...] c’est la sensibilité des lecteurs à la ‘redite’’. Laurent Jenny, ‘La Stratégie et la forme’, *Poétique*, 27 (1976), 257-81 (p. 258). See also Orr, p. 39.

¹⁰³ Gignoux, p. 26. See also Anne-Claire Gignoux, ‘De l’intertextualité à l’écriture’, *Cahiers de Narratologie*, 13 (2006), <<http://narratologie.revues.org/329>> [accessed 14 January 2015] (p. 4).

¹⁰⁴ Bruckner, ‘En guise de conclusion’, p. 107.

¹⁰⁵ Zumthor notes ‘le plaisir d’une reconnaissance’ and discusses rewriting as a game that produces ‘un plaisir provenant de la répétition et des ressemblances’. Zumthor, ‘Le Texte-fragment’, p. 81; Zumthor, ‘Intertextualité et mouvance’, p. 15

¹⁰⁶ Douglas Kelly, ‘Les Inventions ovidiennes de Froissart: réflexions intertextuelles comme imagination’, *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 82-92 (p. 84).

¹⁰⁷ Gignoux, *Initiation à l’intertextualité*, p. 117.

from intertextuality.¹⁰⁸ Theories of parody and adaptation provide critical tools and terminology that can be applied to an examination of medieval rewriting techniques in *Guillaume*, as they study examples of specific and conscious transformation of existing works that invite intertextual recognition. The work of Hutcheon is particularly informative for understanding the parallels between analyses of intertextual rewriting and works of parody and adaptation.¹⁰⁹ Dominant themes in Hutcheon's studies and the work of other theorists include the reproduction and transformation of existing works, the facilitation of recognition of this transformation, and the manipulation of an audience's expectations and knowledge of the parodied or adapted text.¹¹⁰ Parody has also been linked to self-reflexivity. For example, Hannoosh states that authors consciously stress the parodic nature of a text and highlight the reader's role in engaging with parody by creating a work that functions as 'a model by which to interpret itself', suggesting its potential 'as a model or a target' to be received by the reader.¹¹¹ This observation aligns with my contention regarding the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume*, and stresses the way in which analysis of rewriting in the romance can shed light on the way in which the narrative reflects the processes of romance production and reception.

However, rather than limiting analysis of rewriting in *Guillaume* to examination of parody and adaptation specifically, my methodological approach engages more broadly with notions of rewriting, encompassing some of the critical tools provided by these

¹⁰⁸ For example, Cobby notes that 'parody involves a relation with an existing work or works', yet Jenny observes that 'si la parodie est toujours intertextuelle, l'intertextualité ne se réduit pas à la parodie'. Anne Elizabeth Cobby, *Ambivalent Conventions: Formula and Parody in Old French* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995), p. 13; Jenny, p. 260.

¹⁰⁹ Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation* (London: Routledge, 2006); *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000); and 'Ironie et parodie: stratégie et structure', *Poétique*, 36 (1978), 467-77.

¹¹⁰ See comments in: Genette, *Palimpsestes*, pp. 19-21; Kathryn Gravdal, *Vilain and Courtois: Transgressive Parody in French Literature of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), p. 6; Philippe Hamon, *L'Ironie littéraire: Essai sur les formes de l'écriture oblique* (Paris: Hachette, 1996), pp. 79-80; Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody*, p. 6, p. 23, and p. 93; Margaret A. Rose, *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-modern* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 33 and p. 41; Daniel Sangsue, *La Parodie* (Paris: Hachette, 1994), p. 85; Daniel Sangsue, *La Relation parodique* (Paris: J. Corti, 2007), pp. 120-25.

¹¹¹ Michele Hannoosh, 'The Reflexive Function of Parody', *Comparative Literature*, 41 (1989), 113-27 (pp. 113-14). See also Rose, p. 66 and p. 101.

related theories and aligning them with the existing paradigms for research of medieval romance composition. This examination of *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive romance focuses on specific passages that the audience are invited to recognise as allusions to intertextual rewriting. Analysis of the poet's compositional approach is grounded in study of *inventio* and *imitatio* in rewriting of existing works, and particular emphasis will be placed on exploring *mutatio*. The notion of rewriting as intertextual transformation permeates analyses of medieval romance, and close study of intertextual relationships relies on the understanding that 'le rapport intertextuel implique la transformation –, [sic] ou plus précisément, *des transformations*'.¹¹² Indeed, Krueger defines the evolution of medieval romance as a process of 'translation and transformation, adaptation and refashioning, and fertile intertextual and intercultural exchange'.¹¹³ Critics have explored the way in which poets fused together multiple works that they rewrote, as discussed by Eley who builds on Bruckner's concept of intertextual fusion, noting that romance composition is a 'process of fission and fusion of pre-existing stories'.¹¹⁴ It is in reversing this fusion by unpicking intertextual references and perceiving the transformations of intertexts that we can access not only a better understanding of the poet's process of composition, but also the process of recognition undertaken by the audience. For example, Eley's examination of *Partonopeus* demonstrates how study of the complex intertextual rewriting within this romance leads to an observation of the way in which rewriting is signalled to the audience through a series of 'faultlines'.¹¹⁵

¹¹² Bruckner, 'En guise de conclusion', p. 106.

¹¹³ Roberta Krueger, 'Introduction', p. 1.

¹¹⁴ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', pp. 5-6; and Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, *Shaping Romance: Interpretation, Truth, and Closure in Twelfth-Century French Fictions* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), p. 7.

¹¹⁵ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', pp. 7-9. Her observation of 'faultlines' will be explored in Chapter Four, pp. 284-85. Additional examples of similar methodological approaches are found in the work of Donald Maddox: 'Generic Intertextuality in Arthurian Literature: The Specular Encounter', in *Text and Intertext in Medieval Arthurian Literature*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy (New York: Garland, 1996), pp. 3-24; and 'Inventing the Unknown: Rewriting in *Le Bel Inconnu*', in *The Medieval 'Opus'*, ed. by Kelly, pp. 101-23.

Building on the existing methodological frameworks of scholars such as Eley, I will examine examples of intertextual rewriting in *Guillaume*, analysing links between the romance and its intertextual network. Comparison of *Guillaume* with the material rewritten in the romance will allow this study to establish the ways in which the poet employed the techniques of rewriting. In so doing, I will place particular emphasis on the notion of rewriting as transformation, in order to highlight the parallels between this compositional technique and the key themes of the narrative.

Alongside analysis of the poet's approach to composition, this thesis will also explore the audience's reception of rewriting, questioning the way in which intertextual references are manipulated to encourage the audience to engage with the game of romance.¹¹⁶ Although intertextual rewriting is at the heart of my study of *Guillaume*, the emphasis that I will place on the role of the reader will bring my analysis into contact with critical approaches to the reader developed by theorists in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, in particular reception theory and reader-response theory.¹¹⁷ Indeed, Bruckner notes that modern theory can aid the medievalist, by providing 'tools and concepts available in modern critical discourses' with which to analyse texts.¹¹⁸ However, Bruckner also underlines the importance of adjusting 'the findings of modern theory where it does not adequately take into account or represent medieval narrative'.¹¹⁹ For this reason, I will not engage with analytical frameworks outside of the context of medieval romance, such as analysis of the narratee in narratology, and nor will I impose literary-theoretical discussions on close reading of *Guillaume*. For example, although Chapter One takes as its primary focus the female characters of *Guillaume*, it will not engage with gender

¹¹⁶ Scholars stress that exploring authors' use of intertextuality allows us to understand both reading and writing, as 'the writer is a reader of texts [...] before s/he is a creator of texts'. Judith Still and Michael Worton, 'Introduction', in *Intertextuality: Theories and practices* ed. by Michael Worton and Judith Still (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), pp. 1-44 (p. 1).

¹¹⁷ Gumbrecht discusses the ways in which reception theory can be of use to medievalists. Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, 'Strangeness as a Requirement for Topicality: Medieval Literature and Reception Theory', *L'Esprit Créateur*, 21 (1981), 5-12. Reader-response and reception theory will be explored in the final chapter of this thesis.

¹¹⁸ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 3.

¹¹⁹ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 3

theory in its analysis of women in the narrative. Similarly, Chapter Two will not explore contemporary theories of space and frontiers, despite discussion centred on these notions in the text. These lines of enquiry would no doubt prove fruitful for research, yet my focus remains grounded in an examination of intertextual rewriting in order to understand the self-reflexive elements of the romance, rather than discussion of the broader literary concerns in the text.

My methodological approach will develop Simons's and Ferlampin-Acher's work on *Guillaume* within the established theoretical paradigm for analysing intertextual rewriting in medieval romance, incorporating certain aspects of modern literary theory that complement this critical framework. Thus, I will explore the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume*, examining the reflection of the poet's compositional process and the audience's reception of the romance. The understanding of self-reflexivity upon which this study is based defines self-reflexive texts as works that '[make] transparent their own fictional status and generation' by embedding elements into the narrative that stress their nature as literary text and mirror the process by which they are composed.¹²⁰ For example, *mise en abyme*, a term first introduced into literary analysis by Gide in 1893, is a technique by which 'on retrouve ainsi transposé, à l'échelle des personnages, le sujet même de cette œuvre'.¹²¹ Although self-reflexive literature may appear to be a modern concept, certain medieval texts have been dubbed 'self-reflexive', 'auto-referential', or 'specular'.¹²² Scholars have noted the use of *mise en abyme* in medieval romances such as

¹²⁰ Werner Huber, Martin Middeke, and Hubert Zapf, 'Introduction', in *Self-Reflexivity in Literature*, ed. by Werner Huber, Martin Middeke, and Hubert Zapf (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005), pp. 7-10 (p. 10). See also Karlheinz Stierle, 'The Reading of Fictional Texts', in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 83-105 (p. 103).

¹²¹ André Gide, *Journal, 1889-1939* (Paris: Gallimard, Pléiade, 1948), p. 41. See comments in Lucien Dällenbach, *The Mirror in the Text*, trans. by Jeremy Whiteley with Emma Hughes (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), pp. 7-38.

¹²² Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 197; Roberta Krueger, *Women Readers and the Ideology of Gender in Old French Romance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 192; Donald Maddox, *Fictions of Identity in Medieval France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 14-16.

Yvain, in which Calogrenant's tale functions as a 'récit en récit' that provides 'à la fois la première esquisse et le point de départ des aventures à venir du héros'.¹²³

Maddox notes that further examples of *mise en abyme* are found in a variety of texts, including *Erec et Enide*, *Le Bel Inconnu*, and the *Vie de Saint Alexis*.¹²⁴ Critics have observed an abundance of medieval texts that are self-reflexive, either through use of *mise en abyme* or other techniques that allow the work to reflect its own compositional process and fictional status within the narrative.¹²⁵ For example, Baumgartner notes in her study of the *Roman de Troie* that the mosaic image on Hector's tomb doubles the image of 'une écriture qui prend son bien de toutes parts, mais qui met aussi en scène devant son public, la fusion [...] [des] sources'.¹²⁶ However, examples are not limited to medieval romance, as self-reflexivity has also been observed in the work of philosophers such as Alain de Lille.¹²⁷ Galand notes that in the *Anticlaudianus*, a Latin poetic and allegorical treatise on morals, Alain de Lille manipulates the motif of the *locus amoenus* in order to create a self-reflexive work.¹²⁸ By highlighting the 'activité procréatrice de Nature' that mirrors the 'créativité humaine, artistique et littéraire' by which the text is produced, Galand observes the way in which Alain creates 'une autoreprésentation du texte qui offre au lecteur une analyse de ses propres mécanismes'.¹²⁹ The notion of self-reflexivity

¹²³ Marie-Louise Ollier, 'Le Discours "en abyme" ou la narration équivoque', *Medioevo Romanzo*, 1 (1974), 351-64; reprinted in Marie-Louise Ollier, *La Forme du sens: Textes narratifs des XII^e et XIII^e siècles, Etudes littéraires et linguistiques* (Orléans: Paradigme, 2000), pp. 87-98. See also Joan Grimbert, *Yvain dans le miroir: une poétique de la réflexion dans le 'Chevalier du Lion' de Chrétien de Troyes* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1988), pp. 13-34.

¹²⁴ Maddox, *Fictions of Identity*, pp. 15-16.

¹²⁵ For example, see comments in: Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 28 and p. 61; Eley, 'Partonopeus de Blois', pp. 144-7; Huchet, *Le Roman médiéval*, pp. 55-59. These studies examine the following text respectively: the *Folies Tristan*, the *Chevalier de la Charrette*, *Partonopeus de Blois*, and *Le Roman d'Eneas*.

¹²⁶ Baumgartner, 'Benoît de Sainte-Maure et l'oeuvre de Troie', p. 26.

¹²⁷ For general comments on this text, see: James J. Sheridan, 'Introduction', in Alan of Lille, *Anticlaudianus: or the Good and Perfect Man*, trans. by James J. Sheridan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1973), pp. 7-38 (pp. 23-38); James Simpson, *Sciences and the Self in Medieval Poetry: Alan of Lille's 'Anticlaudianus' and John Gower's 'Confessio Amantis'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 22-26; Sarah Powrie, 'Alan of Lille's *Anticlaudianus* as Intertext in Chaucer's *House of Fame*', *The Chaucer Review*, 44 (2010), 246-67.

¹²⁸ Perrine Galand, 'Les "Beaux" Signes: Un "locus amoenus" d'Alain de Lille', *Littérature*, 74 (1989), 27-46 (p. 31).

¹²⁹ Galand, p. 29.

characterises many texts contemporary to *Guillaume*, and Bruckner observes that these works invite the audience to perceive ‘the way stories are put together in writing by authors who enjoin the reader to admire the work’s shape’.¹³⁰ Indeed, Zink observes that Old French romance ‘se définit dès le début comme un genre réflexif, préoccupé par ses propres démarches’.¹³¹

Following the model presented in Galand’s analysis of Alain de Lille’s *Anticlaudianus* and Baumgartner’s commentary on Hector’s tomb in the *Roman de Troie*, this analysis of *Guillaume* will focus on the manipulation of particular elements in the text to signal its self-reflexivity. Analysis of the themes of transformation and recognition will shed light on the way in which the poet mirrors the processes of composition and reception in the narrative of *Guillaume*. This discussion will be complemented by close study of the notions of doubling and correspondence, suggesting that the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume* is foregrounded throughout this romance.

Chapter outlines

The analysis of *Guillaume de Palerne* as a self-reflexive romance presented in this thesis takes a bipartite structure that is subdivided into four chapters. The first two chapters will study the way in which the theme of transformation is manipulated to reflect intertextual rewriting in *Guillaume*. The third and fourth chapters will cover new ground by first analysing the themes of doubling and correspondence before turning to the notion of recognition. These chapters will question how the partnership between poet and audience is mirrored in the narrative, all the while stressing the audience’s role in the reception and creation of medieval romance.

The first two chapters will expand the observations of Simons and Ferlampin-Acher, who both suggest that the poet mirrors his intertextual transformation in the figure

¹³⁰ Bruckner, ‘The Shape of Romance in Medieval France’, p. 13.

¹³¹ Michel Zink, *Littérature française du Moyen Âge* (Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, 1992), p. 131.

of the werewolf and the animal-skin disguises worn by Guillaume. Building on the work of these scholars, I will analyse further elements of the romance that manipulate this theme, which I will term ‘catalysts of transformation’. These catalysts are both concrete and abstract elements of the narrative. ‘Concrete catalysts’, such as the representation and actions of individual characters, and ‘abstract catalysts’, such as the different settings used by the poet, both transform the plot of *Guillaume* by triggering change in the romance. Yet these same catalysts also act as signals with which the poet highlights intertextual rewriting and encourages the audience to recognise his compositional process, as individual characters and settings are aligned with intertextual models known by the audience.

Chapter One will present analysis of ‘concrete’ catalysts of transformation by examining characters who cause change in the narrative and signal the presence of intertextual rewriting. This chapter takes a deliberate diversion from the work of Ferlampin-Acher and Simons by turning not to the figures of Alphonse and Guillaume, but rather to the female characters of the romance. Close reading of passages related to key female figures will also offer new analysis of their influence on the narrative and the intertextual models that they signal and transform. The focus on women will allow this thesis to look beyond Alphonse and Guillaume in its examination of transformation, challenging the emphasis placed on these figures in the majority of *Guillaume* criticism. In light of the prominent part taken by Guillaume and Alphonse in the text and in existing scholarship, there is a risk that analysis of these characters may eclipse other aspects of the romance that are equally instrumental in reflecting the poet’s approach to the composition of his romance.¹³² By maintaining distance from Guillaume and Alphonse, the analysis of female characters in *Guillaume* will allow us to draw conclusions

¹³² For example, the work of Sconduto demonstrates that study of the dual *Guillaume* heroes in virtual isolation from the rest of the romance can lead to the neglect of other characters. It should also be noted that although Ferlampin-Acher’s introduction to *Guillaume* encompasses examination of other characters, she dedicates a considerable section to comments regarding the relationship between Guillaume and Alphonse. Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, pp. 48-83.

regarding the extent to which transformation is manipulated throughout the romance in its narrative and intertextual sphere.

After examining women as ‘concrete’ catalysts of transformation, Chapter Two will turn to ‘abstract’ elements that perform the same function in the text. It will take as its focus the abstract concept of space, aligning with Simons’s recent work on space in *Guillaume*. Following the same methodological approach as Chapter One, Chapter Two will use close reading to study the way in which bordered spaces catalyse narrative transformation and highlight intertextual rewriting. These first chapters will provide new insight into rewriting in *Guillaume*, and will shed light on the reflection of the poet’s compositional approach in the narrative. They will each offer observations on the way in which transformation is manipulated in *Guillaume* to create a self-reflexive romance, and Chapter Two will conclude by discussing the discoveries made in both chapters.

Chapter Three marks a turning point in the thesis, and a break from a methodological approach based on the work of Simons and Ferlampin-Acher. This chapter will present new analysis of *Guillaume* in its consideration of the notions of doubling and correspondence that underpin the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume*. The exploration of these notions will engage with the figures of the werewolf and Guillaume in order to examine the partnership between these double heroes. It will develop an understanding of the way in which the emphasis placed on their relationship as doubles not only signals intertextual rewriting hitherto ignored in *Guillaume* scholarship, but also stresses the importance of doubling and correspondence in relation to the composition of the romance. By exploring these concepts alongside a contextualised examination of doubling and interpretation in the twelfth century, the chapter will conclude by returning to the notion of self-reflexive literature, establishing a framework for analysis of *Guillaume* as a work that reflects both its production and reception.

Chapter Four will take up this framework by using analysis of recognition in the narrative to explore the way in which the poet manipulates this motif to double the role of the *Guillaume* audience. After analysing characters' recognition of Alphonse and Guillaume as transformed figures, the chapter will explore the emphasis placed on the relationship between transformation and recognition in the narrative. This link will then be examined at the meta-level of the romance, as the chapter engages in study of the partnership between poet and audience as agents of transformation and recognition in romance production and reception. The chapter will bring together aspects of modern reception and reader-response theory to complement current understanding of medieval romance creation and the importance of the reader, suggesting ways in which they can shed light on the audience role that is reflected in *Guillaume*.

The conclusion of this thesis will draw upon the analyses of transformation, doubling and correspondence, and recognition in order to examine the extent to which *Guillaume de Palerne* can be seen as a self-reflexive romance that reflects the processes of romance composition and reception within its narrative. The focus placed on the roles of both poet and audience will enable the thesis to suggest ways in which the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume* adds to our understanding of romance composition and reception within the contemporary context of the work. It will also suggest that the methodological approach of this study, which blends established approaches to medieval literature with elements of 'modern' literary theory, is a fruitful paradigm that provides a space in which scholars can explore and understand 'modern' concepts. Indeed, it will offer an example of such research in practice, illustrating how *Guillaume* can provide a lens through which to read these theories. Above all, the thesis will contribute to the recent trend that seeks to place *Guillaume* within the field of mainstream scholarship of Old French romance, suggesting new avenues through which study of this often neglected text can enrich our knowledge of French romance at the end of the twelfth century.

Chapter One: Women as catalysts of transformation

To date, studies of *Guillaume* have privileged analysis of transformation in relation to two key male protagonists, the eponymous hero and the werewolf Alphonse, and comments regarding self-reflexivity in the romance have been restricted to discussion of these figures. In so doing, other catalysts of transformation have been overlooked, notably the female figures whose presence and function within the narrative is just as pivotal as their male counterparts. Close examination of women in *Guillaume* indicates that they catalyse narrative change and signal intertextual rewriting, and that they are linked to transformation throughout the romance. In particular, the representation of key figures such as the heroine, Melior, and her confidante, Alixandrine, highlights the use of women as concrete catalysts of transformation. Like the eponymous hero, Melior undergoes a quasi-metamorphosis into animal form by donning animal skins, and she is the first to take on this hybridising disguise (vv. 3073-86). More strikingly, the physical transformations in the narrative are caused by two women, Brande and Alixandrine. Brande turns Alphonse into a werewolf (vv. 295-309), and Alixandrine suggests and provides the animal skins worn by Guillaume and Melior (vv. 3020-27; vv. 3054-3109). However, although critics such as Vuagnoux-Uhlig have commented on some elements of the depiction of *Guillaume*'s female figures, no significant research has yet been dedicated to women in the text.¹ This lack of critical attention sits at odds with

¹ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, pp. 171-83. Her study presents some analysis of Melior and Felise.

the increased interest regarding female figures in medieval romance, as shown in the work of Burns, Krueger, Pratt, and others.²

Guillaume presents eight female protagonists (including the unnamed wife of the ‘vachier’) of which four key women catalyse narrative and intertextual transformation. Melior, her confidante Alixandrine, Queen Felise (Guillaume’s mother), and Queen Brande (Alphonse’s stepmother) all have a transformative effect upon the narrative and intertextual spheres of the text. This chapter will present individual sections of analysis that examine three of these figures, Melior, Alixandrine, and Queen Felise. The chapter will not analyse Brande independently of the other key women, as existing critical commentary has already explored the representation of this figure, focusing in particular on her role transforming Alphonse.³ However, commentary related to Brande will nevertheless be incorporated into discussion of Melior, Felise, and Alixandrine as ‘catalysts of transformation’.

The analysis of women in *Guillaume* presented in this chapter will not engage with feminist or gender-focused approaches to medieval romance, but will instead use close reading of female figures as a methodological tool for understanding the manipulation of transformation in the romance. Examination of the relationship between women and transformation in *Guillaume* will explore the impact that they have on the narrative, yet it will also analyse the links signalled between intra- and intertextual female

² For example, see the following: E. Jane Burns, *Bodytalk: When Women Speak in Old French Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993); Albrecht Classen, ‘Introduction’, in *The Power of a Woman’s Voice in Medieval and Early Modern Literatures: New Approaches to German and European Women Writers and to Violence Against Women in Premodern Times* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), pp. 1-36; Roberta Krueger and E. Jane Burns, ‘Introduction: Courtly Ideology and Woman’s Place in Medieval French Literature’, *Romance Notes*, 25 (1985), 205-19; Krueger, *Women Readers and The Ideology of Gender*; Karen Pratt, ‘The Image of the Queen in Old French Literature’, in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), pp. 235-62; Karen Pratt, ‘Analogy or Logic: Authority or Experience? Rhetorical Strategies for and Against Women’, in *Literary Aspects of Courtly Culture*, ed. by Donald Maddox and Sara Sturm-Maddox (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1994), pp. 57-66. See also more general comments on women in the Middle Ages in: Alcuin Blamires, *The Case for Women in Medieval Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); Robert Fossier, ‘La Femme dans les sociétés occidentales’, *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 20 (1977), 93-104; and *Women and Gender in Medieval Europe: An Encyclopedia*, ed. by Margaret Schaus (Routledge: Abingdon, 2006).

³ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, pp. 51-52 and pp. 76-77; Dubost, p. 561; Sconduto, ‘Rewriting the Werewolf’, pp. 32-33.

figures. In particular, the transformations that shape the narrative are mirrored in the poet's intertextual transformation, as the portrayal of the key women in *Guillaume* highlights rewriting of a range of textual models. The poet's compositional process relies on the transformation of material (*mutatio*), and he reconfigures models by dividing them up into their component parts, redistributing and fusing individual elements into a new composition. This technique was used by the poet's literary predecessors, such as Chrétien de Troyes.⁴ For example, Guyer notes that in *Cligès* 'Medea as a source of inspiration is split in two, to offer [...] the substance of Soredamors's thoughts and monologues and [...] the magic, charms, and potions of Thessala, who takes the name of Medea's country'.⁵ This chapter will explore this technique in *Guillaume* by examining the relationship between female figures and their textual counterparts. It will thus shed light on the compositional process of intertextual rewriting that is mirrored in the transformations that form and shape the narrative.

The focus this chapter will place on understanding the relationship between key female figures and their textual models as one of fragmentation and reconfiguration will stress the importance of transformation in *Guillaume*, yet it will also emphasise the notions of doubling and correspondence to be explored later in the thesis. The poet establishes parallels between women and the intra- and intertextual counterparts that they double, manipulating the correspondence between these doubles by rewriting each model. The intra- and intertextual doubling signalled by the depiction of female figures underlines the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume*, as the audience are invited to perceive the links between the work and its models. The narrative change catalysed by women doubles the intertextual rewriting with which the poet composes *Guillaume* and that he encourages the readers to recognise in their reception of the text. The emphasis placed on

⁴ For example, Eley and Simons argue that Chrétien de Troyes 'split' and 'fragmented' the character of Urraque from *Partonopeus* in *Yvain*. Penny Eley and Penny Simons, 'Partonopeus de Blois and Chrétien de Troyes: A Re-assessment', *Romania*, 117 (1999), 316-41 (p. 333).

⁵ Foster E. Guyer, *Romance in the Making: Chrétien de Troyes and the Earliest French Romances* (New York: Vanni, 1954), pp. 128-29.

transformation and doubling in the portrayal of women highlights an invitation for recognition of the parallels between the narrative and its intertextual sphere within the self-reflexive romance that this study explores more widely.

In its three sections of analysis dedicated first to Melior, then Felise, and finally Alixandrine, this chapter will above all explore the reflection of the poet's compositional process in the *Guillaume* narrative. It will extend the horizon of *Guillaume* scholarship away from the figures of the werewolf and the eponymous hero. In so doing, it will begin to fill the lacunae in existing criticism, examining the way in which overlooked transformative elements of the romance, such as women, can shed light on the self-reflexive nature of this text.

Melior

As the heroine of *Guillaume de Palerne*, Melior provides a clear example of the poet's use of women to catalyse transformation. However, Melior's transformative influence lies not in her power over the course of the narrative, but rather in the transformation of intertextual material highlighted by her presence in *Guillaume*. In particular, the representation of Melior signals rewriting of the model presented by the heroine of the anonymous *Partonopeus de Blois*, also called Melior. This text is believed by most scholars to have been composed c. 1182-85, with a *terminus ad quem* (1188) that predates the *terminus a quo* of *Guillaume* (c. 1190).⁶ This relative chronology indicates that the *Guillaume* poet and his audience knew *Partonopeus*, and the alternative dating of the latter romance (c. 1170) provided by Eley and Simons suggests that greater knowledge

⁶ Olivier Collet and Pierre-Marie Joris, 'Introduction', in *Le Roman de Partonopeu de Blois*, ed. and trans. by Olivier Collet and Pierre-Marie Joris (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 2005), pp. 9-49 (pp. 19-22); Anthime Fourier, *Le Courant réaliste dans le roman courtois en France au moyen âge*, 2 vols (Paris: Nizet, 1960), I, pp. 315-446 (p. 426). The *terminus ad quem* for *Partonopeus* is the year of composition of Aimon de Varenne's *Florimont*, which was influenced by *Partonopeus*. Collet and Joris, p. 19.

of *Partonopeus* may have been accessed via texts that in fact reworked the anonymous romance, such as the later work of Chrétien de Troyes.⁷

That the *Guillaume* poet knew *Partonopeus* is signalled by his use of the name Melior. *Partonopeus* contains the first occurrence of this name in Old French literature, and the only other use of this name in twelfth-century texts.⁸ Ferlampin-Acher notes the parallels established by the name ‘Melior’ between the *Guillaume* and *Partonopeus* heroines, yet she states that ‘le rapprochement ne puisse être maintenu’, arguing that the name ‘Melior’ could have been used to signal the *Guillaume* heroine’s excellence through an echo with the Latin comparative ‘melior’.⁹ However, the depiction of the *Guillaume* heroine makes several allusions to the *Partonopeus* model, and the audience are encouraged to expect Melior to mirror her intertextual predecessor. For example, each Melior is the heiress of a great empire, and this renders them both prime targets for betrothals and pressure to marry. In *Partonopeus*, the death of Melior’s father, the Emperor of Byzantium, prompts her barons to insist that she finds a husband (vv. 1341-44).¹⁰ Similarly, the *Guillaume* Melior is the daughter of the Emperor of Rome, and as sole heiress to the Holy Roman Empire her father consents to her betrothal to the son of the Greek Emperor (vv. 2641-48). The relationship between each Melior and their respective fathers is also stressed by the absence of a mother figure for either heroine, and both poets insist upon the high status of these women. The *Partonopeus* poet emphasises the qualities appropriate for an emperor’s daughter in his portrayal of Melior, describing her education and upbringing (vv. 4557-96). In the same way, the *Guillaume* poet notes

⁷ Penny Eley and Penny Simons, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois* and Chrétien de Troyes’, pp. 316-41; Eley and Simons ‘The Prologue to *Partonopeus de Blois*’, pp. 10-12.

⁸ ‘Melior’, in Louis-Fernand Flutre, *Table des noms propres avec toutes leurs variantes figurant dans les romans du moyen âge écrits en français ou en provençal et actuellement publiés ou analysés* (Poitiers: Centre d’Etudes supérieures de civilisation médiévale, 1962), p. 136. Simons refers to the *Guillaume* poet’s ‘very obvious borrowing of the name of the heroine Melior’ from *Partonopeus*. Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 424. See also Zingarelli, ‘Il “Guillaume de Palerne” e i suoi dati di luogo e di tempo’, p. 261.

⁹ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 27; Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Guillaume de Palerne*: une parodie?’, p. 61; *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Ferlampin-Acher, p. 129, note 1.

¹⁰ *Le Roman de Partonopeu de Blois*, ed. and trans. by Olivier Collet and Pierre-Marie Joris (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 2005).

that Melior is extremely beautiful and wise, stating that ‘Mais ainc ne fu de mere nee / Nule plus bele ne plus sage’ (vv. 650-51), yet he also stresses her nobility: ‘Molt par fu cortoise et honeste, / Plaine de francise et d’ounor’ (vv. 654-55).

Melior in *Guillaume* is modelled on the Byzantine Empress from *Partonopeus*, sharing her name, status, and basic character traits. However, once this intertextual link has been established, the poet highlights transformation of this intertextual model. Indeed, Melior is not a simple reproduction of her *Partonopeus* namesake. In *Partonopeus*, Melior is portrayed as a prominent political power-broker who rules over the Byzantine Empire unaided after her father’s death (v. 1337). The representation of Melior as powerful is further marked by her seniority in age over the eponymous hero, as she is ‘quite explicitly characterised as being older than Partonopeus’.¹¹ Melior’s influence over Partonopeus is emphasised by her possession of magic powers. For example, she tells him about her mastery of ‘Nigromance et encantemens’ (v. 4598) that she uses to facilitate their relationship by making herself and her household invisible to him and he to them (vv. 4640-46). Melior’s magic powers indicate the fusion of intertextual models in *Partonopeus*, as the poet combines mortal heroine with fairy mistress in his rewriting of the Classical tale of Cupid and Psyche.¹² The motif of the fairy mistress used in ‘Celtic’ texts such as the *lais* is manipulated by the depiction of Melior as a ‘rationalized’ fairy whose powers are acquired through instruction.¹³ Although she is referred to as a fairy when she approaches Partonopeus in the bedchamber at the Chef d’Oire (vv. 1121-30),

¹¹ Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, pp. 32-33. The eponymous hero is thirteen years old at the start of the romance (v. 543). The age of Melior is not given, although she states that she had surpassed her tutors’ knowledge by the age of fifteen, implying an age greater than fifteen (vv. 4595-96).

¹² Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, pp. 122-23; Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, pp. 7-8.

¹³ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 123; Colleen P. Donagher, ‘Socializing the Sorceress: The Fairy Mistress in *Lanval*, *Le Bel Inconnu*, and *Partonopeu de Blois*’, *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 4 (1997), 69-88 (pp. 69-71). See also John R. Reinhard, *The Survival of Geis in Medieval Romance* (Hulle: Niemeyer, 1933), pp. 233-99 (p. 299).

Melior is wholly mortal.¹⁴ Melior takes a ‘dominant role in the couple’ and exercises ‘total control over Partonopeu’, and Adams states that she ‘manipulates through magic to achieve what she desires’.¹⁵ However, Melior’s control through magic is stopped when Partonopeus breaks the taboo and looks at her (v. 4656), stripping her of her powers in what some critics see as a shift in the portrayal of Melior that renders her ‘subordinate’.¹⁶ Nevertheless, Melior continues to take centre stage throughout *Partonopeus*, and the poet highlights the image of an ‘educated woman who thinks and acts with autonomy’.¹⁷

The *Guillaume* poet rewrites the image of a strong and dominant woman who holds influence over others in the romance, transforming the model of Melior from *Partonopeus*. Rather than depicting Melior as older than the hero and using her seniority to suggest superiority as in *Partonopeus*, the poet states that she is the same age as Guillaume: ‘Et meïsmes de tel aage / Com Guillaumes pooit bien estre’ (vv. 652-53). This detail immediately transforms the intertextual parallel with the *Partonopeus* heroine, indicating equality between Guillaume and Melior rather than dominance of the heroine. The reference to the parallel between the lovers’ age also introduces additional intertextual models that inform the representation of Melior, echoing the *romans idylliques* such as *Floire et Blanchefleur*, in which the hero and heroine are born on the

¹⁴ *Partonopeus* mss. B, G, L, P, T, and V of use ‘fée’, ms. L uses ‘dame’ (v. 1045), and ms. A uses ‘arme’ (v. 1121), translated by Tobler as ‘soul’ or ‘being’ and by Collet and Joris as ‘fée’. See ‘Ame’ in Adolf Tobler, *Tobler-Lommatzsch altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, 11 vols (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1925), I, pp. 330-32; and *Roman de Partonopeu de Blois*, p. 127. The manuscript transcriptions can be viewed at ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’: *An Electronic Edition*, ed. by Eley et al. (Sheffield: HriOnline, 2005) <www.hrionline.ac.uk/partonopeus> [accessed 10 February 2015]. See also Donagher, pp. 71-74; and Denis Hüe, ‘Faire d’armes, parler d’amour: les stratégies du récit dans *Partonopeu de Blois*’, in *Rémanences: Mémoire de la forme dans la littérature médiévale* (Paris: Champion, 2010), pp. 289-302 (pp. 290-92).

¹⁵ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, pp. 123-24; Tracy Adams, ‘Crossing Generic Boundaries: The Clever Courtly Lady’, *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 21 (2004), 81-96 (pp. 90-91).

¹⁶ Gretchen Mieszkowski, ‘Urake and the Gender Roles of *Partonopeu of Blois*’, in *Partonopeus in Europe: An Old French Romance and its Adaptations*, ed. by Catherine Hanley, Mario Longtin, and Penny Eley (New York: Global Academic Publishing, 2004), pp. 181-95 (pp. 191-93); Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, pp. 126-48. See also Rita Lejeune, ‘La Femme dans les littératures française et occitane du XI^e au XIII^e siècle’, *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 20 (1977), 201-17 (p. 213); Anne Reynders, ‘Mélior de Chef d’Oire: manipulatrice habile ou femme résignée? Les réécritures du *Partonopeu de Blois* et le rôle social de l’héroïne dans le roman propre’, *Neophilologus*, 94 (2010), 407-19 (pp. 409-12).

¹⁷ Anita Benaim Lasry, ‘The Ideal Heroine in Medieval Romances: A Quest for a Paradigm’, *Kentucky Romance Quarterly*, 32 (1985), 227-43 (p. 240).

same day (vv. 158-70).¹⁸ Both Lot-Borodine and Vuagnoux-Uhlig have explored the intertextual links between *Guillaume* and other romances qualified as ‘idylliques’, and the allusion to this model early in the romance signals the fusion of multiple and diverse material in the representation of Melior.¹⁹

The *Guillaume* poet emphasises the differences between his heroine and the *Partonopeus* model invoked by her name. Unlike *Partonopeus* Melior, the *Guillaume* heroine does not possess political power. Her father remains alive until after her marriage to Guillaume and she never becomes Empress in her own right, only gaining this title when her husband is crowned Emperor (v. 9469). Critics have noted that Melior in *Partonopeus* exercises influence over the course of the narrative and is portrayed as ‘a creator of fiction’ whose control over the story represents a model of ‘romantic artistry’.²⁰ In direct contrast, *Guillaume* Melior holds negligible power over the narrative. Melior does not dictate others’ actions like her intertextual model, who lures Partonopeus to the Chef d’Oire in order to become her lover, setting out rules for his conduct (vv. 1331-1564). *Guillaume* Melior has no such power, and instead acts upon the orders of others such as her confidante Alixandrine (vv. 1366-73; vv. 1430-34). The only indication of Melior’s influence is found in two dreams in which she foresees key moments in the narrative (vv. 3991-4023; vv. 5178-90), although these sequences suggest that she is privy to the knowledge of future events, rather than in control of them.²¹

Melior does not shape the *Guillaume* narrative, and her lack of transformative influence highlights rewriting of this intertextual model. The sharp contrast between the *Guillaume* and *Partonopeus* heroines is emphasised by the gradual effacement of *Guillaume* Melior from the narrative. Although she is present throughout the majority of

¹⁸ Robert D’Orbigny, *Le Conte de Floire et Blanchefleur*, ed. and trans. by Jean-Luc Leclanche (Paris: Champion, 2003).

¹⁹ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, pp. 171-83; Lot-Borodine, *Le Roman idyllique*, pp. 233-65.

²⁰ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, pp. 112-13; R. W. Hanning, ‘The Audience as Co-Creator of the First Chivalric Romances’, *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 11 (1981), 1-28 (pp. 17-18).

²¹ For comments on these dreams, see Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 70; and Corbellari, pp. 357-60.

the narrative, Melior is referred to less frequently by name as the text progresses.²² Indeed, once Melior and Guillaume join Felise's household in Palermo (v. 5330) the poet uses collective nouns 'puceles' (v. 6281; v. 6378; v. 7070) and 'dames' (v. 5552; v. 5835) to denote Melior, Felise, and Florence, rather than employing each individual name. This gives the impression of Melior slipping into the background of the narrative, as the poet replaces his portrayal of Melior as an individual figure with the image of a group of women. Most strikingly, Melior appears to be entirely forgotten during one key scene. After Alphonse has been retransformed, the main protagonists gather to listen to him recount his adventures:

Desor .I. paile de Bisterne
 Sist la roïne de Palerne,
 Les li Florence la romaigne,
 Avec la roïne d'Espaigne.
 Dejuste Amphous Guillaumes sist,
 Qui molt l'acole et conjoist;
 Ses pere et ses frere ambedui
 D'autre part sisent jouste lui. (vv. 7975-82).

Melior's absence is noticeable in this group portrait. The poet signals Florence, Alphonse, and Guillaume by name, and clearly refers to Felise (v. 7976), Brande (v. 7978), and both the King of Spain and his son (v. 7981), yet Melior is not mentioned. It is possible that the adjective following Florence's name, 'la romaigne' (v. 7977), could have been intended as a reference to Melior. However, this term denotes a connection to the Greek Empire, as shown in a later reference to the Greek prince Lertenidus's father as 'L'empereor de Roumenie' (v. 8951). 'La romaigne' cannot therefore be applied to Melior, daughter of the Roman Emperor, but rather describes Florence, granddaughter of the Greek Emperor.

The absence of Melior in this scene stresses how little importance she holds in this part of the text, as she is easily forgotten in the depiction of key characters. More strikingly, Melior's voice is not heard during the scenes set inside the Palermo palace,

²² Of the 54 occurrences of the name 'Melior' noted by Micha, 32 occur in the first half of the romance, and 22 in the second half. Alexandre Micha, 'Index des noms propres et des personnages', in *Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. by Micha, pp. 329-34 (p. 332).

where she remains silent for over 3800 verses (vv. 5198-9037). Although she is spoken to by others, such as Felise who shares news of Guillaume's victory with her (vv. 7042-50), her responses are not communicated in either direct or indirect speech. Melior's voice is only heard on two brief occasions totalling less than seven full verses of direct speech, and each time she is overshadowed by other characters. First, Melior bids her father farewell when he leaves Palermo (vv. 9037-39). These three lines are immediately followed by longer speeches from both Felise (vv. 9048-57) and Alixandrine (vv. 9077-81) that eclipse Melior's words to Nathaniel. One hundred lines later Melior says goodbye to Alphonse:

‘Sire’, ce a dit Meliors,
‘Cil Damedieix qui del sien cors
Raïnst le mont vos maint a joie
Si voirement com jel voudroie.’
‘Amen, bele’, li rois respont (vv. 9157-61)

This passage offers no personal message and contrasts with the longer speech from Guillaume that follows (vv. 9170-78). After this farewell, Melior's voice is not heard again, even though the text continues for just under another five hundred lines.

The silencing of Melior's voice and the effect this has on reducing her status in the narrative is also echoed in the *Guillaume* epilogue. The poet refers to Melior not by name, but in relation to Guillaume, noting that the eponymous hero ‘.II. enfans ot de *sa moillier*’ (v. 9645) (emphasis mine). Melior is not seen as a character in her own right, but is reduced to Guillaume's wife and the mother of his children. Melior's position in *Guillaume* diminishes as the romance develops, particularly in the scenes that follow the lovers' entrance into the Palermo palace with Felise. Indeed, there is a notable ‘amuïssement de l'héroïne’ in this section, as Melior appears to be silenced and forgotten by the poet.²³ The silencing of Melior contrasts starkly with the model of *Partonopeus* heroine, and the *Guillaume* poet replaces the dominant Melior from his intertext with a woman who fades into the background of his narrative.

²³ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 180.

However, the emphasis placed on *Guillaume* Melior's silence also indicates the fusion of different intertextual material in this figure, as the text alludes to and rewrites the model of the heroine from Chrétien's *Erec et Enide*. The link between the heroine of this romance and *Guillaume* Melior has been hitherto ignored by critics, yet the *Guillaume* poet explores the notion of a silent heroine that is manipulated in Chrétien's romance. The silencing of Melior (from v. 5198) occurs after the lovers join Felise in the Palermo palace (v. 5330). The depiction of the interaction between Felise and Melior signals Chrétien's romance, alerting the audience to the parallels between Melior and Enide. Once inside 'une chambre sousterrine' (v. 5331), the lovers undress from their skins, bathe, and redress in human clothing:

Tost furent prest lor garniment
 C'aporter lor fist la roïne:
 Au chevalier fu la meschine
 Et la roïne a Melior.
 D'uns dras de soie tos a or,
 Riches et biax et bien ouvrés,
 De blans ermines bien forrés
 A la pucele apareillie. (vv. 5354-61)

The poet emphasises the quality of the clothing, stating explicitly that Melior's clothes are given to her by Felise (v. 5357). The closeness between these women is emphasised once again when the Queen oversees Melior getting dressed and presents her to Guillaume:

Quant del tot l'ot bien atillie
 Comme ele pot mix, sans faintise,
 Si l'a par la main destre prise;
 Desi au damoiseil l'enmaine
 [...] La roïne li rent s'amie (vv. 5362-74)

Felise takes charge over Melior, who becomes the object rather than the subject of these verses (v. 5364), and the poet highlights the dominance of the Queen rather than the heroine. This balance of power is emphasised as the scenes inside the palace develop, as Felise takes a central role that eclipses Melior's position in the narrative.

The image of Felise providing Melior with fine clothing and presenting her to Guillaume as if Melior were a member of her household (v. 5374) also functions as a

signal to *Erec*. The first encounter between Enide and Guinevere focuses on the Queen's acceptance of the impoverished Enide, shown through her decision to replace Enide's tattered white tunic (vv. 1565-66) with one of her own dresses: "Droiz est que de mes robes ait, / Et je li donrai bone et bele, / Tot orendroit, fresche et novele" (vv. 1580-82).²⁴ Guinevere honours Enide by clothing her, and Chrétien notes the sumptuous nature of the dress she presents to Enide (vv. 1585-1638).²⁵ Chrétien stresses the careful attention that Guinevere and her handmaidens pay to ensure that Enide's new attire is well fitted (vv. 1658-60), emphasising the closeness between the women and the dominance of Guinevere over Enide. This relationship is alluded to in *Guillaume*, as Guinevere's gift of clothing is mirrored in Felise's present of silk and ermine to Melior (vv. 5358-60) and the attention she gives to dressing Melior 'Comme ele pot mix' (v. 5363).

The closeness depicted between Felise and Melior parallels the relationship between Guinevere and Enide, establishing Enide as an intertextual model for the *Guillaume* heroine. This intertextual allusion is manipulated in the depiction of Melior as a silent, passive female figure in the latter sections of the narrative. In *Erec*, Enide is characterised throughout the main section of the romance as a woman who is ordered to remain silent, but who refuses to obey her husband's orders.²⁶ Enide breaks her 'utter' silence of the first 2000 lines of text to reproach Erec for neglecting his knightly duties (vv. 2525-71), and in response he bids that she accompany him on a quest but remain

²⁴ Chrétien de Troyes, 'Erec et Enide', ed. and trans. by Jean-Marie Fritz, in Chrétien de Troyes, *Romans, suivis de Chansons, avec, en appendice, Philomena* (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1994), pp. 61-283.

²⁵ Wright, pp. 107-08. For further comments, see: Peter Noble, 'The Character of Guinevere in the Arthurian Romances of Chrétien de Troyes', *The Modern Language Review*, 67 (1972), 524-35 (pp. 525-26); Peter S. Noble, *Love and Marriage in Chrétien de Troyes* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1982), p. 16; Lynn Tarte Ramey, 'Representations of Women in Chrétien's *Erec et Enide*: Courtly Literature or Misogyny?', *The Romanic Review*, 84 (1993), 377-86 (p. 381).

²⁶ Maura Coghlan, 'The Flaw in Enide's Character: A Study of Chrétien de Troyes' *Erec*', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 5 (1979), 21-37; Erin Murray, 'The Masculinization of Enide's Voice: An Ambiguous Portrayal of the Heroine', *Romance Languages Annual*, 8 (1996), 79-83; Deborah Nelson, 'Enide: Amie or Femme?', *Romance Notes*, 21 (1981), 358-63.

silent (vv. 2764-71).²⁷ Enide repeatedly disobeys Erec's commands for silence, and is defined by her transgressive voice that acts like a weapon to protect and defend her 'ami' from peril.²⁸ The *Guillaume* poet signals Enide in his representation of Melior in the Palermo palace, inviting the audience to expect her behaviour to mirror Enide's and for her to similarly interrupt the text that follows with passages of disruptive speech. However, the poet transforms this model. Unlike Enide, Melior is characterised in the final section of the text by her silence rather than speech, and the audience's expectations are thwarted through the transformation and inversion of this intertextual model. Although Melior's relationship with Felise aligns these women with Enide and Guinevere, Melior takes on the submissive role that Enide refuses to adopt in Chrétien's text.

Melior is presented as a female who obeys rather than transgresses the edict of silence placed on Enide. The *Guillaume* heroine is seen neither as a dominant woman like *Partonopeus* Melior, nor as an equal of the eponymous hero, as suggested by the model of Chrétien's Enide, whose status at the end of *Erec* highlights the 'equality of man and wife'.²⁹ Instead, Melior 'se distingue par sa passivité et son inertie', and this depiction places her in submission to Guillaume and others in the narrative.³⁰ Indeed, Vuagnoux-Uhlig suggests that Melior be seen as a female figure with which the poet responds to the model of dominant women such as Fénice in *Cligès*, as he attempts to 'reconduire la demoiselle sur un modèle plus docile'.³¹

Above all, Melior's docility rewrites the model signalled by her name, the dominant and powerful heroine of *Partonopeus*. This intertextual rewriting is further stressed by Melior's lack of magic powers, in contrast to her *Partonopeus* model:

²⁷ Burns, *Bodytalk*, p. 158; Joan Brumlik, 'Chrétien's Enide: Wife, Mistress and Metaphor', *Romance Quarterly*, 35 (1988), 404-14 (p. 405).

²⁸ Grace M. Armstrong, 'Women of Power: Chrétien de Troyes's Female Clerks', in *Women in French literature: a collection of essays*, ed. by Michel Guggenheim (Saratoga CA: Anma Libri, 1988), pp. 29-46 (p. 34).

²⁹ Armstrong, p. 32.

³⁰ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 179.

³¹ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, pp. 177-79.

‘l’héroïne [...] porte le nom de la fée de *Partonopeu* mais n’est qu’une mortelle.’³² The transformation of the *Partonopeus* figure indicates the rewriting through which *Guillaume* is composed. The portrayal of Melior does not allude to and rewrite one individual intertextual model, but rather presents a fusion and reconfiguration of multiple sources. In particular, the representation of Melior suffering from her love for Guillaume (vv. 817-979) highlights links with Ovidian intertexts and the *romans d’antiquité* in which this motif is prevalent. These intertextual allusions are only made possible by the distancing of the *Guillaume* heroine from the model of *Partonopeus*, in which Melior’s role as fairy mistress ‘precludes her playing the part of the young woman who has to learn about love, a role that is fundamental in the presentation of other romance heroines.’³³ If the *Guillaume* poet had chosen to align his heroine closely with *Partonopeus* Melior, he would have ruled out the possibility of manipulating the topos of the young woman tormented by love. The clear transformation of the *Partonopeus* model thus stresses his process of intertextual rewriting, facilitating the fusion of additional material into the representation of Melior.

The motif of a young heroine discovering love and suffering from her emotions was developed by Old French poets from the work of Ovid. The *Ars Amatoria* and the *Heroides* provided a lexis with which poets could describe the effects of love, and Medea’s monologue in the *Metamorphoses* (VII, vv. 11-71) was a source for the monologues of suffering lovers in the *romans d’antiquité*.³⁴ The poets of these texts transformed the works of Virgil, Statius and others by introducing a new emphasis on the motif of suffering from love, using ‘Ovidian vocabulary to describe the process of falling

³² Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 27.

³³ Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, p. 38.

³⁴ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. by Frank Justus Miller, 2 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1941), Vol. 1, pp. 342-43. For comments on the influence of Ovid, see: Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines*, pp. 125-50; Helen C. R. Laurie, ‘*Piramus et Tisbé*’, *The Modern Language Review*, 55 (1960), 24-32 (p. 25); Charles Muscatine, ‘The Emergence of Psychological Allegory in Old French Romance’, *PMLA*, 68 (1953), 1160-1182 (pp. 1169-72).

in love and the effects of love'.³⁵ Indeed, Frappier notes the presence of 'toute une sémiologie venue d'Ovide' in these texts that use an Ovidian 'description minutieuse des symptômes de l'amour-maladie' to stress the notion of love as an illness.³⁶ The most striking use of Ovidian discourse in the *romans d'antiquité* is found in the *Roman d'Eneas* (c. 1160), which presents an extended development of the theme of love in the poet's translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*.³⁷ The depiction of Dido, Lavine, and Eneas suffering from love demonstrates the poet manipulating 'all the tropes for private [...] love that the medieval school tradition was crafting out of its reading of Ovid'.³⁸ The monologues uttered by these figures emphasise the use of Ovidian material, as observed by Huchet: 'par la bouche de Lavinia et d'Enéas en proie à l'amour, Ovide parle'.³⁹ Ovidian love rhetoric became a key feature in French romance, and the treatment of this motif in the *romans d'antiquité* was further developed by poets such as Chrétien. In particular, the depiction of Soredamors and Alexandre in *Cligès* demonstrates rewriting of Ovidian material alongside the *Eneas*.⁴⁰ For example, Guyer suggests that the lovers in *Cligès* suffer 'exactly like Ovid's lovers', and Micha notes that the depiction of two sets of lovers

³⁵ Rosemarie Jones, *The Theme of Love in the 'Romans d'antiquité'* (London: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 1972), p. 66.

³⁶ Jean Frappier, 'La Peinture de la vie et des héros antiques dans la littérature française du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle', in *Histoire, mythes et symboles: Etudes de littérature française* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1976), pp. 21-54 (p. 29). See also Petit, pp. 388-92.

³⁷ See comments in: Dominique Boutet, *Formes littéraires et conscience historique aux origines de la littérature française (1100-1250)* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999), pp. 116-17; Cormier, *One Heart One Mind*; Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines*, pp. 126-50; Simon Gaunt, 'From Epic to Romance: Gender and Sexuality in the *Roman d'Eneas*', *Romanic Review*, 83 (1992), 1-27 (p. 8); Helen C. R. Laurie, 'Eneas and the Doctrine of Courtly Love', *The Modern Language Review*, 64 (1969), 283-94 (p. 283).

³⁸ Christopher Baswell, 'Marvels of Translation and Crises of Transition in the Romances of Antiquity', in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Krueger, pp. 29-44 (p. 39).

³⁹ Huchet, *Le Roman médiéval*, p. 153. See also: Cormier, pp. 204-16; Omer Jodogne, 'Le Caractère des œuvres "antiques" dans la littérature française du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle', in *L'Humanisme médiéval dans les littératures romances du XII^e au XIV^e siècle*, ed. by Anthime Fourrier (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1964), pp. 55-86 (p. 77-79); and Vinaver, *The Rise of Romance*, pp. 23-24.

⁴⁰ Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, 'Chrétien de Troyes as a Reader of the *Romans Antiques*', *Philological Quarterly*, 64 (1985), 398-405 (p. 398); Laurence Harf-Lancner, 'Introduction', in Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès*, ed. and trans. by Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006), pp. 9-52 (pp. 24-25).

(Alexandre and Soredamors, Cligès and Fénice) mirrors the structure of the *Eneas* (Dido and Eneas, Lavine and Eneas).⁴¹

The *Guillaume* poet drew upon the tradition of Ovidian-inspired representations of love in his depiction of Melior discovering her feeling for Guillaume. The physical symptoms of love Melior displays allude to the Ovidian topos of love as an illness:

Ensi lonc tans tel vie maine,
Ensi souffri ses cors grant paine;
Le boire pert et le mangier;
A jeüner et a veillier
Est atornee la pucele.
La color pert de la maissele
Qu'ele avoit tant vermeille et gente. (vv. 971-77)

The poet lists Melior's symptoms in an arbitrary manner that highlights the topos he is manipulating. However, other passages present particular examples of this motif found in the *Roman d'Eneas*, in which Dido suffers from her love for Eneas:

ele se pasmë et s'estent,
sofle, sospirë et baaille,
molt se demeinë et travaille,
tremble, fremist et si tressalt
li cuers li ment et se li falt (vv. 1230-34)⁴²

In *Guillaume*, the poet signals the *Eneas* as Melior lists her symptoms, echoing the woes of her intertextual counterpart:

'Diex, quex maus est dont tant me duel,
Qui si me fait estendillier
Et souspirer et baillier
Et refroidier et reschaufer,
Muer color et tressuer
Et trambler tot en itel guise,
Comme si fievre m'estoit prise?' (vv. 838-42)

The position of 'souspirer' and 'baillier' on the same line alludes to Dido's speech, suggesting that the poet is rewriting both a topos and an individual example of this motif.

⁴¹ Guyer, p. 137; Alexandre Micha, 'Eneas et Cligès', in *Mélanges de philologie romance et de littérature médiévale offerts à Ernest Hoepffner* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949), pp. 237-43 (pp. 239-40).

⁴² *Le Roman d'Eneas: Texte Critique*, ed. by Jacques Salverda de Grave (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1891).

Melior expresses her emotions in a monologue that aligns with the Ovidian love motif (vv. 829-907; vv. 909-49). Ferlampin-Acher notes the reference to the topos of love as an illness, stating that ‘l’évocation des souffrances et des symptômes, d’inspiration ovidienne et reprise par les premiers romans, est ici traditionnelle’.⁴³ However, certain elements of Melior’s monologue also indicate rewriting of specific intertexts, and Micha observes that the depiction of Melior discovering her feelings ‘s’inspire étroitement du *Cligès* et de l’*Eneas*: mêmes plaintes alternées et symétriques, mêmes interrogations à volte-face, mêmes symptômes physiques, mêmes hésitations à passer à l’aveu’.⁴⁴ Although Melior’s monologue is shorter than those of Lavine and Soredamors, particular details signal these intertexts.⁴⁵ For example, Melior states that she is ‘fole et niche’ (v. 882), signalling Lavine in the *Eneas*, who twice reproaches herself for being ‘fole’ (v. 8134; v. 8279), and Soredamors in *Cligès*, who calls herself ‘fole’ on two occasions (v. 511; v. 515).⁴⁶ Yet more intertextual manipulation is found at the start of Melior’s monologue, which opens with a direct complaint to her suffering heart:

[...] ‘Cuers, que as tu?
 Qu’as tu esgardé ne veü?
 Que t’ont mi oel monstre ne fait,
 Qui m’as embatue en cest plait’ (vv. 829-32)

As Melior continues, she states that her eyes that are to blame for her suffering:

‘Dont ai je tort qui en blasmoie
 Mon cuer de rien, ce m’est avis.
 Cui dont ? Mes iex, qui l’i ont mis
 En cele voie, et mené la’ (vv. 862-65)

These comments can be aligned with passages in both *Eneas* and *Cligès*, in which Lavine and Soredamors chastise their eyes and heart.⁴⁷

⁴³ *Guillaume de Palerne* trans. by Ferlampin-Acher, p. 133, note 1.

⁴⁴ Micha, ‘Introduction’, p. 27.

⁴⁵ Lavine has six monologues, totalling 537 verses (vv. 8083-8334; vv. 8343-80; vv. 8426-44; vv. 8676-8775; vv. 9130-88; vv. 9846-9914). Soredamors has two monologues, totalling 199 verses (vv. 475-523; vv. 897-1046)

⁴⁶ Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès*, ed. and trans. by Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Champion, 2006).

⁴⁷ Micha states that Soredamors’s monologue is inspired by Lavine’s monologue in the *Eneas*. Micha ‘*Eneas et Cligès*’, pp. 242-43.

However, the depiction of Melior suffering most strongly indicates rewriting of *Cligès*, as observed by Lot-Borodine.⁴⁸ In *Cligès*, Soredamors begins her monologue by cursing her eyes for having ever seen Alexandre, accusing them of ‘traïson’ against her heart (vv. 474-77). The *Guillaume* poet takes up this notion, inserting more allusions to Soredamors when Melior realises that her eyes are not guilty because they are controlled by another power: “‘Et s’ ai je tort qui d’iaus me plaign. / Por coi? por ce: coupes n’i ont.”” (vv. 868-69). Soredamors similarly questions the guilt of her eyes: “‘Quex corpes et quel tort ont il? / Doi les an ge blasmer? – Nenil!”” (vv. 503-04). This statement is alluded to by the *Guillaume* poet, who further manipulates Chrétien’s romance by showing Melior questioning the authority she holds over her heart and eyes. In *Cligès*, Soredamors ‘assumes responsibility for herself’ and ‘reaffirms her sovereignty’.⁴⁹ She states that she still controls her eyes (vv. 481-505), even though they act in the interests of her heart (vv. 481-502). In *Guillaume*, Melior also questions the guilt of her eyes for causing her suffering. Melior asks whether she is in charge of her heart that controls them: “‘N’ ai je mon cuer en ma baillie?”” (v. 885). Melior echoes Soredamors’s questions regarding whether she has her eyes in her ‘baillie’ (v. 481), yet the *Guillaume* poet transforms Chrétien’s text and Soredamors’s insistence upon her authority over her actions (v. 505). In contrast, Melior realises that she is powerless to control her heart: “‘Sont il a lui? Oil, por voir, / Et font du tot a son voloir”” (vv. 871-72) (emphasis mine). The *Guillaume* poet rewrites Soredamors’s naivety in his depiction of Melior swiftly dismissing the idea that she exercises control over her heart (v. 890), signalling and manipulating both a general topos of love-sick heroine and a specific intertextual allusion to *Cligès* within his portrayal of Melior.

⁴⁸ Lot-Borodine, *Le Roman idyllique*, pp. 246-7.

⁴⁹ Peter Haidu, *Aesthetic Distance in Chrétien de Troyes: Irony and Comedy in ‘Cligès’ and ‘Perceval’* (Geneva: Droz, 1968), pp. 73-74. See also Joan Tasker Grimbert, ‘On Fenice’s Vain Attempts to Revise a Romantic Archetype and Chrétien’s Fabled Hostility to the Tristan Legend’, in *Reassessing the Heroine in Medieval French Literature*, ed. by Kathy M. Krause (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2001), pp. 87-106 (p. 91).

The representation of Melior experiencing the first pangs of love rewrites another individual intertext that aligns with the Ovidian motif of suffering heroine. The anonymous Old French *Narcisus et Dané*, a *lai* of 1006 verses composed c. 1160-1165, rewrites the tale of Narcissus from book II of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.⁵⁰ This text draws upon the topos of suffering young lovers developed in the *Roman d'Eneas* and the other *romans d'antiquité* alongside which it is most often studied.⁵¹ The anonymous *Narcisus* poet transforms Ovid's work by replacing the nymph Echo with the impetuous princess Dané.⁵² Dané externalises her feelings for Narcissus in three monologues totalling 152 verses (vv. 182-98; vv. 221-92; vv. 329-92) that explore the topos of love and suffering. The depiction of Dané's painful experience of love provides another example of the Ovidian model manipulated by the *Guillaume* poet in his representation of Melior's discovery of her amorous sentiments. Although Vuagnoux-Uhlig states that nothing indicates that the *Guillaume* poet was directly inspired by *Narcisus et Dané*, close comparison between Melior and the *Narcisus* heroine suggests otherwise.⁵³

Dané is 'la fille au roi de la cité' (v. 127), and her status as a young noble is mirrored in Melior's position as Emperor Nathaniel's daughter. Similarly, she is similar in age and beauty to Narcissus (vv. 342-46), a detail echoed in the closeness the *Guillaume* poet observes between Guillaume and Melior (vv. 653-53). However, the clearest intertextual parallel between Melior and Dané is found in Melior's monologues. In

⁵⁰ *Narcisus et Dané*, ed. and trans. by Penny Eley (Liverpool: Liverpool Online Series Critical Editions of French Texts, 2002). In line with Eley's work, the title 'Narcisus et Dané' shall be used throughout this study, rather than 'Le lai de Narcisse', preferred by other scholars. Penny Eley, 'Introduction', in *Narcisus et Dané*, pp. 7-30 (pp. 11-13); and Petit, pp. 10-11.

⁵¹ Eley notes the evidence given by scholars to demonstrate rewriting of the *Eneas* in *Narcisus et Dané*. Eley, 'Introduction', p. 11. Baumgartner states that the work forms part of the corpus of *romans d'antiquité*. Emmanuèle Baumgartner, *Le Récit médiéval: XII^e-XIII^e siècles* (Paris: Hachette, 1995), p. 20.

⁵² For comments on the poet's rewriting of Ovid's text, see the following: Eley, 'Introduction', p. 15; Albert Gier, 'L'Amour, les monologues: le *Lai de Narcisse*', in *Conjunctures: Medieval Studies in Honor of Douglas Kelly*, ed. by Keith Busby and Norris J. Lacy (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994), pp. 129-37; Miranda Griffin, "'Dont me revient ceste parole?'" Echo, Voice and Citation in *Le Lai de Narcisse* and *Cristal et Clarie*', *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 22 (2011), 59-74 (pp. 63-64); Françoise Jappé, 'Adaptation et création dans le conte de *Narcisse*', *Bien dire et bien apprendre*, 14 (1996), 155-67 (p. 155); and Vuagnoux-Uhlig, pp. 110-16.

⁵³ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 172.

Narcisus, Dané externalises her emotions for Narcisus in a series of extended monologues, and the resulting questions and answers are signalled and manipulated in *Guillaume*. In particular, the depiction of Melior alludes to Dané’s debate regarding whether or not to tell Narcisus about her love for him (vv. 352-92), as Melior asks herself “‘Mais je ne sai comment le sache / Li damoisiax. Qui li dira?’” (vv. 932-33). Similar thoughts are expressed by Lavine and Soredamors, who both debate the reaction that a declaration of their love would cause (*Eneas*, vv. 8362-80; vv. 8712-75; *Cligès*, vv. 992-1046).⁵⁴ In *Guillaume*, Melior decides not to tell Guillaume about her love, stating that “‘Ja voir par moi ne le savra’” (v. 934). This decision contrasts with Dané, who resolves to personally declare her love: “‘Assés est mius que je li die’” (v. 355). In fact, the *Guillaume* poet aligns Melior with Lavine and Soredamors, who ‘refrain from declaring their love’ because this behaviour is not ‘proper’.⁵⁵ However, Melior’s decision nevertheless acts as an intertextual signal to *Narcisus*, not through similarity with the *lai*, but rather through the poet’s transformation of this intertext.

In *Narcisus*, Dané’s monologues suggest that the girl has a split personality. Like the monologues of figures such as Medea in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and Lavine in *Eneas* that portray ‘un débat dialogué amour-raison’, as Dané argues with herself in the first and second person: “‘Qu’es ce, Dané, que tu redis?’” (v. 375).⁵⁶ However, the *Narcisus* poet exaggerates the portrayal of Dané’s mental conflict to such an extent that the girl’s internal debate almost splits her in two, contrasting ‘good’ Dané with ‘bad’ Dané: “‘Dont te vient or ceste parole? / Orains fus sage, or es fole!’” (vv. 261-62) (emphasis mine). ‘Fole’ and ‘sage’ are apt antonymic markers for the conflicting characters Dané embodies. ‘Sage’ Dané is rational, showing an awareness of both moral and social codes of conduct

⁵⁴ Micha notes the links between Soredamors’s and Lavine’s monologues on this matter. Micha, ‘*Eneas et Cligès*’, p. 242.

⁵⁵ Krueger and Burns, pp. 208-09. Lavine sends a written message rather than speaking to Eneas in person (vv. 8769-8840), and Soredamors concludes that if Alexandre loves her he will become aware of her feelings (vv. 1016-20; vv. 1042-46).

⁵⁶ A. M. Cadot, ‘Du récit mythique au roman: étude sur *Piramus et Tisbé*’, *Romania*, 97 (1976), 433-61 (p. 455). See also Cormier, pp. 206-07; Eley, ‘Introduction’, pp. 16-17; Jodogne, pp. 77-78.

by reprimanding herself for thinking about choosing a husband without her father's consent (vv. 254-56). In contrast, 'fole' Dané acts upon an 'excès du désir féminin' and dominates, as Dané's decision to tell Narcisus of her love is made by this side of her character.⁵⁷ Indeed, Vuagnoux-Uhlig comments that the *lai* creates 'une vision très négative' of a heroine, 'liée aux pulsions incontrôlables d'un éros mortifère'.⁵⁸

In *Guillaume*, Melior's monologue alludes to Dané's decision to confess her love to Narcisus and to the suggestion of the *Narcisus* heroine's split personality. The poet contrasts Melior's resolution to hide her feelings with Dané's brazen declaration of love, yet he also alludes to the scene in which Dané's confession takes place. As Melior explains her decision, the *Narcisus* poet's depiction of the eponymous hero's rejection of Dané is manipulated. When Dané declares her love, Narcisus criticises her behaviour:

'Par Diu, pucele, mout es *fole*
Quant onques en *meüs parole*,
Et male cose as mout enprise
[...] Ce tien je mout a grant *folie*' (vv. 485-92) (my italics)

Narcisus emphasises the folly of Dané's actions, and Dané appears to be guided by the 'bad' side of her character. The *Guillaume* poet signals Dané's foolishness in Melior's monologue, and her justification of her decision not to tell Guillaume of her love acts as a commentary on Dané's behaviour and Narcisus's reaction:

'Et se ce est par aventure
Que fuisse oïe *sans mesure*,
Et si *outrageuse* et si *fole*
Que j'en *meüssse* a lui *parole*
Si ne sai je que dire doie.
Se je di que malade soi
Et le mal qui tenir me seut
Et comment me tient et me deut
A *mal* ira, si com je croi:
'Damoisele, ce poise moi'
Que me responderoit il al?' (vv. 935-40) (emphasis mine)

Melior states that she would be foolish to speak to Guillaume, echoing Narcisus's comments on the folly of Dané's actions through a close repetition of elements of his

⁵⁷ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 132.

⁵⁸ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 132.

speech (compare *Narcissus*, v. 485-86 with *Guillaume*, vv. 937-38). Melior's imagined dialogue with Guillaume provides a brief summary of the exchange between Narcissus and Dané. She notes that if, like Dané, she were to say that she was ill (vv. 475-80), Guillaume would respond without sympathy and understanding, just like Narcissus. Her monologue highlights transformation of *Narcissus*, as elements of this intertextual figure are split and redistributed into *Guillaume*.

Melior's actions align her with the voice of 'good' Dané in the *Narcissus* heroine's monologues, rewriting the intertextual model and suggesting knowledge of and critical distance from the actions of 'bad' Dané. However, the *Guillaume* poet also builds on the perceived division in the figure of Dané to create two distinct Meliors that rewrite the contrasting sides of Dané's psyche. Alongside 'real' Melior the poet inserts a second Melior who appears in a dream to Guillaume and causes him to fall in love with her (vv. 1122-28). The actions of 'dream' Melior mirror those of 'bad' Dané, and there is a particular intertextual allusion to the scene in which Dané approaches Narcissus and declares her love for him (vv. 447-534). Dané pronounces an emotional speech to Narcissus, begging for his love:

'Des ore mais est il bien drois
Que tu aies de moi *merci*.
[...] Car en toi pent tote ma vie.
Tu seus me peus santé doner' (vv. 464-77) (my emphasis)

Dané stresses that she will die without Narcissus's love, asking for his mercy to save her from certain death. This sentiment is echoed in the speech of 'dream' Melior:

'Je sui la bele Meliors
Qui *merci* te requier et prie
Que tu de moi faces t'amie [...]
Car autrement sans lonc respit
Morrai, que vivre ne porroie,
Se n'ai t'amor et tu la moie' (vv. 1136-44) (my emphasis)

Like Dané, 'dream' Melior begs for mercy and beseeches her beloved to save her life by granting her his love, stressing an allusion to Dané's speech. This figure is aligned with

the actions of 'bad' Dané, indicating the division of this figure into two separate characters in *Guillaume*.

Rewriting of *Narcissus* is demonstrated once again in the actions of 'dream' Melior. Although this figure is aligned with 'bad' Dané, her behaviour rewrites the actions of this intertextual model, who appears before Narcissus and immediately kisses him (v. 454) before declaring her love (vv. 457-82). Dané refuses to acknowledge Narcissus's rejection, crying and throwing off her mantle to reveal her half-naked beauty (vv. 509-10). More tears and imploration follow, and the poet emphasises the image of the inconsolable heroine: 'L'iaue li ciet aval la face' (v. 515). The *Guillaume* poet transforms this scene, rewriting Dané's actions as 'dream' Melior appears before Guillaume already in tears (vv. 1130-31), and, unlike Dané, does not approach Guillaume physically before addressing him. It is only after she has declared her love that she kisses him (vv. 1145-46), and he returns rather than rejects her embrace (v. 1147). Dané's actions are rewritten in reverse order, showing transformative rewriting of *Narcissus*. This rewriting is further stressed by the positive denouement of 'dream' Melior's actions, which result in Guillaume embracing this imaginary figure (vv. 1153-64). What is more, the transformation of Dané's actions and the creation of 'dream' Melior signal the notion of doubling in *Guillaume*. The poet develops the division within Dané's psyche into two individual figures that not only double the intertextual models of 'good' and 'bad' Dané, but which also correspond with one another, indicating use of Melior to signal transformation, doubling, and correspondence.

The depiction of Melior in *Guillaume* highlights the poet's compositional approach. Intertextual models signalled by Melior's name and actions are transformed and fused together, and the text above all manipulates the association between Melior and the heroine of *Partonopeus*, frustrating expectations for the *Guillaume* heroine to be a carbon copy of her intertextual model. This rewriting is stressed through the image of Melior as a

passive figure who does not trigger narrative change, presenting a stark contrast with the dominant and powerful *Partonopeus Melior*. As the *Guillaume* heroine is distanced from her namesake, the poet stresses his amalgamation of divergent literary models in her intertextual make-up, fusing elements of Chrétien's *Enide* with the Ovidian-inspired Lavine, Soredamors, and Dané. Yet more models are alluded to in the depiction of Melior, as her engagement to the Greek prince, Guillaume's uncle, mirrors the situation of Fénice and Iseut.⁵⁹

Melior is an avatar of intertextual transformation and is not a direct reproduction of any individual model her presence alludes to, but rather is a combination and transformation of them all. However, although Melior is the heroine of *Guillaume*, her influence on the narrative is minimal, and the transformation triggered by her presence is limited to the intertextual sphere of the romance. Yet the representation of key women in *Guillaume* is not only used to emphasise transformation of intertextual material. Indeed, other key female figures suggest that the self-reflexive nature of the romance is highlighted through the reflection of intertextual transformation, as signalled by female figures, with the depiction of women transforming the course of the narrative. This chapter will now turn to analysis of the first of these transformative women, Queen Felise.

Queen Felise

One female figure used to simultaneously transform the narrative and intertextual material is Queen Felise. Like Melior, Felise's name, actions, and the role she plays in the narrative allude to intertextual models that are rewritten and fused together. Felise is introduced into the narrative in the opening scene of *Guillaume* in which the eponymous hero is kidnapped by the wolf. The poet emphasises in particular Felise's role as Guillaume's mother, and the depiction of her reaction to his abduction aligns her with other mothers in twelfth-century texts. These allusions are stressed by a long monologue

⁵⁹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 105; Vuagnoux-Uhlig, pp. 178-79.

in which Felise laments her son's disappearance (vv. 129-58). This speech signals the model of grief-stricken mother, who critics have observed are often moved to 'exprimer leur émotivité' and whose discourse is triggered by 'le deuil, l'affliction, la perte' in texts contemporary to *Guillaume*.⁶⁰ The poet presents individual allusions to different monologues from two of the *romans d'antiquité*, the monologue of Pallas's mother in the *Roman d'Eneas* (vv. 6317-70), and the monologue of the Queen of Ligurge in the *Roman de Thèbes* (vv. 2547-52).⁶¹ In *Eneas*, Pallas's mother mourns the loss of her son after he is killed in battle by Turnus. Her monologue emphasises the 'intensité de l'amour maternel', a function that is fulfilled by Felise's monologue in *Guillaume*.⁶² Pallas's mother expresses anger at the warriors in whose service her son was killed (v. 6345), and stresses her despair at his death:

'Filz, fait vos ont malvaise aïe,
molt vos ont poi guardé la vie.
Lasse, je n'avrai mais confort
de ma tristor jusqu'a la mort;
tote menrai ma vie en duel,
la morz me prendreit ja mon vuel.' (vv. 6365-70)

This mother laments the meaningless nature of life without her son, focusing on the guilt of those responsible for his demise. Similar sentiments are expressed in Felise's monologue, signalling intertextual links with *Eneas*. Felise emphasises the wolf's culpability in taking Guillaume from her, and her wish for death now she has lost her son: 'Qui cuidast que beste ne leus / Vos devorast? Dix, quel eür! / Lasse, por coi vif tant ne dur?' (vv. 132-34).

Other elements also signal a sorrowful mother's monologue in the *Roman de Thèbes*. In this romance, the Queen of Ligurge mourns the loss of her infant son in a six-

⁶⁰ Danièle James-Raoul, 'Les Discours des mères aperçus dans les romans et lais du XII^e et XIII^e siècles' in *La Mère au Moyen Age*, ed. by Aimé Petit (Lille: Université Charles de Gaulle, 1998), pp. 145-57 (p. 145); Danielle Régnier-Bohler, 'La Fonction symbolique du féminin: Le savoir des mères, le secret des sœurs et le devenir des héros', in *Arthurian Romance and Gender: Selected Proceedings of the XVIIth International Arthurian Congress*, ed. by Friedrich Wolfzettel (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995), pp. 4-25 (p. 7).

⁶¹ *Le Roman de Thèbes*, ed. by Guy Raynaud de Lage, 2 vols (Paris: Champion, 1966).

⁶² James-Raoul, pp. 149-50.

line monologue (vv. 2547-52). This mother addresses her son directly and highlights his beauty by referring to his ‘tendre bouche’ (v. 2547). The *Guillaume* poet aligns Felise’s monologue with this passage from *Thèbes*, as Felise addresses Guillaume directly, and makes reference to his ‘tendre bouche’: “‘Fix, dous amis, fait la roïne, / Tendre bouche, coulor rosine”” (vv. 129-30). However, Felise’s monologue is an exaggerated rewriting of its intertextual model. The *Thèbes* monologue is extended to five times its original length, incorporating self-reflexive questions and hyperbolic exclamations (vv. 132-34; v. 140), and even an elegiac description of Guillaume (vv. 135-39; vv. 141-47).

The initial depiction of Felise highlights links with intertextual models of mothers who suffer the loss of a child, indicating the transformation of these works. As the romance develops, the poet also stresses the image of Felise as a widow who must protect her second child, Florence, and defend her late husband’s kingdom from a Spanish invasion (vv. 4415-4539). The image of a widowed mother is not uncommon in Old French texts, and Berkvam notes that ‘de nombreuses femmes se trouvent provisoirement ou définitivement sans mari [...] à la tête d’un grand héritage ou de vastes domaines’.⁶³ Felise’s situation is illustrative of the role and actions of widowed mothers who must strive to protect their children. Indeed, Berkvam observes that ‘les veuves vertueuses des chansons et romans [...] protègent leurs enfants: la reine Félise déclare la guerre au roi d’Espagne parce qu’il voulait obtenir de force la main de Florence’.⁶⁴ Although the portrayal of Felise as a widowed mother protecting her one remaining child may be seen to be a role played by several female figures, this image in *Guillaume* alludes most strongly to the mother figure in Chrétien’s *Perceval*.⁶⁵

In *Perceval*, Chrétien emphasises the tie between mother and son by introducing the eponymous hero as ‘li fils a la veve dame’ (v. 74). Perceval is defined by his

⁶³ Doris Desclais Berkvam, *Enfance et maternité dans la littérature française des XII^e et XIII^e siècles* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1981), pp. 97-98.

⁶⁴ Berkvam, p. 98.

⁶⁵ Chrétien de Troyes, *Perceval, ou le Conte du Graal*, ed. and trans. by Jean Dufournet (Paris: GF Flammarion, 1997).

relationship with his mother, and his choice to leave her behind and forge his own chivalric identity causes her such grief that she dies from her sorrow (vv. 620-25; vv. 3582-3619).⁶⁶ In *Guillaume*, Felise's monologue after the kidnapping of Guillaume reflects the strong link between mother and son and the grief caused when this is severed in *Perceval*, signalling this text to the audience. However, the *Guillaume* poet rewrites the figure of Perceval's mother, fragmenting this intertextual model into different elements of his work. In Chrétien's romance, the dominant image of Perceval's mother is as an overprotective parent who will do all she can to shelter her child.⁶⁷ This notion is evoked in *Guillaume* not in relation to Felise's relationship with her son, but rather in her actions defending her daughter from the advances of the Spanish King and his son, as she is willing to give up everything except Florence (vv. 4428-32; vv. 4478-84). The actions of Perceval's mother are split into two separate elements of the portrayal of Felise, who displays grief at separation in relation to the kidnapping of Guillaume, and later shows her protective behaviour towards her daughter.

However, the *Guillaume* poet also rewrites another aspect of Perceval's mother's desire to protect her son. In *Perceval* the hero's mother uses her position of authority to (mis)educate and influence her child, attempting to keep him ignorant of 'any knowledge of knights and war' that had led to the death of her husband and Perceval's two older brothers (vv. 455-88), and presenting 'an aggressive and radical rejection of knighthood itself' in her instruction of Perceval.⁶⁸ As the widow and daughter of celebrated knights (vv. 416-31) Perceval's mother is seen to have 'failli complètement à son devoir

⁶⁶ Carine Bouillot, 'Existe-t-il une isotopie de l'enfance chez Chrétien de Troyes?', in *Enfances Arthuriennes*, ed. by Denis Hüe and Christine Ferlampin-Acher (Orléans: Paradigme, 2006), pp. 145-160 (p. 150); Ana-Maria Holzbacher, 'La Mère dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes', in *La mère au Moyen Age*, pp. 159-69 (pp. 166-67); Jean-Charles Payen, 'Figures féminines dans le roman médiéval français', in *Entretiens sur la Renaissance du 12^e siècle*, ed. by Maurice de Gandillac and Edouard Jeuneau (Paris: Mouton, 1968), pp. 407-28 (p. 422).

⁶⁷ Penny Schine Gold, *The Lady & the Virgin: Image, Attitude, and Experience in Twelfth-Century France* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 31

⁶⁸ Schine Gold, p. 31; Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, 'Rewriting Chrétien's *Conte du graal* – Mothers and Sons: Questions, Contradictions, and Connections', in *The Medieval 'Opus'*, ed. by Kelly, pp. 213-44 (p. 217).

d'éducatrice' by sheltering her son from knowledge of his chivalric heritage.⁶⁹ Thanks to his mother's influence, Perceval is unaware of chivalric codes of conduct, and she is 'responsable de la naïveté de son fils'.⁷⁰ When Perceval leaves his mother to become a knight, her parting speech (vv. 510-94) provides further counsel that causes numerous incidents for the eponymous hero (for example, vv. 635-733). This advice is alluded to by the *Guillaume* poet, yet it is not offered to Guillaume by Queen Felise. Instead, it is Guillaume's adopted father, the 'vachier', who counsels the eponymous hero when he joins the Emperor of Rome's household (vv. 544-81). Parallels are established between the 'enseignements parentaux' given by the 'vachier' and Perceval's mother, as both figures attempt to shape the future of their departing children with instruction on how they should behave.⁷¹ However, the *Guillaume* poet highlights his redistribution and transformation of this intertext. This speech occurs between father and son, and Guillaume is the adopted child of the 'vachier', reconfiguring the image of Perceval and his mother that is signalled at the start of the romance in Felise's actions. Although Felise alludes to the figure of Perceval's mother, she is not a faithful recreation of this intertextual model, and the poet splits elements of this material and divides them up into different parts of his romance.

The *Guillaume* poet not only depicts Felise as the mother of the eponymous hero, he also insists upon her role as the Queen of Sicily, alluding to and manipulating additional intertextual models. For example, in suggesting an intertextual link between Melior and Enide from *Erec et Enide*, the poet indicates a parallel between Felise and Guinevere from Chrétien's text. Felise is likened to Guinevere by her status as Queen and

⁶⁹ Marie-Noëlle Lefay-Toury, 'Roman breton et mythes courtois: L'évolution du personnage féminin dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes (suite et fin)', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 15 (1972), 283-93 (p. 283). For a contrasting interpretation of the influence of Perceval's mother, see Debora B. Schwartz, "'A la guise de Gales l'atorna": Maternal Influence in Chrétien's *Conte du Graal*', *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 12 (1995).
<<http://www.illinoismedieval.org/ems/VOL12/schwartz.html>> [accessed 13 May 2014].

⁷⁰ Marie-Noëlle Lefay-Toury, 'Roman breton et mythes courtois: L'évolution du personnage féminin dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes (à suivre)', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 15 (1972), 193-204 (p. 200).

⁷¹ *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Ferlampin-Acher, pp. 126-27, note 2.

through her actions welcoming Melior and providing her with fine clothing (*Guillaume*, vv. 5354-76; *Erec*, vv. 1578-1675). However, the depiction of Felise transforms the figure of Guinevere. Aside from donating clothing to Enide, Guinevere plays a subsidiary role in *Erec*, particularly in comparison to Enide. Although Guinevere is seen as ‘Erec’s lady’ in the opening sections of *Erec* and provides a motive for the hero’s chivalric deeds, ‘Enide replaces the Queen as the inspiration of Erec’s valour’.⁷² In *Guillaume*, the allusion to an intertextual relationship between Felise and Guinevere establishes an expectation for Felise to follow the model of Arthur’s Queen and take a similarly secondary role in *Guillaume*. However, the situation is quite the opposite. The *Guillaume* poet alters the balance of influence over the narrative accorded to the Queen and the young woman in *Erec*, inverting the roles so that it is Melior rather than Felise who is overshadowed in the scenes that follow.

Felise is depicted as a powerful woman in the latter sections of *Guillaume*, and her presence eclipses that of the heroine, who appears to fade into the background of the romance. Unlike Guinevere in *Erec*, Felise takes a prominent place in the text, and her voice dominates the narrative, indicating her possession of power with which she can influence and transform the events of the romance. From the start of her meeting with the lovers in the ‘vergier’ (v. 5203) to the end of the romance (v. 9664), Felise has more verses of direct speech than any other female character. Felise has 269 lines of direct speech (6.03% of the remaining verses), compared to Melior’s 7 lines (0.16%) and Alixandrine’s 9 lines in the same section (0.20%), and the dominance of her voice accompanies the silencing of Melior.⁷³ The poet emphasises the importance of Felise’s voice and her role in the latter part of the narrative, as she has only 74.5 fewer verses of direct speech than Guillaume, even though he delivers rallying speeches to his men during

⁷² Noble, ‘The Character of Guinevere’, pp. 524-28.

⁷³ Queen Brande has 91 verses of direct speech (2.04%), and Florence has 5 verses (0.11%). If the calculations are applied from the moment at which Felise’s voice is heard again after the opening scene (v. 4465), she has 350 verses of direct speech (6.73%), only slightly less than Guillaume’s 367 lines in the same section (7.06%) and Melior’s 22.5 verses (0.43%).

the battle scenes that take place in Palermo (vv. 5588-5619; vv. 5633-53). The vocal and physical dominance of Felise during the Palermo section of *Guillaume* is linked to her role in this setting, as she is the widowed queen who must protect her besieged city and her threatened daughter.

The image of Felise ruling over the Kingdom of Sicily unaided after her husband's death signals intertextual parallels between Felise and *Partonopeus* Melior. Both women are the daughters of Emperors, as the *Guillaume* poet notes that Felise is 'fille a riche empeor / Qui de Gresse tenoit l'ounor' (v. 29-30). Felise takes on further elements of the model of *Partonopeus* Melior that the *Guillaume* poet discards in the depiction of his heroine. For example, the poet bestows the political authority of *Partonopeus* Melior onto Felise rather than his heroine. The passive part taken by *Guillaume* Melior contrasts with her *Partonopeus* namesake and with Felise, as the latter's role as sovereign instead aligns her with *Partonopeus* Melior. The intertextual link between Felise and *Partonopeus* Melior is stressed by the dominance of Felise's voice in the latter half of the narrative, and her position as Queen directing armed forces and making decisions about the future of her kingdom (vv. 4465-86; vv. 5022-59) mirrors the image of Melior as ruling Empress in *Partonopeus*.

The depiction of Felise in the latter part of *Guillaume* indicates intertextual rewriting of *Partonopeus* Melior, highlighting the division and fusion of this figure into different parts of the text. Although the name of the *Guillaume* heroine signals this intertextual model, the actions and representation of Felise align more closely with *Partonopeus* Melior. The *Guillaume* poet's portrayal of Melior and Felise emphasises his transformation of the intertextual models to which these women allude, as the names of both characters signal figures that are reconfigured in *Guillaume*. Melior invokes and transforms the *Partonopeus* heroine, and the name 'Felise' suggests a parallel with the

heroine of *Cligès* through a distortion of the name ‘Fénice’.⁷⁴ The situation of Felise as the daughter of the Greek Emperor indicates an allusion to and manipulation of the *Cligès* heroine, who is married to the Emperor of Greece. However, Felise’s position as widowed Queen contrasts starkly with Chrétien’s depiction of Fénice, who is trapped in a love triangle between her husband and his nephew. Indeed, Fénice’s situation is mirrored more closely in *Guillaume* by the position of Melior. When Melior is betrothed to her lover’s uncle, Laertenidon, Vuagnoux-Uhlig notes that ‘le texte renoue alors avec le scénario de *Cligès*, puisque Laertenidon est l’oncle du héros (mais maternel), quoique celui-ci l’ignore encore’.⁷⁵ Melior’s decision to flee Rome rather than marry against her will has also been recognised as an allusion to the intertextual relationship between the *Guillaume* and *Cligès* heroines, and yet more parallels are suggested in the scenes depicting Guillaume and Melior in the Palermo ‘vergièr’, as will be explored in the following chapter.⁷⁶

The *Guillaume* poet uses the names of Felise and Melior to signal intertextual models that are then transformed. Their names provide false leads for the expected characterisation of these figures, as Melior contrasts starkly with the *Partonopeus* heroine and Felise is not a copy of Fénice. The links between *Guillaume* Melior and Fénice on the one hand, and Felise and *Partonopeus* Melior on the other hand, suggest a chiasmus in the manipulation of the poet’s intertextual models. The poet splits and transforms different literary figures within the depiction of the key women in his romance, signalling inverted intertextual doubling through the criss-crossing of material redistributed in *Guillaume*.

Like the portrayal of Melior in *Guillaume*, the depiction of Felise highlights use of key female figures as catalysts of intertextual transformation, as material is signalled through Felise’s name, role, and actions. However, unlike Melior, whose influence on the plot is minimal, the representation of Felise also indicates that she triggers significant

⁷⁴ *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Ferlampin-Acher, p. 116 (note 2).

⁷⁵ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 172.

⁷⁶ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, pp. 105-06. See comments in Chapter Two, pp. 155-62.

changes within the narrative, and that she is central to the happy denouement of the romance. Felise's political power and influence is stressed at the start of the romance. Felise is the wife of King Embron and the daughter of the Emperor of Greece, and is described as 'Gentil dame de franche orine' (v. 28). As a Queen, her marriage gives her 'more power and influence than ordinary women'.⁷⁷ However, after an absence of over 4000 lines, the influence held by Felise is increased in the latter half of the text when she holds political command unaided over the kingdom of Sicily. The poet insists upon the image of Felise as powerful, particularly in her refusal to give up Florence to the King of Spain. Felise addresses her barons with confidence and authority (vv. 4465-86), settling unrest amongst them:

La roïne oi le content;
Drecie s'est el pavement.
Gent ot le cors et le visage,
Bien sot parler, car molt fu sage;
Les barons a a raison mis (vv. 5017-21)

This passage stresses Felise's positive qualities, and she is presented as wise, with an ability to calm her barons and gain authority over them. The poet indicates Felise's power to control and alter the course of the narrative through her political influence as ruling sovereign.

Felise's actions also trigger events that change the course of the narrative. When Guillaume and Melior take refuge in the 'vergier' in Palermo, they are observed by Felise (vv. 4945-61). Her advisor identifies the couple and tells her that the young man she sees will be able to save her kingdom from the Spanish invasion (vv. 5111-54), and Felise thus decides to go to the 'vergier' to implore Guillaume's assistance, donning a deerskin and approaching the lovers (vv. 5159-5209). This action marks a turning point in the narrative, as the couple accept Felise's proposal and leave the 'vergier' with her (vv. 5330-31), ending their time as fugitives disguised in animal skins.

⁷⁷ Pratt, 'The Image of the Queen in Old French Literature', p. 236.

When the lovers are inside the Palermo palace, Felise's role initiating this important transformation is emphasised. The couple remove their skins and are given a bath and new clothing, and a moment of rebirth is suggested in their transition from quasi-animal to human form. The poet stresses Felise's actions that trigger this metamorphosis:

La ot commandé la roïne
Apareillier .II. riches bains.
Ele meïsme premerains
Est fors de sa pel descousue
Et as jovenciaus est venue.
Ele meïsme a .I. coutel
A chascun mis fors de sa pel,
[...] Tost furent prest lor garniment
C'aporter lor fist la roïne (vv. 5332-55)

The repetition of 'ele meïsme' emphasises the part Felise plays in her physical transformation (vv. 5334-35) and that of the lovers (vv. 5336-38). It is Felise who gives orders for the couple's bath to be prepared, and she hands them their human clothing.

Felise's transformative influence is not limited to facilitating the couple's rebirth. The Queen takes on the duty of metamorphosing the lovers by cutting them out of their animal skins, freeing them from their hybrid form (vv. 5337-38). The image of Felise removing Guillaume and Melior from the skins places her in opposition to the two females who cause physical transformation in *Guillaume*, Brande and Alixandrine.⁷⁸ Ferlampin-Acher has observed that the polarity between Queen Felise and Queen Brande creates opposing positive and negative feminine models in *Guillaume*.⁷⁹ However, Ferlampin-Acher has not recognised the role that Felise plays in retransforming the lovers. The parallels established between Felise and Brande (and Alixandrine) highlight the notion of doubling in *Guillaume*, as female figures are depicted as reconfigured doubles of one another. The actions of Brande, Alixandrine, and Felise, who all transform other characters in the narrative, establish a connection and correspondence between these

⁷⁸ Alixandrine's role transforming the lovers will be discussed in the final section of this chapter.

⁷⁹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 52.

figures, emphasising the notion of intra-textual doubling alongside the intertextual rewriting that their presence signals.

As the romance moves towards its conclusion, the poet highlights the power Felise holds to transform the narrative, positioning her at the heart of the final transformation that resolves *Guillaume*. The happy denouement relies on the recognition of Guillaume as Felise's son and heir to the throne of Sicily, as it is only once this identity is bestowed upon him that Guillaume is able to legitimately marry Melior. Suggestions of this identity have already been made during Guillaume's time in Palermo, most notably by Felise. She tells Guillaume "Quant regardai vostre samblance, / De mon chier fil oi ramembrance" (vv. 6345-46), and the poet states that she believes that Guillaume is her son (vv. 6367-72).⁸⁰ Indeed, Ferlampin-Acher notes that 'la *samblance* de Guillaume a éveillé le souvenir, la *ramembrance* de sa mère, qui la première divine qui il est'.⁸¹ Although it is Alphonse who recognises Guillaume and declares that Guillaume is Felise's son (vv. 8095-8128), Guillaume's inheritance of the kingdom of Sicily is facilitated by Felise when she unquestioningly accepts him as her heir and obliges her barons and subjects to do the same (vv. 8129-32). Felise's political power is used to ensure the transformation of Guillaume from unknown knight to King of Sicily, and she thus plays 'un rôle déterminant dans l'accomplissement social des héros', all the while altering 'la destinée matrimoniale des amants'.⁸²

Vuagnoux-Uhlig argues that Felise is depicted as 'une figure résolument positive', in *Guillaume*.⁸³ This statement can be supported by the position Felise occupies in opposition to Brande, and by her role enabling the positive conclusion of the text. Felise's transformative influence on the narrative contrasts with the power wielded by Melior. The poet emphasises Felise's dominance over the heroine until the very end of the romance,

⁸⁰ Chapter four will present more detailed discussion of the recognition of mother and son in the Palermo episodes. See in particular, pp. 274-78.

⁸¹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 79. See also Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 180.

⁸² Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 173; p. 62.

⁸³ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 176.

and as a consequence ‘la relation de la mère et du fils occupe une position privilégiée dans la structure narrative’.⁸⁴ *Guillaume* does not focus on the relationship between Guillaume and Melior, but rather on the family ties between Guillaume and his mother. This alternative focus is signalled most clearly in the *Guillaume* epilogue:

Del roi Guillaume et de sa mere,
De ses enfans et de son genre,
De son empire et de son regne
Trait li estoires ci a fin. (v. 9650-53) (emphasis mine)

Felise usurps the place most often taken by the heroine, sharing ownership of the tale that has been told and obscuring Melior’s role. For example, in *Yvain*, Chrétien’s concluding verses refer to ‘mon seignor Yvain, le fin, / Et de s’amie chiere et fine’ (vv. 6813-14).⁸⁵ Similarly, in ms. D of the *Roman d’Eneas*, the poet comments on the happy ending of Lavine and Eneas’ story: ‘rois en fu et belle Lavine / sa cortoise monillier roine / et vesquirent en bonne pais’ (verse numbers not given).⁸⁶ In contrast with such epilogues that privilege the role played by the heroine, the final lines of *Guillaume* suggest that the text is not about Guillaume and Melior, but rather it is about Guillaume, his mother, and his lineage. *Guillaume* emphasises the importance of Felise in the narrative, and her role as a catalyst of narrative transformation. Felise eclipses Melior in the latter part of the text, and the portrayal of the Queen highlights fusion of elements taken from different intertextual models, including the model of *Partonopeus* Melior alluded to and rewritten in the depiction of the *Guillaume* heroine. Felise is seen as a double for intertextual models that are transformed in the romance, yet the role she plays in returning the lovers to their human form also suggests that she doubles other powerful women who trigger transformation in *Guillaume*, Brande and Alixandrine.

⁸⁴ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 173.

⁸⁵ Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain, ou le chevalier au lion*, ed. and trans. by Michel Rousse (Paris: Flammarion, 1990).

⁸⁶ ‘Appendice I’ in *Le Roman d’Eneas*, pp. 379-82 (p. 382). Similar sentiments are found in the main manuscript tradition (ms. A, vv. 10105-23).

The notion of Felise doubling internal and external models is developed by the poet in greater depth at the end of the romance, when he indicates an extra-textual parallel between the Queen and the *Guillaume* patroness.⁸⁷ This extra-textual relationship is established in the closing fifty-five lines of *Guillaume*, which first describe Felise as ‘bone dame ert et loiaus’ (v. 9623) before turning to the poet’s patron and asking that God protect ‘contesse Yolent, / La boine dame, la loial’ (vv. 9655-56). Both Felise and ‘Yolent’ are qualified as ‘bone dame’ and ‘loial’, signalling a relationship between these two figures. Vuagnoux-Uhlig has observed this parallel, noting that ‘on peut même se demander si [...] [Felise] ne se confond pas avec la comtesse Yolande’.⁸⁸ However, Vuagnoux-Uhlig does not develop her analysis of this extra-textual link, and fails to note the similarities between Felise’s political power in the narrative and the influence wielded by ‘Yolent’ over the poet. By aligning the figure of Felise, whose dominant role is stressed throughout the latter section of *Guillaume*, the poet underlines the importance of his patroness, giving ‘Yolent’ the same prominence in the extra-textual sphere of the romance that is accorded to Felise within the narrative.

The link established between Felise and the *Guillaume* patroness also indicates use of this figure to signal and manipulate more intertextual transformation, reconfiguring a motif used in *Partonopeus*. A dominant trait of the *Partonopeus* poet’s style is repeated allusions to a female figure that exists in the extra-textual sphere of his romance, as the narrator figure makes reference to his ‘amie’ in several narratorial interjections (vv. 1873-80; vv. 3415-38; vv. 4039-42; vv. 4529-34; vv. 6263-73). The fictional nature of this lady has been debated by critics, and scholars have questioned the possibility that this figure

⁸⁷ The identity of the *Guillaume* patroness is discussed in the Introduction to this thesis, pp. 15-16. See also Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, pp. 38-43; Fourrier, ‘La “Contesse Yolent” de *Guillaume de Palerne*’, pp. 115-23; and Micha, ‘Introduction’, p. 23.

⁸⁸ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 175.

may also be the patroness of *Partonopeus*.⁸⁹ This extra-textual woman, whether she be the poet's patroness, lover, or an imagined figure, is linked to the intra-diegetic frame of the romance by the similarities established between her relationship with the narrator/poet and that of Melior and Partonopeus (for example, vv. 1873-80). Indeed, Bruckner notes that the narrative provides 'negative and positive models' for the narrator's own love story with the extra-diegetic female figure.⁹⁰ The woman alluded to by the poet/narrator is not part of the *Partonopeus* narrative, yet she is embedded in the romance and influences the poet, who states that the continuation of the text is undertaken at her request (vv. 10657-64). The *Guillaume* poet both signals and rewrites this element of *Partonopeus* in his own work by establishing a parallel between his patroness and Felise. Unlike *Partonopeus*, the poet gives the identity of his patroness, and he does not compare her influence over him to that of a beloved. Nevertheless, by aligning Felise with 'Yolent' in the closing section of the text, the poet invites the audience to interpret the Queen as an inscribed version of his patroness. This parallel brings 'contesse Yolent' (v. 9655) into the narrative frame of *Guillaume*, yet it also further stresses the importance of Felise's influence over the plot, foregrounding the image of this figure as a catalyst of transformation.

Felise is used to transform the course of the *Guillaume* narrative, and the representation of this figure signals rewriting of inter- and intratextual models. The poet fuses elements of female characters alluded to by Felise's role as mother and widowed queen, signalling transformation in *Guillaume*'s narrative and intertextual spheres. What is more, Felise's presence in the latter part of the romance overshadows that of the

⁸⁹ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', pp. 192-204; John L. Grigsby, 'The Narrator in *Partonopeus de Blois*, *Le Bel Inconnu*, and *Joufroi de Poitiers*', *Romance Philology*, 21 (1968), 536-43; Lori Walters, 'The Poet-narrator's Address to His Lady as Structural Device in *Partonopeus de Blois*', *Medium Aevum*, 61 (1992), 229-41.

⁹⁰ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 111. See also Fourier, *Le Courant réaliste*, p. 428; and Silvère Menegaldo, 'Quand le narrateur est amoureux: prologues et épilogues "lyriques" dans le roman de chevalerie en vers aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles', in *Prologues et épilogues dans la littérature du Moyen Âge*, ed. by Aimé Petit (Villeneuve d'Ascq: Centre d'Etudes Médiévales et Dialectales de Lille III, 2001), pp. 149-65 (p. 158).

heroine, and her transformative influence over the narrative suggests manipulation of the model of *Partonopeus* heroine that Melior signals. Yet, aside from cutting Melior and Guillaume out of their animal skins in the palace, Felise's power to physically transform others in the narrative is limited. Instead, it is Melior's confidante, Alixandrine, who is seen to possess transformative power that fully matches the reconfiguration of intertextual material signalled by her presence. This chapter will now explore the way in which the representation of Alixandrine highlights the poet reflecting the form and compositional process of his work within its narrative content.

Alixandrine

Like Felise, Alixandrine has a transformative effect on both the narrative and intertextual spheres of *Guillaume*, yet she takes on a more striking role in transforming the lovers. When called to help the couple avoid Melior's unwanted marriage, Alixandrine proposes that they elope in animal skins (vv. 2991-3027), and their escape 'se réalise grâce à l'ingéniosité de la cousine'.⁹¹ The poet emphasises the central part Alixandrine plays in the lovers' quasi-transformation to human/animal hybrids, as she not only gives the couple their disguises (vv. 3059-72), but also sews them into the skins (vv. 3073-3109). Alixandrine also helps the lovers to flee, taking them to the 'vergier' outside the palace and commending them to God as they enter the surrounding forest (vv. 3105-48).

The help provided by Alixandrine alters the trajectory of the plot by facilitating the couple's departure from Rome. Yet the poet also stresses the way in which Alixandrine physically transforms Guillaume and Melior. Alixandrine tells the lovers that they will not be recognised in the skins (vv. 3020-24), and the success of her plan is emphasised as soon as they don the disguises: "Bele, que te samble de moi? / [...] – Si sables ors et fiere beste / De cors, de membres et de teste" (vv. 3081-86). Indeed, Behrmann notes that Alixandrine 'is at the origin of the lovers' existence in their

⁹¹ Lot-Borodine, *Le Roman idyllique*, p. 262. See also Brown-Grant, pp. 90-91.

animalized form’, and the poet highlights her role reconfiguring their appearance: ‘*Cele a prise la menor pel / [...] Sor Melior l’a estendue*’ (vv. 3073-75) (emphasis mine).⁹² As Alixandrine transforms Guillaume and Melior, her ability to alter their physical state echoes Brande’s power to change Alphonse into and from his zoomorphic form as a wolf (vv. 285-309; vv. 7728-55), although Alixandrine opposes Brande by acting at the request of the lovers rather than against their will.⁹³

The transformative power wielded by Alixandrine indicates that she is a catalyst of transformation. However, Alixandrine’s influence is not limited to physical metamorphosis. Further scenes emphasise her role transforming the *Guillaume* plot by facilitating the union of Guillaume and Melior. It is thanks to Alixandrine that Guillaume and Melior become lovers, as she ensures their meeting in the ‘vergier’ and acts as mediator between the two love-sick youths until Melior accepts Guillaume as her ‘ami’ (vv. 1376-1724).

The representation of Alixandrine as the couple’s go-between alludes to intertextual models rewritten in *Guillaume*, highlighting use of this figure to signal narrative and intertextual transformation. The model of the confidante and go-between was inherited by French romance from the Ovidian tradition, as Faral observes that ‘l’amour a besoin de confidences, et Ovide place ordinairement près de ses héroïnes une nourrice, aux conseils de laquelle elles ont recours’.⁹⁴ The figure of confidante, or *mestre*, was developed in the *romans d’antiquité* and early French romance. The confidante would listen to the heroine’s woes, suggest a course of action, and would often play an active part in schemes designed to ensure the couple’s union and to protect their

⁹² Behrmann, p. 343.

⁹³ Chapter Three will discuss the parallels between the lovers’ disguises and Alphonse’s hybrid form. See in particular the section entitled ‘Alphonse and Guillaume as human/animal hybrids’, pp. 185-211.

⁹⁴ Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines*, p. 127.

relationship.⁹⁵ For example, in the *Roman d'Eneas*, Dido's sister, Anna, listens to the Carthaginian Queen's complaints about her love for Eneas and advises her on the appropriate course of action (vv. 1272-1390).⁹⁶

The first appearance of Alixandrine aligns her with the figure of confidante. Alixandrine observes Melior suffering and encourages the heroine to confide in her (vv. 984-91), stressing their close relationship: “‘Et si *pres* sui vostre *cousine*, / Vostre *privee*, vostre *amie*” (vv. 998-99) (emphasis mine). Yet although Alixandrine helps the love-sick Melior, she later acts as go-between for hero and heroine, assisting both in the ‘vergier’ where they become lovers.⁹⁷ Alixandrine leads Melior to the ‘vergier’ and notices Guillaume asleep under an apple tree (vv. 1393-1402), proposing that the girls join him (v. 1430). There, she places herself between the two would-be lovers (vv. 1478-79) and orchestrates their union. Alixandrine mediates the conversation between the reluctant couple, acting as the channel by which they communicate. She addresses each one alternately (vv. 1483-1685) and persuades Melior to take Guillaume as her lover (vv. 1689-1711).

The image of Alixandrine as go-between in the ‘vergier’ indicates manipulation of the Ovidian-inspired topos of go-between alongside rewriting of specific intertexts. In particular, Alixandrine's mediation between the lovers alludes to the depiction of Guinevere in *Cligès*. Noble observes that the role of Guinevere in *Cligès* is to ‘unite the two lovers by taking the initiative which they were unable to take’.⁹⁸ Guinevere realises that Alexandre and Soredamors are in love (vv. 2253-56) and addresses them together (vv. 2263-94). Chrétien emphasises Guinevere's situation between the lovers (‘Entr’ax .II.

⁹⁵ For comments on the figure of confidante, or ‘mestre’, see the following: Pierre Jonin, *Les Personnages féminins dans les romans français de Tristan au XII^e siècle* (Gap: Ophrys, 1958), pp. 223-24; Mieszkowski, *Medieval Go-betweens*, p. 6 and p. 79; Wilmotte, *Origines du roman en France*, p. 175.

⁹⁶ David J. Shirt, ‘The Dido Episode in *Enéas*: The Reshaping of Tragedy and its Stylistic Consequences’, *Medium Aevum*, 51 (1982), 3-17 (p. 9 and p. 12).

⁹⁷ This episode and the ‘vergier’ setting will be discussed in detail in Chapter Two, see pp. 148-54.

⁹⁸ Noble, ‘The Character of Guinevere’, p. 530. See also: Myrrha Borodine, *La Femme et l'amour au XII^e siècle auprès les poèmes de Chrétien de Troyes* (Paris: Picard, 1909), p. 95; Mieszkowski, *Medieval Go-betweens*, pp. 84-85.

fu assise en mi', v. 2260), and depicts her forcing them to confess their feelings. Guinevere uses her position as mediator to forge their relationship, promising to assist them in their marriage arrangements (vv. 2290-94). Indeed, Pratt notes that Guinevere 'sets herself up as a lecturer in matters marital [...] forcing the timorous Soredamors and Alexandre to declare their mutual love, then acting as marriage broker for them'.⁹⁹ This model is signalled in the depiction of Alixandrine, who is placed between Guillaume and Melior in the 'vergiere' and who takes an active role in uniting the lovers. Although Alixandrine is Melior's confidante and is at first aware only of the young lady's feelings, she encourages Guillaume to confide in her by explaining that she understands his sentiments: "Sire, bien sai vostre corage" (v. 1632). Alixandrine then mirrors Guinevere's actions, using her knowledge about each lover to bring them together. However, the poet indicates transformation of his intertextual model. Unlike Guinevere, who addresses both Alexandre and Soredamors at the same time and tells them to become lovers, Alixandrine alternates between listening to Guillaume's woes and ordering Melior to become his lover: "Secorés, bele, vostre amant" (v. 1685).

Alixandrine's behaviour invokes the intertextual model of Guinevere in *Cligès*, yet the *Guillaume* confidante is not an exact reproduction of this figure. As with his depiction of other key female characters, the poet fuses elements of several different confidante models in his representation of Alixandrine, forging this figure from the reconfiguration of intertextual material. One of the most dominant models he rewrites is the second confidante in Chrétien's *Cligès*, Fénice's nursemaid Thessala. Thessala is Fénice's 'nourrice entremetteuse' to whom she talks when she realises she is in love with Cligès (vv. 2984-3119).¹⁰⁰ Thessala explains the illness from which Fénice suffers, telling her "Vos amez, tote an sui certaine" (v. 3103). Just as Alixandrine recognises Melior's

⁹⁹ Pratt, 'The Image of the Queen in Old French Literature', p. 246.

¹⁰⁰ Alexandre Micha, 'Chrétien de Troyes', in *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, ed. by Jean Frappier and Reinhold R. Grimm, 11 vols (Heidelberg: Winter, 1978), IV, pp. 231-64 (pp. 243-44).

suffering as symptomatic of love and encourages her to explain her feelings, Thessala ‘s’aperçoit du changement qu’une maladie mystérieuse a produit en elle [Fénice], et elle provoque la première par ses questions les confidences de sa jeune maîtresse’.¹⁰¹ Thessala plays the role of confidante throughout *Cligès*, assisting her mistress in her plans to secure a union with Cligès and helping both lovers when they leave the court of Emperor Alis.¹⁰² Thessala cares for the couple when they live in hiding in Jean’s tower (vv. 6267-6314), before helping them to escape to England (vv. 6642-57). Like Guinevere’s position mediating between Soredamors and Alexandre, Thessala intervenes on behalf of both Cligès and Fénice. However, she takes on a more active role than Guinevere by participating in the intrigues she engineers to ensure the couple’s happiness.

Micha observes that in *Guillaume*, Alixandrine ‘joue le même rôle que Thessala’.¹⁰³ As Melior’s confidante, Alixandrine assists the lovers in their escape from Rome, and it is thanks to the bear-skin disguises she provides that the couple flee undetected. The poet emphasises Alixandrine’s role as go-between to whom the couple turn for help:

Alixandrine ont apelee
 [...] Molt l’ont apressee et requise.
 Que s’ele set en nule guise
 Riens qui lor puist mestier avoir,
 Que ore en face son pooir. (vv. 2983-90)

The poet stresses the lovers’ dependency on Alixandrine, repeating their pleas for help and suggesting that Alixandrine is capable of resolving their situation. The same dependent relationship is stressed in *Cligès*, as Chrétien notes that Fénice understands that Thessala is able to facilitate her happiness (vv. 5428-33). Just as Guillaume and Melior’s requests for aid lead Alixandrine to suggest and procure the disguises, Fénice succeeds in

¹⁰¹ Borodine, *La Femme et l’amour*, pp. 103-04. See also Michelle A. Freeman, *The Poetics of ‘Translatio Studii’ and ‘Conjointure’: Chrétien de Troyes’s ‘Cligès’* (Lexington, KY: French Forum, 1979), pp. 46-47.

¹⁰² Karen Pratt, ‘*De vetula*: the Figure of the Old Woman in Medieval French Literature’, in *Old Age in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Interdisciplinary Approaches to a Neglected Topic*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), pp. 321-43 (p. 329).

¹⁰³ Micha, ‘Introduction’, p. 27.

persuading Thessala to assist her: ‘Et sa mestre li aseüre / qu’ele l’en eidera del tot’ (vv. 5434-35). When Alixandrine helps the lovers escape into the forest (vv. 3105-48) her actions allude to Thessala, whose role guiding Cligès and Fénice to safety is stressed by Chrétien: ‘[...] Fenice et Cligés s’an vont / et Tessala menee an ont’ (vv. 6507-08).

Alixandrine is aligned with Thessala, and the poet highlights her position as an active go-between for both lovers. Yet Thessala is also characterised by her knowledge of magic that she employs to help the lovers. Chrétien states that Thessala ‘savait molt de nigromance’ (v. 2986), and some critics describe her as a sorceress, ‘although the romance never uses the word *sorcière*’.¹⁰⁴ The association made between Thessala and magic is emphasised by two potions that she prepares on behalf of Fénice to ensure the couple’s happy union. Firstly, Thessala protects Fénice’s virginity for Cligès by giving Emperor Alis a potion that gives him ‘l’illusion de posséder sa femme’ at night, even though this physical relationship only exists in his dreams.¹⁰⁵ Later, Thessala gives a potion to Fénice (vv. 5388-5472; vv. 5753-70) that allows her to ‘trick her husband’ and disappear from court with Cligès by giving her ‘l’apparence de la mort’ while asleep.¹⁰⁶

The depiction of Thessala fulfilling the role of confidante through her manipulation of magic has led critics to observe Chrétien fusing two contrasting models, both inherited from Ovid. Guyer notes that Thessala is ‘compounded’ of Medea and the nurse of Myrrha from the *Metamorphoses*, as Chrétien combines the former’s knowledge of magic with the image of the latter’s close relationship with her mistress.¹⁰⁷ The *Guillaume* poet adopts Chrétien’s compositional technique of intertextual fusion, blending elements of the make-up of Thessala, Guinevere, and other confidante models in his

¹⁰⁴ Laine E. Doggett, ‘On Artifice and Realism: Thessala in Chrétien de Troyes’s *Cligès*’, *Exemplaria*, 16 (2004), 43-72 (p. 48). For further discussion of Thessala as a sorceress, see Freeman, *The Poetics of ‘Translatio Studii’ and ‘Conjointure’*, p. 48 and p. 53.

¹⁰⁵ Micha, ‘Chrétien de Troyes’, p. 240. See also Sarah Kay, ‘Courts, Clerks, and Courtly Love’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Krueger, pp. 81-96 (p. 89).

¹⁰⁶ Peggy McCracken, ‘The Body Politic and the Queen’s Adulterous Body in French Romance’, in *Feminist Approaches to the Body in Medieval Literature*, ed. by Linda Momperis and Sarah Stanbury (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), pp. 38-64 (p. 45); Jonin, p. 223.

¹⁰⁷ Guyer, pp. 147-48. See also Doggett, p. 60; and Freeman, *The Poetics of ‘Translatio Studii’ and ‘Conjointure’*, p. 48.

representation of Alixandrine. Indeed, allusions to Thessala highlight his transformation of this model. For example, the assistance offered by Alixandrine to aid Melior's suffering not only signals the model of caring confidante, but also rewrites the magical ruse employed by Thessala to help Fénice.

In *Cligès*, Fénice asks for Thessala's aid in order to escape an adulterous relationship, telling her "Mestre, or vos an entremetez" (v. 3176). In *Guillaume*, Melior similarly beseeches Alixandrine to cure her lovesickness: "Or sés mon cuer, or me conseille [...] Si com tu sés que on doit faire" (vv. 1073-75). Lot-Borodine states that in *Guillaume* 'toute cette scène paraît imitée de l'entretien de Fénice avec sa nourrice Thessala dans *Cligès*'.¹⁰⁸ However, she does not provide more evidence to support this statement, and neglects the parallels inserted between Alixandrine's solution and Thessala's proposed plan of action. In *Cligès*, Thessala promises a magical ruse:

Lors li dit sa mestre et otroie
que tant fera conjuremanz
et poisons et anchantemanz
que ja de cest empereor
mar avra garde ne peor (vv. 3178-82)

This suggestion is echoed in Alixandrine's response to Melior's request for help:

'Or ne soiés en tel effrois,
N'en tel paor n'en tel esmai.
Une herbe connois que je ai:
[...] De la douçor de la racine
Seriés tote garie et fine
Quite de cest mal et delivre
A tos les jors qu'ariés a vivre' (vv. 1084-92)

The *Guillaume* poet signals Chrétien's text, as both confidantes attempt to allay their mistress's fears (*Guillaume* v. 1085; *Cligès*, v. 3182). Alixandrine's offer of 'une herbe' (v. 1086) strengthens this reference by suggesting a magical cure that mirrors Thessala's 'poisons et anchantemanz' (v. 3180). The *Guillaume* poet continues to emphasise the image of Alixandrine procuring a 'herbe', referring to it twice in less than twenty lines (v. 1086; v. 1102) and again in a later conversation between the women (v. 1352). The

¹⁰⁸ Lot-Borodine, *Le Roman idyllique*, p. 247.

way in which Alixandrine describes the properties of this ‘herbe’ creates the suggestion that it is magical, as it will cure Melior of her ailment (vv. 1089-90). Alixandrine also indicates that she alone knows of this remedy (v. 1086), aligning her more closely with Thessala, who is the only one able to make potions in *Cligès* (vv. 3226-38).

In her commentary on this scene, Vuagnoux-Uhlig wrongly states that Alixandrine offers to provide Melior with ‘un philtre capable de guérir son mal d’amour’.¹⁰⁹ Although the *Guillaume* poet signals Thessala’s potion, he does not faithfully reproduce this ruse. Alixandrine offers only a ‘herbe’ with implied magical properties, rather than an explicitly magical potion or remedy. *Cligès* is alluded to and transformed in *Guillaume*, and further alterations are made to this model when the purpose of the sorcery is changed from a poison in Chrétien’s text to a remedy: “‘Seriés tote garie et fine” (v. 1090) (emphasis mine). More strikingly, although the poet repeatedly makes reference to this ‘herbe’, no such magic medicine is ever produced. The poet thwarts the audience’s expectations and rewrites his intertextual model by choosing only to suggest the presence of a potentially magical substance. Alixandrine’s actions signal Thessala’s poison, yet, as noted by Ferlampin-Acher, she does not faithfully copy her intertextual model.¹¹⁰

However, the poet insists elsewhere upon the intertextual parallel between Alixandrine and Thessala as magical confidantes. The poet notes that Alixandrine is worried about how to ensure that Guillaume learns of Melior’s feelings, and emphasises the image of Alixandrine wishing to act on her mistress’s behalf (vv. 1096-1115). The poet suggests that Alixandrine actively orchestrates the lovers’ union by administering some form of potion to Guillaume. The scene following the women’s discussion depicts Guillaume’s vision of ‘dream’ Melior (vv. 1118-1275), and the swift *enchaînement* of these scenes and the parallel between Alixandrine and Thessala indicates Alixandrine’s involvement and the presence of a magic potion. Questions are raised regarding whether

¹⁰⁹ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 177.

¹¹⁰ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 99.

the 'herbe' suggested by Alixandrine is a rewritten version of the potion given in *Cligès*, and whether Alixandrine administers a potion to Guillaume that triggers his dream of Melior, mirroring Alis's potion-fuelled visions of Fénice. These questions are left unanswered, and the scene is left open to interpretation. However, Schiff and Mieszkowski both note that Alixandrine's implied magic power is made explicit in the Old English *William of Palerne*, in which she gives a potion to Guillaume that causes his vision of Melior.¹¹¹ This action is implied in the Old French *Guillaume*. The intertextual allusion to Thessala suggests that Alixandrine possesses a working knowledge of magic used to facilitate the relationship between hero and heroine, thereby adding another element to the mix of intertextual models fused into this figure.

Allusions to Guinevere and Thessala in the representation of Alixandrine not only highlight the fusion and transformation of intertextual material, they also underline the importance of doubling and correspondence in *Guillaume*. The two *Cligès* confidantes double one another in Chrétien's romance, and rewriting of both figures in *Guillaume* emphasises the poet's awareness of this doubling and the correspondence between them. The audience are encouraged to perceive similar intra-textual doubling within this work, not by the presence of two confidante figures as in *Cligès*, but rather by the suggested parallels between key female figures that are strengthened by the intertextual allusions these women signal. For example, the implied narrative link between Alixandrine and Brande is emphasised when Alixandrine is aligned with the magical figure of Thessala.¹¹² Brande is the only figure characterised by her use of magic in *Guillaume*, as the poet notes that she has knowledge of 'sorceries et ingremance' (v. 287). Brande uses a magic 'oingnement' (v. 301) to transform Alphonse, later retransforming him with a magic ring and a book from which she reads an incantation (vv. 7731-51). By suggesting that

¹¹¹ Mieszkowski, *Medieval Go-betweens*, pp. 86-88; Schiff, pp. 428-29. See also Tibbals, p. 357.

¹¹² Schiff notes that the link between Alixandrine and Brande as sorceresses is more explicit in the Old English *William*, as the poet insists upon Alixandrine's 'magical skill'. See Schiff, pp. 428-29.

Alixandrine is able to use magic, the poet emphasises intratextual links between her and Brande, aligning the disguises she provides with Brande's metamorphosis of Alphonse.

The poet encourages the audience to perceive links between Alixandrine and female figures that she doubles in the intra- and intertextual spheres of *Guillaume*. The portrayal of Alixandrine as confidante incorporates further intertextual models, the manipulation of which also signals the poet's awareness of the intertextual network in which his romance is situated. One of these models is Lunete in *Yvain*, confidante to the heroine, Laudine. Described by Micha as 'un avatar de la *maistre*' and as 'a prototype of the resourceful female go-between' by Krueger, Lunete plays an active role throughout *Yvain*, and Germain suggests that 'there would be no story at all without her'.¹¹³ The *Yvain* epilogue emphasises the central place accorded to Lunete in the narrative (vv. 6809-14), and despite an original dearth of critical attention dedicated to this figure, much recent scholarship has explored the influence she holds over the romance.¹¹⁴

The model of Lunete is used alongside a second confidante with whom Chrétien's go-between is in close intertextual conversation. In *Partonopeus*, Melior's sister Urraque acts as confidante and as go-between for Melior and the eponymous hero, taking on a hands-on and 'interventionistic' approach to this role.¹¹⁵ Scholars have observed the intertextual parallels between Urraque and Lunete, although Eley and Simons's alternative dating of *Partonopeus* has triggered debate regarding the direction of influence

¹¹³ Micha, 'Chrétien de Troyes', p. 260; Roberta L. Krueger, 'Questions of Gender in Old French Courtly Romance', in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Krueger, pp. 132-49 (p. 138); Ellen Germain, 'Lunete, Women, and Power in Chrétien's *Yvain*', *Romance Quarterly*, 38 (1991), 15-25 (p. 24).

¹¹⁴ See comments in the following: Renée Allen, 'The Roles of Women and Their Homosocial Context in the *Chevalier au Lion*', *Romance Quarterly*, 46 (1999), 141-54; Roberta L. Krueger, 'Love, Honor, and the Exchange of Women in *Yvain*: Some Remarks on the Female Reader', *Romance Notes*, 25 (1985), 302-17; Mieszkowski, *Medieval Go-betweens*, pp. 115-18; J. M. Sullivan, 'The Lady Lunete: Literary Conventions of Counsel and the Criticism of Counsel in Chrétien's *Yvain* and Hartmann's *Iwein*', *Neophilologus*, 85 (2001), 335-54 (p. 336); Z. P. Zaddy, 'Chrétien misogyne', *Mediaevalia*, 80 (1980), 301-07 (p. 304).

¹¹⁵ Mieszkowski, 'Urraque and the Gender Roles of *Partonopeus of Blois*', p. 193. Ferrante also observes that Urraque 'manipulates both lovers' to her advantage. Joan M. Ferrante, *Woman as Image in Medieval Literature: From the Twelfth Century to Dante* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), p. 84.

between these figures.¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, the depiction of Alixandrine in *Guillaume* indicates the poet's awareness of this intertextual link, as he manipulates both models simultaneously and individually in the representation of this go-between.

The depiction of Alixandrine persuading Melior to accept Guillaume as her lover signals rewriting of *Yvain* and *Partonopeus*. Lunete and Urraque manipulate their respective mistresses in order to force them into union with each respective hero, later abusing their role as confidante to coerce each lady to forgive and reconcile with their lovers after they have become estranged. In *Yvain*, Lunete uses her 'skill at verbal manipulation' to persuade Laudine to marry Yvain in spite of the fact that he killed Laudine's husband (vv. 1589-1877), 'craftily engineering' the couple's union.¹¹⁷ Later, she employs her 'intelligence et astuce verbale' to trick Laudine into taking back Yvain, setting a 'verbal trap' and making Laudine swear to reconcile the 'chevalier au lion' with his lady (vv. 6602-60).¹¹⁸ Lunete (ab)uses her position of trust and is depicted as both resourceful and manipulative.¹¹⁹ Indeed, Sullivan notes her 'aggressive efforts' to help Laudine through lies and deceit, and has questioned the extent to which Lunete is portrayed as a faithful confidante to Laudine.¹²⁰ Similar comments have been made of Urraque in *Partonopeus*. Although Urraque is introduced as Melior's sister and confidante

¹¹⁶ Bruckner notes that Urraque was influenced by Lunete, but this statement is refuted in Eley and Simons's re-evaluation of the dating of *Partonopeus*. See the following: Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, 'Repetition and Variation', pp. 101-05; Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, *Narrative Invention in Twelfth-Century French Romance: The Convention of Hospitality (1160-1200)* (Lexington, KY: French Forum Publishers, 1980), p. 153; Eley and Simons, '*Partonopeus de Blois* and Chrétien de Troyes', pp. 332-33.

¹¹⁷ Armstrong, p. 40; Marc Glasser, 'Marriage and the Use of Force in *Yvain*', *Romania*, 108 (1987), 484-502 (p. 488).

¹¹⁸ J. R. McGuire, 'L'Onguent et l'initiative féminine dans *Yvain*', *Romania*, 112 (1991), 65-82 (p. 76); Peter Haidu, 'Narrativity and Language in Some XIIth Century Romances', *Yale French Studies*, 51 (1974), 133-46 (p. 144). Press notes that Lunete catches Laudine in 'the web of her own words'. A. R. Press, 'Chrétien de Troyes's Laudine: A *Belle dame sans mercy*?', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 19 (1983), 158-71 (p. 169).

¹¹⁹ See comments in: Natalie Grinnell, 'The Other Woman in Chrétien de Troyes's *Yvain*', *Critical Matrix*, 10 (1996), 36-57; R. W. Hanning, 'Love and Power in the Twelfth Century, with Special Reference to Chrétien de Troyes and Marie de France', in *The Olde Daunce: Love, Friendship, Sex, and Marriage in the Medieval World*, ed. by Robert R. Edwards and Stephen Spector (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), pp. 87-103 (pp. 94-95); Krueger, *Women Readers and the Ideology of Gender*, p. 49.

¹²⁰ Sullivan, 'The Lady Lunete', p. 336; pp. 440-41.

who comes to her with counsel when Partonopeus breaks Melior's taboo (vv. 4905-5042), the first advice she offers is in favour of the disgraced hero (vv. 4911-12). Urraque later 'pressures Melior to rethink her love affair' from Partonopeus's point of view, and lies to Melior in order to encourage her to forgive him, 'pushing her sister to suicide threats'.¹²¹ Reynders qualifies Urraque as 'un personnage très positif' and 'digne de l'admiration', yet Urraque's invasive meddling mirrors the actions of Lunete and suggests that she serves Melior in an ambiguous manner, as noted by the poet: 'Urrake en doit avoir grant blasme, / Car trop est vers li de fort ire / Qui tant li suefre son martire' (vv. 7084-86).¹²²

The suggestion that Urraque does not wholly act in the best interests of her sister aligns her with Lunete, as both women in some way bully the ladies they serve. The same manipulative behaviour is indicated in the portrayal of Alixandrine in the 'vergier' scene. Although Alixandrine appears to help Melior, her approach to uniting the couple borders on the aggressive and manipulative behaviour of Lunete and Urraque. Alixandrine goes between the lovers and shifts her promise of help from Melior to Guillaume, telling him that she will heal him of his pain: "En moi poés fiance avoir, / C'aidiés serés à mon pooir." (vv. 1667-68). Rather than arguing on behalf of Melior, Alixandrine uses her feminine guile to help Guillaume and to persuade Melior to accept him as her lover:

'Damoisele, por Jhesu Crist,
Et por pitié et por amor,
Aiés pieté de la dolor
Que cis vallés sueffre por toi.' (vv. 1672-75)

Alixandrine almost forces Melior to become Guillaume's 'amie', imploring her to have mercy on the young man and emphasising his pain and suffering.

The image of Alixandrine acting in the interests of Guillaume rather than Melior signals individual parallels with Urraque. In the first conversation between Urraque and Melior, Urraque tells her sister to forgive Partonopeus for breaking the taboo she set, advising her to accept him as her lover (vv. 4911-5042). Urraque urges Melior to have

¹²¹ Mieszkowski, *Medieval Go-betweens*, p. 112.

¹²² Reynders, p. 411.

mercy on Partonopeus: “‘Dame, fait ele, aiés merci, / Por vostre honor, de vostre ami”” (vv. 4911-12). This scene is alluded to in Alixandrine’s request for Melior to have mercy on Guillaume, stressed by the repetition of ‘pity’ (v. 1673; v. 1674). However, the *Guillaume* poet transforms *Partonopeus*, undermining the gravitas of the situation in which Urraque requests forgiveness after Partonopeus defied Melior and jeopardised their relationship. In contrast, Alixandrine asks for Melior’s mercy to cure Guillaume’s lovesickness. Alixandrine’s desperate plea is a tongue-in-cheek allusion to and rewriting of Urraque’s serious conversation with Melior, highlighting transformation of this model.

The poet emphasises the image of Alixandrine assisting Guillaume in the ‘vergier’, aligning this go-between with Lunete and Urraque who both save the lives of the heroes of their respective texts. In *Partonopeus*, Urraque ensures Partonopeus’s safe escape from the Chef d’Oire when he is exiled by Melior, ushering him to a ship that returns him to France (vv. 5046-5154). Later, she happens upon Partonopeus in the Ardennes forest and takes him back to her island where she restores him to health (vv. 5924-6292). In *Yvain*, Lunete is first depicted by Chrétien helping Yvain by hiding him from the knights that seek to find and kill him for murdering Esclados (vv. 973-1143). Later, she encourages Laudine to marry Yvain to not only satisfy the amorous sentiments he has confided in her, but also to ensure that he is no longer in danger of being killed by Laudine’s men. Indeed, Mieszkowski notes that the extensive help Lunete gives to Yvain may lead the audience to first believe that Lunete is Yvain’s go-between.¹²³ Similar comments could be made of Urraque’s defence and protection of Partonopeus, and both confidantes appear to support the heroes more than the heroines of these texts.

The *Guillaume* poet manipulates the image of the confidante saving the hero from mortal danger in his portrayal of Alixandrine. In the ‘vergier’ Guillaume tells Alixandrine

¹²³ Mieszkowski, *Medieval Go-betweens*, p. 116.

that he is dying from love (vv. 1484-85), and highlights Alixandrine's power to manipulate Melior and save him, asking for her mercy:

'De mon cors, bele, et de ma vie
Que tot avés en vo baillie,
[...] Se par tans ne me secorés
A cele dont vos dit m'avés
Qui la balance en sa main tient' (vv. 1651-57)

Guillaume exaggerates the power Alixandrine and Melior hold over his fate, and his speech encourages Alixandrine to serve his wishes. She transmits his exaggerated statement to Melior as a fact, telling her that Guillaume will die without her love:

'Por toi se muert et fait tel fin.
[...] S'il ne devient li vos amis,
Par le signor qui me fist nestre,
Ne quit que voie demain vespre.
Secorés, bele, vostre amant.' (vv. 1678-85)

Alixandrine threatens Melior with responsibility of Guillaume's death, making it clear that Guillaume is dying because of Melior (v. 1678). The use of the imperative 'secorés' (v. 1685) stresses that Melior's actions will either kill or cure the young man. Melior has no option but to accept Guillaume, and she notes that rejection would result in murder: "Je ne vouldroie pas de lui / Estre *homecide* ne d'autrui, / Ne pecherresse en tel maniere" (vv. 1691-93) (emphasis mine). Alixandrine's actions persuading Melior to accept Guillaume align with Lunete and Urraque, as the confidante is seen not only to manipulate her lady, but also to save the life of the eponymous hero.

However, the *Guillaume* poet uses this allusion to *Yvain* and *Partonopeus* to signal rewriting of these intertextual models. Unlike the very real dangers faced by Yvain and Partonopeus, Alixandrine saves Guillaume from a figurative terminal condition rather than an actual state of peril. Alixandrine knows that Melior loves Guillaume, and this knowledge makes the threat of Guillaume dying at the hands of love less real, highlighting intertextual transformation. What is more, Alixandrine does not need to ask

Melior to forgive Guillaume for a treacherous act, unlike the forgiveness that the confidantes in *Yvain* and *Partonopeus* request of their ladies. Instead, she only asks Melior to abandon her misgivings about the reaction the love affair would cause. Alixandrine does not lie to her mistress, nor push her to a state of extreme emotion as Urrique and Lunete do to Melior and Laudine respectively.

The *Guillaume* poet insists on a more positive portrayal of Alixandrine as go-between, and despite her actions in favour of Guillaume, he suggests that she is less biased towards the hero than the confidantes she signals. Further transformation of these figures is also facilitated by the lack of discord between Guillaume and Melior after they become lovers. Unlike Lunete and Urrique, who must reconcile hero and heroine, Alixandrine must only unite Guillaume and Melior. Later, she assists them together as a couple, like Thessala in *Cligès*, and does not help each one individually. Alixandrine's function as confidante is fulfilled after the lovers unite in the 'vergier', as she fades 'out of the picture' with a 'decisive exit line': 'Illuec les *laist*, si *s'en parti*, / Par le vergier vait cuellant flors; / Et il recordent lor amors' (vv. 1720-22) (my emphasis).¹²⁴

The representation of Alixandrine as confidante signals and transforms the models of Lunete and Urrique, and this character is distanced from these figures as the romance progresses and she serves both hero and heroine together. The assistance she offers to the couple aligns her with the model of another confidante, Iseut's handmaid Brengain in the *Tristan* legend. Brengain is central to the couple's relationship in both Old French *Tristan* romances, as it is due to her actions that they drink the potion that triggers their love.¹²⁵ Brengain goes to great lengths in order to protect and help the lovers, even taking Iseut's place in bed on her wedding night and 'sacrificing her virginity' to keep their relationship

¹²⁴ Charles Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition: A Study in Style and Meaning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), p. 141; Mieszkowski, *Medieval Go-betweens*, pp. 156-57.

¹²⁵ See Bérout's *Tristan*, vv. 2205-19. Bérout, 'Le Roman de Tristan', in *Tristan et Yseut. Les poèmes français. La saga norroise*, ed. and trans. by Daniel Lacroix and Philippe Walter (Paris: Livre de Poche-Lettres Gothiques, 1989), pp. 22-281. See also Thomas, *Le Roman de Tristan: poème du XII^e siècle*, ed. by Joseph Bédier, 2 vols (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1902), I, pp. 141-55.

hidden.¹²⁶ Jonin aligns Brengain with other active confidantes who strive to assist the lovers, as Brengain ‘se lance à corps perdu dans l’aventure amoureuse et périlleuse que court sa maîtresse’, noting her propensity for ‘la ruse pour favoriser les amours clandestines’.¹²⁷

In *Guillaume*, Alixandrine reflects the role played by Brengain, helping both lovers in order to facilitate the smooth running of their relationship. However, one of the clearest signals to this figure is found in the depiction of the lovers’ departure from Rome without Alixandrine. Although Alixandrine asks to leave with Guillaume and Melior (vv. 3047-50), Guillaume refuses her request (vv. 3051-53) and she remains behind at court. The image of the fugitive couple stepping into the forest outside the palace and leaving behind the go-between alludes to Tristan and Iseut living in exile in the Morrois forest without Brengain in Bérout’s *Tristan* (vv. 1271-2748). This intertextual link is developed in the ambiguous depiction of Alixandrine’s actions after the couple’s departure. Alixandrine is questioned by Nathaniel when he learns that Melior is missing (v. 3521), and she fulfils the role of faithful go-between, lying about her knowledge of Melior’s whereabouts (vv. 3535-49). Alixandrine gives an extended fictional account of events (vv. 3535-68; vv. 3574-3648; vv. 3658-80), stalling the search party for the lovers by suggesting that the Emperor first search Guillaume’s ‘ostel’ (v. 3676). Ferlampin-Acher observes that Alixandrine invents ‘une fiction pour expliquer la fuite de son amie’, and the confidante can be seen to act in the interests of Guillaume and Melior by using her speech to buy them time in which to escape further into the forest.¹²⁸

However, close analysis of her description of the events that precede the lovers’ flight suggests an ambiguous portrayal of this confidante, simultaneously signalling and

¹²⁶ Thomas, pp. 156-57; Roberta L. Krueger, ‘Loyalty and Betrayal: Iseut and Brangien in the Tristan romances of Bérout and Thomas’, in *Sisterhood surveyed*, ed. by Anne Dzamba Sess (West Chester, PA: West Chester University, 1983), pp. 72-78 (p. 73). See also Florica Bodistean, ‘Tristan and Isolde, or On the Conventions and Liberties of Medieval Eros’, *Journal of Humanistic and Social Studies*, 1 (2010), 7-28 (pp. 16-17).

¹²⁷ Jonin, p. 225.

¹²⁸ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 68.

rewriting the *Tristan* legend. The poet stresses Alixandrine's fear of Nathaniel, noting that 'Tant resoigne sa grant iror' (v. 3526), and twice referring to her 'paor' (v. 3533; v. 3656). The false nature of Alixandrine's actions and speech is also highlighted through her feigned reaction to events: 'Autresi fait Alixandrine / Com de l'afaire riens ne sace.' (vv. 3654-55). Alixandrine's play-acting could be to hide the truth of Melior's whereabouts, yet the poet creates an image of the go-between acting in her own interests to protect herself from Nathaniel's 'molt grant ire' (v. 3536). Alixandrine safeguards herself from blame by gradually telling Nathaniel all she knows about the lovers, all the while ensuring that she will not be accused of treacherous behaviour. Indeed, Micha notes that she creates an 'habile comédie' for Nathaniel and succeeds 'astucieusement à lui apprendre la vérité [...] en se dégageant elle-même de toute responsabilité'.¹²⁹

Alixandrine pretends that she and Melior had a quarrel when Melior confessed her love for Guillaume: "Quant j'oï ce, si l'en blasmai, / Tant l'en repris et chastoiai / Qu'ele m'en a si enhaïe" (vv. 3625-27). This imagined dispute allows Alixandrine to protect herself from Nathaniel's anger, yet it complicates the portrayal of the go-between. Alixandrine stresses Melior's reckless behaviour and emphasises her own innocence by highlighting her objections to Melior's conduct:

'Qu'ele par son *fier mautalent*
M'enchacha de sa chambre fors.
 Mais Diex set bien *cui est li tors*:
 Por bien li dis ce que j'en seu
 Et por son los et por son preu,
 Mais onques riens *n'en volt entendre*.
 Qui li oïst vers moi *contendre*
 Et *laidoier* de sa parole,' (vv. 3664-71) (emphasis mine)

Alixandrine protects her own interests, noting Melior's ill-mannered and ill-advised behaviour, and suggesting that her own actions were correct in the eyes of God (v. 3666). Alixandrine removes any suggestion that she could have been responsible for Melior's

¹²⁹ Micha, 'Introduction', pp. 33-34.

actions, stressing her innocence by stating that Melior acted against her counsel (vv. 3669-70).

The imagined tension between Alixandrine and Melior signals an allusion to discord between mistress and confidante in Thomas's *Roman de Tristan*, preserved in the 'Douce' manuscript.¹³⁰ Fenster notes that in this text Brengain is 'far from a mere compliant servant', adding that 'there is a certain amount of strife between her and Iseult'.¹³¹ The relationship between these women becomes strained when Brengain speaks out at Iseut in an 'intense encounter' (vv. 1419-1766) involving a series of 'invectives brutales'.¹³² Brengain accuses Iseut of 'puterie' (v. 1456) and threatens to tell Marc about her relationship with Tristan (vv. 1685-86). After the quarrel, Brengain warns Marc to survey his wife's behaviour, although she implies that Iseut loves count Cariado rather than Tristan (vv. 1843-52). In *Guillaume*, Alixandrine's conversation with Nathaniel alludes to this scene, and her fictitious dispute with Melior is aligned with the quarrel between Iseut and Brengain. However, this intertextual model is rewritten, as the roles of aggressor and victim are inverted so that Alixandrine is the object of Melior's insults. Brengain's tirade against Iseut is transformed into the imagined harangue of Melior, who is alleged to have called Alixandrine a 'garce fole' (v. 3672). What is more, unlike Brengain, who lies about the identity of Iseut's lover, Alixandrine tells Nathaniel that Melior is in love with Guillaume (vv. 3633-35). Most strikingly, the dispute in *Guillaume* is imagined, unlike the real quarrel depicted in *Tristan*.

The insistence upon this imagined argument complicates interpretation of Alixandrine's behaviour. Alixandrine's invented dispute with Melior can be seen as a ruse

¹³⁰ Thomas, 'Le Roman de Tristan', in *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, suivi de La Folie Tristan de Berne et La Folie Tristan d'Oxford*, trans. by Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Ian Short and ed. by Félix Lecoy (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003), pp. 41-245. For a comprehensive introduction to the manuscripts of Thomas's romance, see Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Ian Short, 'Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas: Introduction', in *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas*, pp. 9-40.

¹³¹ Thelma S. Fenster, 'Introduction', in *Arthurian Women* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. xvii-lxxvii (p. xxxi).

¹³² Krueger, 'Loyalty and Betrayal', p. 74; Jonin, p. 324.

created by the faithful confidante to aid the lovers and to free herself from blame. Yet, the poet earlier stresses the denial of Alixandrine's request to accompany the lovers (vv. 3047-53) and her grief when they leave (vv. 3114-18), suggesting that her distress at being left behind triggers feelings of animosity that are expressed in her depiction of an imaginary dispute between her and Melior. Alixandrine did not need to tell Nathaniel the identity of Melior's lover, raising the question whether her choice to betray Guillaume and trigger the search for the eponymous hero and Melior suggests further discord between confidante and mistress. These questions are left unanswered in *Guillaume*, and the conversation between Alixandrine and Nathaniel creates an ambiguous image of this confidante as faithful to Guillaume and Melior.

However, this ambiguity can be better understood if the exchange between Alixandrine and the Emperor is read as an allusion to Thomas's *Tristan*. The poet invites his audience to perceive the intertextual reference to *Tristan* and his transformation of this material in his representation of Alixandrine's behaviour. The contradictions that are created in his portrayal of the otherwise faithful go-between slandering her mistress suggest a mismatch between the intertextual material and elements of the *Guillaume* narrative into which the poet inserts his transformed model, highlighting the presence of rewriting.

There are additional contradictions in the depiction of Alixandrine that are the result of intertextual transformation. After having been left behind by the lovers and interrogated by Nathaniel, Alixandrine is absent from the narrative until the final section, in which she is reunited with the couple in Palermo. Here, she is one of three women who become brides in a triple wedding that depicts Alixandrine's marriage to Brandin of Spain alongside the marriage of Guillaume and Melior, and Florence and Alphonse (vv. 8801-8942). Close analysis of the events that precede this wedding highlight a contradiction within the narrative regarding women's consent in marriage, yet this contradiction can be

understood if it is seen as the consequence of the poet's endeavours to signal intertextual transformation.

Brown-Grant states that *Guillaume* 'makes the most forceful case for individual consent as the prime consideration in marriage'.¹³³ The *Guillaume* poet emphasises the futile nature of characters' attempts to force women into marriage, as Melior's elopement with Guillaume in the face of her betrothal to a Greek prince is coupled with Felise's actions to defend Florence from a forced union with Brandin. When the Spanish forces are defeated, Brandin admits that his efforts to marry Florence 'par force' (v. 7181) were wrong: "Moilliers a prendre ait mal dehé / C'on prent outre sa volenté!" (vv. 7175-76). The message of Brandin's words echoes the change in views on the necessity for consent of both man and woman in marriage during the twelfth-century in France, as the Church began to stress the importance of *consensus*.¹³⁴ The poet highlights his awareness of this notion in Brandin's speech, emphasising the importance of equal consent by noting that the Spanish Prince had wished to marry Florence 'outre sa volenté' (v. 7176).

However, support for consent in marriage is later contradicted in the depiction of the betrothal of Florence and Alixandrine to their future husbands. Both women play a passive role in these scenes, and although they do not object to the arrangements made, the poet suggests that the wedding plans are made without their direct consent. Florence is promised in marriage to Alphonse by Guillaume at the former's request:

'Or te requier, se il te plaist,
Que tu me *doignes* ta seror
Avoir a feme et a oissor.
- Hé! chiers amis, dis me tu voir
Que tu vels ma seror *avoir*?
[...] Liés et joians la vos *otroi*,

¹³³ Brown-Grant, pp. 90-91.

¹³⁴ For comments on the changing views towards consent in marriage, see the following: Neil Cartlidge, *Medieval Marriage: Literary Approaches, 1100-1300* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997), pp. 8-18; Georges Duby, *Le Chevalier, la femme et le prêtre: Le Mariage dans la France féodale* (Paris: Hachette, 1981), pp. 223-39; Georges Duby, *Medieval Marriage: Two Models From Twelfth-Century France*, trans. by Elborg Foster (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), pp. 16-17; Simon Gaunt, *Gender and Genre in Medieval French Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 74-75; Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 81-92 and pp. 131-38.

Et la moitié de m'onor
Vos *doins* avecques ma seror
En mariage. [...] (vv. 8290-8307) (emphasis mine)

The language in this passage, particularly the verbs 'donner', 'avoir' and 'otroier', emphasises the image of Florence as a prize given to Alphonse by Guillaume, whose status as her brother allows him possession of her. Florence's consent to this marriage is not required, and Alphonse rather seeks Guillaume's agreement to the arrangement (v. 8290). The poet notes that Florence is happy with the betrothal (vv. 8321-22), yet the agreement is made without her prior consent, contradicting the message of Brandin's earlier speech. This same contradiction occurs in the depiction of Alixandrine's betrothal:

Puis ont parlé d'Alixandrine
Tant ont la parole menee
Que de Brandin est afiee
[...] Et il l'a *prise* de bon gré (vv. 8772-76) (my emphasis)

Alixandrine's consent is not sought, and she is discussed as an object to be taken by Brandin. Although the poet does not state that Alixandrine objects to this match, this scene nevertheless contradicts Brandin's earlier speech. The marriage plans are made by men without the consultation of Alixandrine, and the passage raises questions regarding their efforts to obtain her consent.

The contradiction caused by male characters failing to seek the consent of Alixandrine and Florence can be understood when the wedding episode is read as an intertextual allusion to *Partonopeus*. The triple wedding in *Guillaume* mirrors the ms. A version of *Partonopeus* that ends with a triple wedding between Partonopeus and Melior, Lohier and Urraque, and Gaudin and Persewis (ms. A vv. 11937-12082).¹³⁵ Scholars have hitherto ignored this intertextual allusion in *Guillaume*, and Ferlampin-Acher instead believes that the *Guillaume* triple wedding demonstrates only the poet's endeavours to tie

¹³⁵ Eley and Simons conclude that ms. A is closest to the original version of *Partonopeus*: Eley and Simons, '*Partonopeus de Blois* and Chrétien de Troyes', p. 319; Penny Simons and Penny Eley, 'A Subtext and its Subversion: The Variant Endings to *Partonopeus de Blois*', *Neophilologus*, 82 (1998), 181-97 (p. 195); Penny Simons, 'A Romance Revisited: Reopening the Question of the Manuscript Tradition of *Partonopeus de Blois*', *Romania*, 115 (1997), 368-405.

up the loose ends of his narrative in three marriages that ‘bouclent le récit’ and ‘ne laissent aucun héros en liberté’.¹³⁶ However, given the intertextual links signalled and manipulated by the *Guillaume* poet to *Partonopeus* through the name of his heroine, his decision to depict Melior’s wedding alongside those of Alixandrine and Florence represents a further effort to highlight rewriting of this romance.

Parallels between the respective heroines and confidantes of these works suggest the *Guillaume* poet doubling *Partonopeus*, as Melior and Alixandrine mirror Melior and Urrique throughout *Guillaume* and in the triple wedding episode. Florence echoes Persewis, the girl who Eley notes is ‘too young to understand love’ in *Partonopeus*, as the *Guillaume* poet portrays Florence as young (‘la meschine’, v. 4426), shy (vv. 7892-7907), and always in the company of her mother (v. 5555).¹³⁷ Just as with other elements of *Partonopeus* alluded to in *Guillaume*, the poet transforms his intertextual model, altering the hierarchy of marriages presented in *Partonopeus* so that the prestigious union of Urrique to King Lohier is rewritten into the wedding of Florence and Alphonse, future King of Spain.¹³⁸ The confidante is relegated to third place in the order of marriages, as Alixandrine’s union with Brandin more closely echoes the alliance of Persewis and Gaudin. Indeed, the poet emphasises the lower status of Alixandrine’s husband, contrasting with Urrique’s royal suitor: ‘Mais il n’est rois n’ele roïne’ (v. 8910).

Florence and Alixandrine act as signals to Urrique and Persewis and take on functional roles in this episode, emphasised by the reference to Alixandrine as ‘La tierce damoisel’ (v. 8817). These women are treated as ‘extras’ used for rewriting of *Partonopeus*, and the functional role of their marriages as facilitating an allusion to this intertextual material results in the mismatch between earlier passages of the narrative and the depiction of the women’s consent to their part in the triple wedding. By trying to

¹³⁶ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 96; p. 29.

¹³⁷ Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, p. 38-39. See also Simons, ‘A Romance Revisited’, p. 399.

¹³⁸ Penny Sullivan, ‘Love and Marriage in Early French Narrative Poetry’, *Trivium*, 19 (1984), 85-102 (pp. 98-99).

manipulate and signal an intertextual allusion to *Partonopeus* the poet neglects to nuance this model into the narrative, creating a ‘faultline’ that highlights the disjuncture between the intertextual model and his text.¹³⁹ The poet endeavours to use the key women in *Guillaume* to signal intertextual transformation, yet at times his efforts lead to contradictions in the narrative that can be better understood when read alongside the intertexts that he rewrites.

The depiction of Alixandrine presents the most developed use of a female figure to trigger and signal both narrative and intertextual transformation in *Guillaume*. Alixandrine is central to events that reconfigure the early sections of the narrative, uniting Guillaume and Melior and physically transforming them into quasi-animal hybrids. This confidante also assists the lovers in their escape from Rome, once again causing narrative change. Yet her actions shaping the narrative signal and rewrite intertextual material, mirroring and transforming models of confidantes from other texts. Alixandrine alludes to Guinevere, Thessala, Lunete, Urraque, and Brengain, who each play a key part in altering the narrative of their respective romances. Lefay-Toury notes that Lunete ‘se révèle être le personnage actif dans toutes les circonstances qui font avancer l’intrigue’, and these comments are echoed in her analysis of Thessala and in Eley’s observations on the ‘central role’ of Urraque in *Partonopeus*.¹⁴⁰ The emphasis in *Guillaume* on Alixandrine’s transformative influence indicates parallels with intertextual models, yet the representation of the confidante signals his transformation of each intertext and the fusion of material into this figure.

The depiction of Alixandrine illustrates emphasis of transformation in the form and content of *Guillaume*. Her actions reconfigure the narrative, and the depiction of this figure signals intertextual rewriting. Yet close analysis of Alixandrine also indicates

¹³⁹ Eley’s notion of ‘faultlines’ as a signal of rewriting will be explored in detail in Chapter Four of this thesis, see pp. 284-85. For her comments, see Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, pp. 7-9.

¹⁴⁰ Lefay-Toury, ‘Roman breton et mythes courtois (à suivre)’, p. 198; p. 195; Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, p. 187.

manipulation of the notions of doubling, correspondence, and recognition that are central to *Guillaume*. Alixandrine doubles Brande in the narrative, and the representation of this go-between fuses the doubled confidantes in Chrétien's *Cligès* alongside other intertextual models, emphasising the presence of doubling and correspondence within *Guillaume*. Recognition is highlighted in scenes featuring Alixandrine, as contradictions which result from intertextual fusion can be better understood when this rewriting is recognised. The narrative mismatches produced by the representation of Alixandrine's imagined dispute with Melior and the depiction of her betrothal to Brandin are a result of the poet's efforts to emphasise intertextual rewriting, indicating a wish to stress the intertextual sphere of this self-reflexive text. The audience are encouraged to perceive the narrative and intertextual layers of the text simultaneously and to see the romance as the result of intertextual rewriting, even if at times this rewriting renders certain parts of the narrative both ambiguous and contradictory.

Conclusion

The *Guillaume* poet highlights the self-reflexive nature of his romance by mirroring his compositional process through intertextual rewriting in a narrative that emphasises the theme of transformation. Ferlampin-Acher and Simons have both identified the *Guillaume* poet's use of the theme of transformation in the werewolf motif and animal-skin disguises to signal intertextual rewriting, yet analysis of the key female figures of *Guillaume* suggests that this theme is not only stressed in the depiction of Alphonse and Guillaume.¹⁴¹ Close reading of the representation of Melior, Felise, and Alixandrine has shown that the portrayal of these characters emphasises transformation, all the while signalling intertextual rewriting of material known to the audience.

Women are avatars of transformation in *Guillaume*. In the narrative, the three women analysed have varying degrees of influence, as Melior's passive role is

¹⁴¹ Their findings are discussed in the introduction to this thesis.

counterbalanced by Felise's dominance, whilst Alixandrine's actions as confidante and go-between trigger physical and narrative transformation and alter the course of the plot. The transformative impact that these figures have on the narrative signals the use and reconfiguration of intertextual material. For example, the passivity of Melior contrasts with the literary model her name signals, the heroine of *Partonopeus*, whereas Alixandrine's interventions in the plot align her with the confidante figures of Lunete, Urraque, and Thessala.

The poet stresses intertextual rewriting, as none of the key women are exact replicas of one single model known to the audience. Instead, each woman is formed through the transformation and fusion of different material, as elements from individual models are divided and recombined, such as the redistribution of elements of *Partonopeus* Melior into different characters. For example, although Melior's name echoes the *Partonopeus* heroine, the representation of Felise as a powerful woman aligns her more closely with this figure. The poet refracts and multiplies the allusions to each intertextual model in his representation of the three key women in *Guillaume*, emphasising transformation of this material and inviting the audience to perceive parallels between the text's narrative and intertextual layers.

However, analysis of these female figures indicates that the *Guillaume* poet's efforts to encourage perception of intertextual rewriting leads in places to contradictions in the narrative. For example, in consciously signalling an allusion to the triple wedding of *Partonopeus*, this scene is reduced to the function of an intertextual allusion. The poet neglects to nuance certain elements of the episode into the overarching narrative, and thus creates contradictory passages regarding the importance of seeking women's consent to marry. Understanding this scene as an intertextual allusion to *Partonopeus* sheds light on the reasons for the narrative contradictions within *Guillaume*, yet it also emphasises the

importance of the audience's recognition of intertextual allusions that signal the poet doubling narrative and intertextual spheres, as will be explored in Chapter Four.

The poet's repeated efforts to emphasise intertextual transformation in his depiction of Alixandrine, Felise, and Melior indicate his continued desire to stress the parallels between the form and content of *Guillaume*. These women double and transform the intertextual models that they signal, and the notions of doubling and correspondence that will be analysed in Chapter Three stretch over the inter-, intra-, and extra-textual spheres of the romance. The intertextual relationship between Alixandrine and Thessala as confidantes who manipulate magic strengthens the depiction of Alixandrine as a double of Brande, who in turn doubles Felise in the narrative through parallels linking and contrasting these women as queens and mothers. The poet also suggests that Felise is an intra-diagetic double for the patroness of the romance, further stressing the notions of doubling and correspondence that will be explored in the third chapter of this thesis.

Although analysis of women in *Guillaume* has highlighted links between the depiction of key female figures and the themes of recognition, doubling, and correspondence, this chapter has above all shed new light on links between women and transformation. By turning its critical gaze away from the werewolf and the quasi-metamorphosed eponymous hero, this analysis has indicated the fruitful nature of research into elements of *Guillaume* that remain under-explored by critics. In particular, it suggests that the poet's endeavours to emphasise his compositional process through the theme of transformation, as indicated by the work of Ferlampin-Acher and Simons, permeate different elements of the text.

However, this analysis has not exhaustively engaged with 'catalysts of transformation' in *Guillaume*, and has been limited only to figures in the text that actively alter the plot, or the representation of which signals intertextual allusions. Thus, there remains scope for further study to ascertain the extent to which transformation is

manipulated in elements which do not function as active narrative subjects and trigger change or signal rewriting, but which are rather abstract features of the romance's textual backdrop. For this reason, Chapter Two will now turn to 'abstract catalysts of transformation' in *Guillaume*, focusing on space due to its prominent role in shaping the key events of the romance. It will explore the representation of space in the narrative and use of this feature to emphasise parallels between the content of the romance and its form as a text composed through intertextual rewriting. It will examine how characters' movement into particular spaces are manipulated to alter the course of the narrative, all the while engaging with analysis of the way in which the depiction of specific spaces highlights scenes from intertextual material rewritten in *Guillaume*.

Chapter Two: Space as a catalyst of transformation

The first chapter of this thesis explored reflections of the *Guillaume* poet's compositional process in the narrative through analysis of women as 'concrete catalysts of transformation'. However, it indicated that further study was necessary to understand whether the same function was fulfilled by 'abstract' elements of *Guillaume*. The backdrop against which the events of the romance take place forms an abstract element with which the poet foregrounds transformation. In particular, space is manipulated in the narrative to shape the plot and create allusions to intertextual material. As observed by critics, the poet emphasises a number of geographical locations in *Guillaume*, and Simons notes that the romance is 'structured around notions of space', as the plot follows a cyclical structure that starts and ends in Palermo.¹

In her analysis of rural space in *Guillaume*, Simons argues that the depictions of certain spaces signal 'intertextual dialogues', such as a reference to the Ardennes forest (v. 8191) that alludes to *Partonopeus de Blois*.² Simons also identifies the transformative effect that spaces such as the 'vergier' have on the narrative, and as such her work establishes a preliminary framework for analysing space as an 'abstract catalyst of transformation' in *Guillaume*.³ Employing the methodological approach used to discuss 'concrete catalysts of transformation' in Chapter One, this chapter will use close reading of *Guillaume* to explore the way in which the use of specific spaces to triggers transformation in the narrative and signals intertextual rewriting. In particular, it will examine characters' movement between spaces, discussing the way in which this movement highlights the process of narrative and intertextual transformation.

In order to analyse movement between defined spaces in *Guillaume*, this analysis will focus on three demarcated spaces: the Straits of Messina; the forest and 'wild spaces'

¹ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 409; Dunn, pp. 39-85; Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 23-5; pp. 108-12.

² Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', pp. 409-10; p. 429.

³ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 413.

outside Rome and between Rome and Sicily; and the ‘vergiers’ in Rome and Palermo. These spaces have been selected due to their links with important narrative events and the repeated use of these settings in the romance. The Straits of Messina are crossed twice in *Guillaume*, and both the forest and the ‘vergier’ are each used three times as the setting for events that alter the plot. Although Simons discusses these spaces, she neither explores the relationship between them and the notion of transformation, nor examines the way in which the depiction of characters’ movements into and within these spaces suggests their function as an abstract element of the romance that signals its self-reflexive nature.⁴

This chapter will explore how the poet uses these spaces to alter the trajectory of the plot and to catalyse the audience’s recognition of the romance’s intertextual sphere. The borders or frontiers that surround these spaces mark them out from other settings in the romance, and are used to highlight intertextual allusions. Although the terms ‘border’ and ‘frontier’ have been referred to by Zumthor as ‘ambiguë’, the presence of borders and frontiers in literary texts nevertheless allow us to ‘cut out a given expanse in an otherwise unbroken continuum’ and to ‘distinguish between two spaces’ within the narrative.⁵ In *Guillaume*, the poet depicts borders that are man-made, such as the wall around the ‘vergier’, as well as others that are naturally occurring, such as the edge of the forest and the different landmasses that delineate the Straits of Messina. Characters’ movement across the borders of and through these spaces aligns with significant events in the plot, all the while signalling scenes from material manipulated in the text.

Analysis of demarcated spaces as indicators of intertextual transformation aligns with critics’ examination of signals that highlight rewriting in literary texts, as explored in particular by theorists of parody. For example, Hutcheon notes that a text which consciously reworks pre-existing material depends on the ability of its reader or audience

⁴ In her study of *Guillaume* entitled ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, Simons discusses the Straits of Messina on pp. 424-25, the forest on pp. 414-17 and pp. 426-29, and the ‘vergier’ on pp. 412-13.

⁵ Paul Zumthor, *La Mesure du monde: représentation de l’espace au moyen âge* (Paris: Seuil, 1993), p. 59; Fabienne L. Michelet, *Creation, Migration, and Conquest: Imaginary Geography and Sense of Space in Old English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 10.

to acknowledge ‘that what they are reading *is* a parody’.⁶ Critics have observed that this recognition is often facilitated by ‘des signaux invitant et aidant le lecteur à identifier un autre texte sous le texte qu’il lit’.⁷ Similarly, medievalists studying the ‘game of romance’ stress the importance of the audience’s recognition of rewriting, noting that this was often enabled by markers or signals in the narrative.⁸ Indeed, in her analysis of parody in *Guillaume*, Ferlampin-Acher comments on her search for ‘des marqueurs de parodie’.⁹ This analysis of demarcated spaces in *Guillaume* will extend Ferlampin-Acher’s analysis to the broader notion of intertextual rewriting. Using close readings of key episodes set in demarcated spaces in *Guillaume*, it will be the first of its kind to examine space as a signal of rewriting in the text. By exploring the hypothesis that the poet uses three bordered spaces to trigger narrative change and simultaneously signal rewriting, this study will shed further light on the parallels between the content and form of *Guillaume* and its nature as a self-reflexive romance.

The understanding of space used in this analysis is based on de Certeau’s definition of ‘espace’ as ‘un lieu pratiqué’, a meeting of different elements that is ‘animé par l’ensemble des mouvements qui s’y déploient’.¹⁰ This definition contrasts with that given by de Certeau of ‘lieu’, a term that denotes stability and order in which ‘les éléments considérés sont les uns à côté des autres’.¹¹ ‘Place’ refers to a particular setting without the different events that take place within it, and a ‘space’ is the animated version of this stable ‘place’. For example, ‘place’ may be used to designate the building that is called a house, whereas ‘space’ is applied to discussion of this ‘place’ as one in which people interact and in which events take place. In this chapter, I will analyse the depiction

⁶ Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody*, p. 93.

⁷ Sangsue, *La Parodie*, pp. 84-85. See also Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Guillaume de Palerne*: une parodie?’, p. 59; Rose, p. 37.

⁸ Bruckner, ‘Intertextuality’, p. 230.

⁹ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Guillaume de Palerne*: une parodie?’, pp. 59-60.

¹⁰ Michel de Certeau, *L’Invention du quotidien: Arts de faire*, 2nd edn., 2 vols (Paris: Gallimard, 1990), I, pp. 172-73.

¹¹ De Certeau, p. 173.

of particular ‘places’ that become animated ‘spaces’ in *Guillaume* due to characters’ movements and the action that takes place within them, using the terms ‘space’ and ‘setting’ synonymously throughout my analysis.

The focus on space presented by this chapter also aligns with the critical trend of analyses of space in medieval literature. In the latter part of the twentieth century, key scholars such as Hanning, Le Goff, and Zumthor broadened understanding of space in medieval studies.¹² Their work corresponded with the growing number of analyses of space in literature that developed from studies of space in semantics and poetry in the mid-twentieth century.¹³ Within this ‘geocriticism’ in literary analysis, scholars also began to incorporate sociological approaches, such as those of Lefebvre, and their work formed the theoretical movement known as the ‘spatial turn’.¹⁴ These studies discussed the way in which space, an abstract element of a text, ‘shapes narrative structure’ and is manipulated by authors.¹⁵ Indeed, Genette stressed the importance of studying literature ‘dans ses rapports avec l’espace’.¹⁶

This chapter expands on approaches to space in literary criticism by engaging with close examination of the representation of bordered spaces in *Guillaume*. In so doing, it also blends the methodological approaches adopted by medievalists in analyses of space in French romance. Some critics have focused on the use of different spaces in one single

¹² Robert W. Hanning, *The Individual in Twelfth-century Romance* (London: Yale University Press, 1977), pp. 160-70; Jacques Le Goff, *L’Imaginaire Médiéval* (Paris: Gallimard, 1985), p. xv and pp. 59-75; Zumthor, *La Mesure du monde*.

¹³ Gaston Bachelard, *La Poétique de l’espace* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967); Maurice Blanchot, *L’Espace littéraire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1955); Michel Butor, *Répertoire II* (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1964), pp. 42-50; Gérard Genette, *Figures II* (Paris: Seuil, 1969), pp. 43-8; Jean-Pierre Richard, *Poésie et profondeur* (Paris: Seuil, 1955).

¹⁴ Henri Lefebvre, *La Production de l’espace* (Paris: Anthropos, 1974). See also the following: Jon L. Berquist, ‘Introduction: Critical Spatiality and the Uses of Theory’, in *Constructions of Space I: Theory, Geography, and Narrative*, ed. by Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), pp. 1-12; Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989); Antje Ziethen, ‘La Littérature et l’espace’, *Arborescences*, 3 (2013), <<http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1017363ar>> [accessed 19 January 2015] (pp. 1-29).

¹⁵ Sharon Kinoshita, *Medieval Boundaries: Rethinking Difference in Old French Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), p. 3.

¹⁶ Genette, *Figures II*, p. 43. See also Michel Crouzet, ‘Introduction’, in *Espaces Romanesques*, ed. by Michel Crouzet (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982), pp. 1-2 (p. 1).

text, such as Zovic's examination of transgressive spaces in Bérout's *Tristan*, whereas others have analysed the representation of one individual space across a corpus of works.¹⁷ Medievalists have also explored the relationship between man and particular spaces.¹⁸ In particular, critics have examined the way in which the settings of literary works were 'real' spaces known to the audience and endowed with symbolic meaning that was influenced by representations of these spaces in fictional texts.¹⁹ As a consequence, poets depicted particular spaces in their texts in order to encourage an audience to perceive latent symbolic meanings and intertextual references. This chapter will develop approaches to studying poets' use of space to signal symbolic meanings and intertextual rewriting, examining whether the same technique was used by the *Guillaume* poet to signal the intertextual sphere of his romance.

This focused and detailed analysis of space as a catalyst of transformation in *Guillaume* will explore the poet's use of demarcated spaces to alter the course of the plot and to highlight reconfiguration of intertextual material. Just as Chapter One suggested that the manipulation of women as a concrete catalyst of transformation in *Guillaume* emphasises the notions of doubling and recognition that are key to the self-reflexive nature of the romance, this chapter will also question whether it is possible to perceive a similar emphasis on doubling and recognition in the use of space. In so doing, it will present additional evidence with which to establish whether the poet reflects his compositional process in parts of the narrative unrelated to Guillaume and Alphonse, thus complementing the findings of Chapter One. It will continue to extend the critical gaze on transformation in *Guillaume* to more elements of the text, and will build on the work of

¹⁷ Neda Chernack Zovic, *Les Espaces de la transgression dans le Tristan de Bérout* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996). For analyses of individual spaces, see Ribard's analysis of the forest and 'l'Autre monde', and Le Goff's discussion of the 'désert-forêt'. Jacques Ribard, 'Espace romanesque et symbolisme dans la littérature arthurienne du XIIe siècle' in *Espaces Romanesques*, pp. 73-82 (pp. 76-81); Le Goff, pp. 59-75. See also Albrecht Classen, 'Introduction', in *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age*, ed. by Classen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 1-191.

¹⁸ Georges Duby, *L'Économie rurale et la vie des campagnes dans l'Occident médiéval*, 2 vols (Paris: Aubier, 1962); Georges Duby, *Hommes et structures du Moyen Âge* (Paris: Mouton, 1973).

¹⁹ Zumthor states that each romance setting, 'n'est jamais dépourvu de sens pour celui qui "s'y trouve"'. Zumthor, *La Mesure du monde*, p. 52. See also Le Goff, p. xv.

Simons in order to understand the relationship between space, narrative transformation, and intertextual rewriting in this self-reflexive romance.

The straits of Messina

The straits of Messina, referred to as ‘Far’ in *Guillaume* (v. 115, v. 117), are situated between the Sicilian town of Messina and the Italian towns of Villa San Giovanni and Reggio in Calabria.²⁰ The straits are delineated by the landmasses they separate, the island of Sicily and the south-western tip of Italy, and are seen as a bordered space that triggers narrative change and signals intertextual rewriting when crossed. The ‘Far’ is traversed twice in *Guillaume*, once by Alphonse carrying the young Guillaume (vv. 113-18), and once by Guillaume, Melior, and the werewolf who guides them to Sicily (vv. 4573-4619). Each crossing alters the geographical setting of the text, which shifts from Sicily to mainland Italy and back again. However, the first journey across this space has the strongest impact on the narrative and more clearly signals intertextual rewriting. The second crossing can be seen as a reprise with variation of the first, as the lovers return to Sicily with the help of the same werewolf who had taken Guillaume from this land at the start of the narrative, and I will therefore focus only on the first crossing.²¹

Although only a few lines are dedicated to description of the first crossing of the straits, the werewolf’s passage across the ‘Far’ with Guillaume nevertheless stresses the importance of this space. After kidnapping Guillaume from the Palermo ‘vergièr’, Alphonse flees to Messina, chased by King Embron and his men (vv. 103-15). The poet glosses over the wolf’s journey, reducing the spatial distance between Palermo and Messina (over 140 miles) with a temporal quickening that stresses the arrival of the beast and his pursuers at the ‘Far’, rather than the wolf’s movement across Sicily: ‘Fuit s’en li leus et cil après / Qui de l’ataindre sont engrés; / Desi *au Far* le vont chaçant: (vv. 113-

²⁰ ‘Far’ is defined as ‘Meerenge’ (straits) or ‘Bucht von Messina’ (bay of Messina). ‘Far’ in Tobler, III, p. 1630.

²¹ I will refer to Alphonse as ‘werewolf’ and ‘wolf’ interchangeably throughout this chapter, and will discuss the poet’s use of these different terms in Chapter Four, pp. 255-68.

15) (emphasis mine). The poet pushes the chase of Alphonse to its geographical limit within Sicily, and stresses the notion of the 'Far' as a decisive bordered space. The wolf's crossing of the straits with Guillaume marks a turning point in the plot:

Il saut en l'eve a tout l'enfant.
Le Far *trespasse*, *perdu* l'ont
Li rois et cil qui o lui sont.
Ensi s'en va en tel maniere
A tout l'enfant la beste fiere.
Li rois arriere s'en retourne.
Molt a le cuer triste et morne
De son enfant qu'a si *perdu*;
A la cité sont revenu. (vv. 116-124) (emphasis mine)

The verb 'trespasser' emphasises the notion of the straits as a bordered space to be traversed. The immediate juxtaposition of this term with 'perdu' indicates a direct correlation between the wolf's movement across the straits and the image of Embron forced to return to Palermo without Guillaume, emphasised by the repetition of 'perdu' (v. 117, v. 123). The 'Far' becomes a point of no return for both father and son, whose movements are directly contrasted in the text. The King returns sorrowfully to his palace without his son and heir (vv. 121-4), whereas Guillaume's journey with Alphonse continues beyond the straits through mainland Italy and ends in the forest outside Rome (vv. 119-20, vv. 168-72). This new setting permanently alters the eponymous hero's life, as he is transformed from Sicilian prince to unknown foundling and is left in a foreign land in the care of a wolf (vv. 173-86).

The narrative transformation wrought by passage across the straits of Messina is accompanied by intertextual rewriting signalled by this space. A relationship between characters' journey across a body of water and narrative change is found in other Old French texts. For example, Zumthor notes that rivers, seas, and fords often act as a frontier, and Frappier observes that such 'frontières humides' separate the 'real' world of

the narrative and 'l'Autre monde' of the 'merveilleux'.²² Close observation of the depiction of Alphonse and Guillaume crossing the straits and the impact of this journey on the narrative indicate use of this space to signal material that is rewritten and fused together in the romance. The poet combines and transforms the depiction of this space from two different story models, blending images of this frontier leading to 'l'Autre monde' in *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus de Blois* with the notion of water as a border separating father and son in the legend of St Eustace and *Guillaume d'Angleterre*.²³ These two sets of works are linked intertextually, as one work within each pair is an intertextual rewriting of the other, and rewriting of them in *Guillaume* provides evidence of a conscious selection of works that are in explicit dialogue with one another.

The first intertextual model signalled by Alphonse and Guillaume's passage across the 'Far' is the journey into the world of the 'merveilleux', as represented in *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus*. In these texts, the latter of which rewrites the former, the fate of the young hero is transformed when he is alone in the forest and boards a magical vessel that transports him to a far-away and marvellous country (*Guigemar*, vv. 89-208; *Partonopeus*, vv. 625-773).²⁴ The crossing of a 'frontière humide' to 'l'Autre monde' is particularly emphasised in the overtly magical depiction of the Chef d'Oire in which the *Partonopeus* hero arrives (vv. 774-880). However, like the crossing of the 'Far' in *Guillaume*, the events that unfold after the water crossing in both *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus* transform the trajectory of the plot, as the eponymous heroes each fall in love with a woman they meet on the other side of this transformative space.

²² Zumthor, *La Mesure du monde*, p. 59; Jean Frappier, 'Remarques sur la structure du lai. Essai de définition et de classement', in Jean Frappier, *Du Moyen Age à la Renaissance: études d'histoire et de critique littéraire* (Paris: Champion, 1976), pp. 15-35 (pp. 23-24).

²³ Marie de France, 'Guigemar', in *Lais de Marie de France*, pp. 26-71; *La Vie de Saint Eustache: Poème français du XIII^e siècle*, ed. by Holger Petersen (Paris: Champion, 1928); Chrétien, *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, ed. by A. J. Holden (Geneva: Droz, 1988).

²⁴ For comments on the reworking of *Guigemar* in *Partonopeus*, see the following: Eley, 'Partonopeus de Blois', p. 24; Eley and Simons, 'Partonopeus de Blois and Chrétien de Troyes', p. 320; Sebastian I. Sobceki, 'A Source for the Magical Ship in the *Partonopeus de Blois* and Marie de France's *Guigemar*', *Notes and Queries*, 48 (2001), 220-22.

The *Guillaume* poet manipulates the intertextual model of a plot-altering journey to 'l'Autre monde' in his romance, demonstrating rewriting of this material in his depiction of the 'Far' crossing. Just as in *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus*, Alphonse and Guillaume's passage across the straits takes place in the opening scenes of the narrative, and it is the hero of the three works whose fate is reconfigured by this movement. The presence of the straits in *Guillaume* signals the possibility of transformation and alludes to similar journeys in these intertexts. However, the *Guillaume* poet alters the model offered by these works. Unlike *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus*, who enter a sumptuous magical vessel voluntarily and undertake their sea crossing unaccompanied, Guillaume is taken against his will across the straits, carried in the mouth of a wolf that swims from one shore to the other, rather than sailing in a luxurious boat.²⁵

Further elements of these texts are rewritten in *Guillaume*. Both *Partonopeus* and *Guigemar* are young knights when they cross the 'frontière humide', yet this motif is changed and exaggerated by the *Guillaume* poet, who depicts the hero making this life-changing sea crossing at only four years of age (v. 35).²⁶ This alteration to the models of *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus* has an impact on the expectation for the crossing to be immediately followed by the main adventure of the romance. Unlike the intertexts alluded to, where there is a smooth *enchaînement* between the heroes' arrival in 'l'Autre monde' and the adventures that befall them there, Guillaume's extreme youth thwarts this expectation, as the audience must wait a few years before the main adventures of the romance. What is more, the 'merveilleux' lands of the intertextual models are replaced with the 'real' location of Rome. Although Guillaume's passage to Italy does alter his fate, this crossing does not present the audience with an unknown and fantastical setting.

²⁵ The luxurious interior of the vessels is emphasised in both texts: *Guigemar*, vv. 170-86; *Partonopeus*, vv. 755-62. Although the ships embark on a voyage suddenly and without the heroes' control over their navigation, both *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus* choose to enter these boats.

²⁶ *Partonopeus* is only thirteen years old at the start of the romance (v. 543). Marie does not state *Guigemar*'s age, although he is referred to as 'dancel' (v. 37), and is therefore still a young knight. For comments on the depiction of the age of the hero in both texts, see Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', pp. 22-24.

Rewriting of the *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus* model is emphasised in the passage, and the narrative is allowed to turn in a different direction, thus making links with a different story model and different intertexts in *Guillaume*.

The *Guillaume* poet also playfully transforms the association in *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus* between hunting and the heroes' journey across this transitional body of water. In both works the heroes find the boats after a hunting episode (*Guigemar*, vv. 76-151; *Partonopeus*, vv. 583-701), scenes that represent the motif of the 'chasse merveilleuse'.²⁷ Both *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus* become isolated in a forest where they come into contact with a beast that is seen to be responsible for the events that befall them and which culminate in their passage to 'l'Autre monde', a motif developed by the *Partonopeus* poet from *Guigemar*.²⁸ The *Guillaume* poet takes the constituent parts of this motif (the wild animal, the hero's isolation, and hunting) and redistributes them in his text to transform his intertextual models. Rather than the hero hunting prey, Guillaume is abducted by an animal that is then hunted by the King and his men who follow them 'à esperon' (v. 103). The order of events is also reconfigured, as the hero is isolated from his family and removed from familiar surroundings after he is abducted by the wolf, rather than before he encounters this creature. The poet stresses the image of Guillaume's isolation from humans by depicting the wolf caring for the child over eight days in the forest outside Rome (v. 169-86). The distinct absence of magic in these scenes and the journey across the straits also alters the association found in the intertextual models between the 'chasse merveilleuse', the sea-crossing, and 'l'Autre monde'.

The straits of Messina act as a transformative space which catalyses events in the narrative whilst signalling and rewriting elements of *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus*. Yet, the

²⁷ This motif depicts the meeting between the hero and an animal that guides him to an encounter with a fairy-mistress or to 'l'Autre monde'. Laurence Harf-Lancner, *Les Fées au Moyen Âge: Morgane et Mélusine: La Naissance des fées* (Paris: Champion, 1984), pp. 223-41 (p. 227).

²⁸ The animals are a white doe in *Guigemar* (vv. 90-92) and a wild boar in *Partonopeus* (v. 585). The depiction of the hero isolated whilst hunting 'clearly underlies the first section of *Partonopeus*' and is developed from *Guigemar*. Eley and Simons, '*Partonopeus de Blois* and Chrétien de Troyes', p. 320. See also Fourrier, *Le Courant réaliste*, pp. 385-86.

representation of the wolf crossing the ‘Far’ with Guillaume also alludes to a second intertextual model. The legend of St Eustace and *Guillaume d’Angleterre* both manipulate the image of a wild animal abducting a child and thus triggering the separation of a father and son. The legend of St Eustace, dating from as early as the eighth century, appeared in European vernaculars from the twelfth century and survives in Old French verse and prose versions.²⁹ This legend was rewritten in the latter part of the twelfth century by the poet of *Guillaume d’Angleterre*, known only as ‘Chrestien’ and believed by some to be Chrétien de Troyes.³⁰ Both the St Eustace legend and *Guillaume d’Angleterre* manipulate the Romulus-type motif in their depiction of an animal taking a young child, and critics have observed intertextual manipulation of this motif and these works in *Guillaume* through the representation of Alphonse caring for Guillaume in the forest outside Rome.³¹ Indeed, Ferlampin-Acher states that ‘le garou qui s’occupe de Guillaume est un double de la louve romaine, mais il rappelle aussi l’animal nourricier de certaines vies de saints (par exemple dans des versions de la légende de saint Eustache)’.³² However, scholars have not noted that the transformative space of the straits of Messina signals these intertextual models to the audience before the wolf’s arrival in the forest outside of Rome.

The main protagonists of the St Eustace legend and *Guillaume d’Angleterre* attempt to cross a body of water with two young sons when a wild animal appears and abducts the children. In the hagiographical legend, Eustace must cross a river with his

²⁹ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, in *Guillaume de Palerne*, pp. 55-57; Gordon Hall Gerould, ‘Forerunners, Congeners and Derivatives of the Eustace Legend’, *PMLA*, 19 (1904), 335-448 (p. 354); Urban T. Holmes, *A History of Old French Literature* (New York: F. S. Crofts, 1937), pp. 47-48; Hermann Knust, ‘Introduccion á la leyenda de San Eustaquio’, in *Dos obras didácticas y dos leyendas: sacadas de manuscritos de la Biblioteca del Escorial* (Madrid: M. Ginesta, 1878), pp. 107-121 (pp. 107-08); Paul Meyer, ‘Notice: Du ms. F 149 de la bibliothèque nationale de Madrid’, *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, 4 (1878), 38-59 (pp. 57-58).

³⁰ Christine Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, in Chrétien de Troyes [?], *Guillaume d’Angleterre*, trans. and ed. by Christine Ferlampin-Acher (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2007), pp. 7-68 (pp. 11-14 and p. 37); A. J. Holden, ‘Introduction’, in *Guillaume d’Angleterre*, ed. by A. J. Holden (Geneva: Droz, 1988), pp. 9-37 (p. 9); Maurice Wilmotte, ‘Introduction’, in Chrétien de Troyes, *Guillaume d’Angleterre*, ed. by Maurice Wilmotte (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1962), pp. iii-xiv (p. x); Maurice Wilmotte, ‘Le Conte de *Guillaume d’Angleterre*’, *Le Moyen Age*, 2 (1889), 188-91; Maurice Wilmotte, ‘Chrétien de Troyes et le conte de *Guillaume d’Angleterre*’, *Romania*, 46 (1920), 1-38.

³¹ Dunn, pp. 88-89 and pp. 112-14; Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, in *Guillaume de Palerne*, pp. 15-18 and pp. 57-59. See also Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, pp. 415-18.

³² Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?*’, p. 61.

sons but cannot carry them both across at once, so he takes the younger child first, leaving the older child on the riverbank. However, disaster strikes for both children when he returns to fetch the other son, as described in *La Vie de St Eustache*:³³

Kant ill out passé le menor,
Sil vient après por le greignor.
Ainz qu'il se fust del gué issu,
Un grant lyon est la venu
Ou l'enfant iert, sil l'a saisi,
Et puis s'en est o tout parti.
Et quant cil vit qu'il le tenoit
Et quel pas sieurre nel porroit,
Retorne soi de l'autre part.
Mes un leu fu en son esgart
Qui ja avoit pris l'autre enfant
Et s'en estoit alé fuiant. (vv. 895-906)

The river acts as a trigger for change in the narrative that affects the fate of Eustace and his sons, stressed by the emphasis of Eustace's movement across the river and back again (v. 895, v. 903) and the immediate disasters that befall him there.

Guillaume d'Angleterre follows the St Eustace legend as an intertextual model, particularly in its representation of the abduction of the hero's children. In this romance, merchants carry off Guillaume's wife to their ship, leaving him alone with his two newborn sons with whom he decides to set sail in a boat moored on the beach (vv. 745-64). He attempts to carry the children to the boat one at a time, and his movement across the beach echoes Eustace's crossing of the river by triggering events that mirror the St Eustace model:

A tout l'un des anfans s'an va,
L'autre lez la roiche laissa,
A la mer vint, si a trové
Un des batiaus toust apresté,
L'enfant i met et revet tost
L'autre quierre, ains qu'il se repost.

³³ *La Vie de Saint Eustache* is preserved in ms. 9446 of the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid and ms. 792 of the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève in Paris, and dates from the mid- to late thirteenth century. The *Guillaume* poet is likely to have known the legend, particularly if *Guillaume* was composed for Yolande de Hainaut, as her scribe Pierre de Beauvais composed a version in 1200. Dunn, pp. 112-13; John Fisher, 'La Vie de Saint Eustache par Pierre de Beauvais', *The Romanic Review*, 8 (1917), 1-67 (especially pp. 1-8); Alexandre Micha, 'Introduction', pp. 26-27; Holger Petersen, 'Introduction', in *La Vie de Saint Eustache: Poème français du XIII^e siècle*, pp. iii-xv.

Jusqu'a la roiche ne s'aresté
Mais trové i a une beste,
Grant come lou et lou sambloit;
A cele beste tenir voit
L'anfant an sa gueule angoulé (vv. 767-77)

The poet stresses the presence of the sea in this scene (v. 769), and the abduction of Guillaume's son invokes the events of the St Eustace legend. However, only one animal appears and abducts the child left on land in *Guillaume d'Angleterre* (v. 774-77), leaving the other abandoned in the boat moored on the beach. More intertextual transformation is created when Guillaume chases after the wolf, although he is unable to keep pace and collapses with tiredness (vv. 782-93). The second child is not kidnapped by another wild animal, but rather is found and taken by passing merchants who also rescue the first son from the wolf that had abducted him (vv. 794-841).

The poet of *Guillaume d'Angleterre* rewrites the St Eustace legend, and the poet of *Guillaume de Palerne* manipulates both texts individually in the 'Far' episode. For example, from *Guillaume d'Angleterre* he borrows the image of the father chasing after the animal abductor, emphasised in King Embron's attempt to retrieve Guillaume from the fleeing werewolf. However, the image of father and son separated by a body of water that lies between them is taken from the legend of St Eustace, in which one son is abducted from the far side of the river when Eustace returns for the other child. This motif is stressed in *Guillaume de Palerne* when Alphonse crosses the straits, as this movement irreversibly separates Embron and Guillaume.

The depiction of the events that occur at the straits of Messina also signals and rewrites elements common to both intertexts. The 'Far' aligns with the river in the St Eustace legend and the sea in *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, as all three spaces spark narrative change that reconfigures the plot of each work. The main narrative alteration brought about by these settings is the separation of a father and son. The 'Far' becomes a point of no return that forces King Embron to journey back to Palermo without his child, just as

Eustace and Guillaume are left bereft of their young sons after their respective river- and sea-episodes. However, the poet of *Guillaume de Palerne* alters his intertextual models. Unlike the St Eustace legend and its derivative romance, the hero of *Guillaume de Palerne* is not the father of the abducted children, but the kidnapped child. The wolf's movement across the 'Far' also contrasts with the works alluded to, as these texts present creatures abducting children at the water's edge and carrying them away from, rather than across, the body of water at which the scene takes place.

The *Guillaume* poet also identifies and separates individual elements of these intertextual models, redistributing these motifs elsewhere in his work. These intertexts each depict the abduction of two children, yet in *Guillaume de Palerne* only one child is taken and carried across the straits of Messina. However, *Guillaume* does in fact portray two abductions. The poet echoes the wolf's kidnapping of Guillaume in the beast's later abduction of the provost's son outside Benevento (vv. 4075-4118). These two intratextually linked scenes highlight the transformation and rearrangement of intertextual material, as they both allude to and rewrite the abduction of children in the St Eustace legend and *Guillaume d'Angleterre*.

The poet further redistributes elements of these intertexts in his depiction of the close relationship between the wolf and Guillaume that rewrites the motif of twins or brothers common to both intertexts. As observed by Pairet, and as I will explore in Chapter Three, these figures are portrayed as doubles in the romance.³⁴ The parallel between the crossing of the 'Far' and scenes in the St Eustace legend and *Guillaume d'Angleterre* suggests at this early stage in the narrative that the wolf is almost like a brother figure for Guillaume, acting as the second abducted child in spite of his role as abductor. The image of Alphonse and Guillaume as doubles is developed throughout the text, as the poet sheds more light on the way in which the relationship between these two characters indicates that they double one another in the narrative.

³⁴ Pairet, p. 66. See comments in Chapter Three, pp. 185-211.

One significant element of the intertextual models rewritten in the ‘Far’ crossing in *Guillaume* is the age of the abducted child. In *Guillaume d’Angleterre* the children are new-born (vv. 455-509), and although the age of the children in the St Eustace legend is not clear, there is an indication that they are both under four years old (vv. 103-04). The *Guillaume de Palerne* poet aligns with variants of the St Eustace model and replaces the new-born children in *Guillaume d’Angleterre* with a four-year-old (v. 35). Although this could be seen as additional evidence of the poet selecting different elements of the two linked intertexts for his work, I believe that this age in fact highlights the fusion of the different intertextual models represented by the St Eustace legend and *Guillaume d’Angleterre* on the one hand, and *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus* on the other.

Guillaume’s age is an incongruous element in the depiction of the ‘Far’ crossing, and it is accentuated by the distance that the wolf carries the child. In the St Eustace legend and *Guillaume d’Angleterre*, very young children are abducted and carried an unspecified distance by the animals that kidnap them, and there is nothing to suggest in either text that this distance is particularly great.³⁵ In contrast, the wolf in *Guillaume de Palerne* not only carries the child from Palermo to Messina (over 140 miles), it also succeeds in swimming across the straits with the infant (at least 1.9 miles). Simons observes that this feat is rendered almost unbelievable by Guillaume’s age, noting that ‘the audience’s credibility is stretched’ and that they only suspend their disbelief due to the ‘highly detailed realism’ found in the depiction of the wolf in the forest outside Rome.³⁶ However, Simons has not observed that the exaggerated age of Guillaume and the distance travelled by the wolf are in fact a product of the fusion of intertextual models from two traditions. The image of a young child carried by a wild animal is taken from the St Eustace legend and *Guillaume d’Angleterre*, and the journey across the sea to a far-

³⁵ For example, in *Guillaume d’Angleterre* the merchants who take the abducted child from the wolf rescue the second child from the boat shortly afterwards, indicating that the wolf has not travelled particularly far (vv. 782-821).

³⁶ Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 421.

away destination alludes to *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus*. The age of Guillaume in this scene is mid-way between the youthful knights of the latter texts, and the young abducted children of the former, and the wolf's actions taking Guillaume across the 'Far' and all the way to Rome blends the role of kidnapping beast with magical vessel. The result is an incongruous and incredible feat which functions as a 'faultline' in the romance, highlighting the mismatches created by the poet's fusion of these intertexts.³⁷

The straits of Messina are a transformative space in *Guillaume*, bordered by the landmasses that they separate. Crossing the 'Far' triggers irreversible changes in the narrative, and the presence of this bordered body of water signals intertextual allusions that the poet rewrites. The intertexts manipulated in this scene highlight the poet's compositional approach, as he manipulates works individually and simultaneously that are engaged in dialogue with one another, foregrounding rewriting and the intertextual network of his romance. This intertextual rewriting results in the poet thwarting the audience's expectations for Alphonse and Guillaume's crossing of the Straits to lead to directly to an encounter with a fair maiden, or for the young prince to be immediately rescued from the animal that kidnaps him like the St Eustace model. However, in order to further understand further manipulation of the intertextual allusions signalled by this bordered space, this analysis will now turn to the next setting of the narrative, the forest.

The forest

The forest is the second bordered space that functions as a catalyst of narrative and intertextual transformation in *Guillaume*, and features prominently in the romance. I will use the term 'forest' to denote both wooded landscapes and the wild, unpopulated spaces through which characters travel, such as the fens and marshland referred to as

³⁷ For more discussion of the concept of faultlines as signalling intertextual fusion, see comments in Chapter One, pp. 102-04, and Chapter Four, pp. 283-85.

‘markais’ (v. 246, v. 3190).³⁸ Three key episodes take place in the forest that transform the narrative and signal intertextual allusions. First, the poet depicts Alphonse caring for Guillaume in the forest outside of Rome, where the child is discovered by a local cowherd who adopts him and changes his identity (vv. 166-269). Second, the Emperor of Rome finds Guillaume in the same forest seven years later and invites the boy to become a member of his household, altering the fate of the eponymous hero by moving him to the world of the court (vv. 359-647). Finally, the poet portrays Guillaume and Melior’s flight through the forest and wild spaces from Rome, as the lovers are led by Alphonse to Sicily where the final scenes of the romance take place (vv. 3169-4560).³⁹

These episodes are set in forests and wild spaces that present ‘un lieu de frontière, à la limite du royaume et donc du monde civilisé’, separated from the spaces that surround them by ‘a natural border, the frontier between two adjacent territories’.⁴⁰ As the poet emphasises characters’ movement in and out of these spaces (for example, vv. 3169-72), he creates the image of a threshold around the forest that triggers narrative change and highlights intertextual allusions when crossed. The forest was a prominent space in the works rewritten by the *Guillaume* poet, yet this setting was a ‘real’ location known to the audience as an important space that provided resources and ground for hunting in the Middle Ages.⁴¹ However, the forest also became linked to literary motifs, as poets manipulated intertextual and symbolic associations established in other works in order to develop the audience’s ‘connaissance [...] symbolique et imaginaire’ of this space.⁴²

³⁸ Simons refers to ‘wild spaces’ in the text, using the term to qualify the ‘long stretches of land between Rome and Palermo’. See Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 412.

³⁹ The verses given are interspersed with other scenes, such as the episode in the quarry outside Benevento (vv. 3881-4255), and the depiction of Nathaniel’s reaction to the lovers’ disappearance (vv. 3411-3865).

⁴⁰ Mattia Cavagna, ‘Le Désert-forêt dans le roman de *Partonopeus de Blois*’, in *Partonopeus in Europe*, ed. by Hanley, Longtin, and Eley, pp. 209-24 (p. 210); Rosa A. Perez, ‘The Forest as a Locus of Transition and Transformation in the Epic Romance *Berte as grans piés*’, in *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age*, ed. by Classen, pp. 433-50 (p. 439).

⁴¹ Dubost, p. 314; Derek Pearsall and Elizabeth Salter, *Landscapes of the Medieval World* (London: Elek Books, 1973), p. 53; Corinne J. Saunders, *The Forest of Medieval Romance: Avernus, Broceliande, Arden* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993), pp. 2-5.

⁴² Zovic, p. 5.

Critics have observed the representation of the forest as a space of exile and wildness, themes explored in texts such as Bérroul's *Tristan*, Chrétien's *Yvain*, and the anonymous *Partonopeus*.⁴³ The forest is also a 'place of mystery' commonly associated with transformation and the 'merveilleux', as found in Marie de France's *Guigemar* and *Bisclavret*.⁴⁴ Indeed, the forest is seen to be 'au cœur de l'aventure chevaleresque', as demonstrated by the dominant role it plays as a setting in the romances of Chrétien de Troyes.⁴⁵

The first forest episode in *Guillaume* manipulates different images and intertexts linked to the forest in its presentation of Alphonse caring for Guillaume. The forest functions as a place of exile for the wolf and the child it has abducted, as it is the end destination of their journey from Palermo:

Tant l'a porté et jor et nuit
Et tante terre trespasee
Que pres de Roume en la countree,
En une grant forest s'arreste
Ou ot mainte sauvage beste. (vv. 168-72)

The depiction of the wolf suggests that this creature has arrived in its natural habitat, a space home to 'mainte sauvage beste' (v. 172). The forest setting creates an expectation for savage behaviour from this child-snatching beast, adding to the image of the wolf as a terrifying animal that was established when the creature appeared in the 'vergiere' and abducted Guillaume (vv. 86-90). Although the audience are not yet aware that the animal is a werewolf, the poet suggests that the beast will mistreat the boy when alone with him in the forest, aligning with the savage behaviour of wolves such as the *Bisclavret*

⁴³ Cavagna, p. 215; Classen, 'Introduction', in *Rural Space*, p. 149; Le Goff, p. 71; Ribard, p. 77; Saunders, p. 49; Zovic, pp. 24-46.

⁴⁴ Pearsall and Salter, p. 52. See also Dubost, p. 317; M. Faure, 'Le *Bisclavret* de Marie de France: une histoire suspecte de loup-garou', *Revue des langues romanes*, 83 (1978), 345-56 (p. 347); Saunders, pp. 56-57.

⁴⁵ Le Goff, p. 70. The heroes of *Erec et Enide*, *Lancelot*, *Yvain* and *Perceval* all have important adventures in the forest. See Pearsall and Salter, p. 51; Ribard, p. 76; Saunders, p. ix; Zumthor, *La Mesure du monde*, pp. 201-16.

werewolf.⁴⁶ In Marie's *lai*, there is a clear association between the forest and the malevolent actions of the 'bisclavret':

hume plusur garulf devindrent
e es boscages maisun tindrent.
Garulf, ceo est beste salvage;
tant cum il est en cele rage,
humes devure, grant mal fait,
es granz forez converse e vait. (vv. 7-12)⁴⁷

"Dame jeo devienç bisclavret.
En cele grant forest me met" (vv. 63-64)

Marie twice states that transformation into a werewolf is linked to movement into the forest (vv. 7-8, vv. 63-64), and Gingras notes that the wild and animalistic nature of this creature 'est développé en étroite association avec l'espace de la forêt'.⁴⁸ When the poet notes that Alphonse arrives in a 'grant forest' with 'mainte sauvage beste' (vv. 171-72), he alludes to Marie's text and the fierce creature she describes.

However, the *Guillaume* poet rewrites this intertext and the association between the forest and animal savagery. The depiction of the wolf within the forest transforms the representation of this creature, distancing it from rather than aligning it with the 'wild beasts' that inhabit this space. As Alphonse cares for Guillaume, the poet inverts the association between the forest and the wildness of the wolf:

La se repose .VIII. jors entiers.
L'enfant de quanques fu mestiers
Li a porquis la beste franche:
Onques de rien n'ot mesestance. (vv. 173-76)

Emphasis is placed on the image of the wolf providing and caring for the child so that Guillaume wants for nothing (v. 176), as stressed in particular by the verb 'porquerre' (v. 175). The poet alters his portrayal of Alphonse, who becomes unthreatening through

⁴⁶ At this moment the audience are unaware that Alphonse is a werewolf rather than a wolf, even though Queen Felise uses the term 'leu garou' in v. 151. Chapter Four will discuss the depiction of Alphonse and the poet's use of terms to refer to this creature.

⁴⁷ 'Bisclavret' in *Lais de Marie de France*, pp. 116-33.

⁴⁸ Francis Gingras, *Erotisme et merveilles dans le récit français des XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002), pp. 191-92. See also Faure, p. 347.

actions that associate him with the she-wolf of the Romulus and Remus legend, rather than with images of predatory human-eating werewolves in *Bisclavret*.

Scholars have observed parallels between the behaviour of the *Guillaume* wolf in the forest and the creature of the Romulus-type narrative that rescues an abandoned child and provides shelter and feeds or suckles them.⁴⁹ Indeed, Ferlampin-Acher states that Alphonse is depicted as ‘un double de la louve romaine’.⁵⁰ However, the *Guillaume* poet rewrites this intertextual model and manipulates links between the romance and the Romulus-type narratives of the St Eustace legend and *Guillaume d’Angleterre* that are alluded to and rewritten in the crossing of the straits of Messina. In these texts the children are quickly rescued from the wild animals that abduct them, and although these creatures do not harm the infants, neither work depicts the animals caring for them.⁵¹ In contrast, Guillaume is alone with the wolf in the forest for eight days before he is ‘rescued’ by the ‘vachier’ (vv. 187-227), and the wolf looks after the child in a maternal manner that is absent from the other texts. The association between this creature and the Romulus she-wolf undermines the depiction of the beast as a threatening ‘grans leus’, and the poet emphasises this image as he describes the male wolf almost suckling the child:

En terre a une fosse faite
Et dedans herbe mise et traite
Et la feuchiere et la lihue
Que par dedans a espandue.
La nuit le couche joste soi
Li leus garous le fil le roi,
L’acole de ses .IIII. piés (vv. 177-83)

The image of the wolf curled around Guillaume in a makeshift den stresses the animal’s caring nature. The juxtaposition of ‘acoler’ with Alphonse’s animal form (‘.IIII. piés’,

⁴⁹ Dunn, pp. 88-89 and pp. 100-01; Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, pp. 414-15. For more detailed discussion of this motif, see Peggy McCracken, ‘Nursing Animals and Cross-Species Intimacy’, in *From Beasts to Souls: Gender and Embodiment in Medieval Europe*, ed. by E. Jane Burns and Peggy McCracken (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013), pp. 39-64.

⁵⁰ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Guillaume de Palerne*: une parodie?’, p. 61.

⁵¹ The wolf in *Guillaume d’Angleterre* is careful not to harm the child it abducts, ‘Et li leus, qui en sa boche a / L’enfant, ne quaisse ne ne blece.’ (vv. 794-5). Similar comments are found in *La vie de Saint Eustache* (v. 922 and v. 939).

v. 183) highlights an insistence upon the human actions that contradict the initial portrayal of this creature as a wild beast.

The depiction of Alphonse creating a den for Guillaume also demonstrates use of the forest to signal intertextual allusions that are rewritten and manipulated throughout the three forest episodes. As the wolf and Guillaume take refuge, the poet signals and rewrites Bérout's *Roman de Tristan*. This text is manipulated throughout *Guillaume*, and the poet in particular alludes to and transforms Bérout's representation of Tristan and Iseut using the forest as a space of refuge. Bérout dedicates a large part of his romance to describing the exiled lovers' nomadic existence in the Morrois forest (vv. 1271-2748) in which they construct a shelter from natural resources:

Sa loge fait: au brant qu'il tient
Les rains trenche, fait la fullie (vv. 1290-92)

La loge fu de vers rains faite,
De leus en leus ot fuelle atraite (vv. 1801-82)

This shelter ('loge' or 'fullie') is the lovers' safe haven, and is alluded to by the description of Alphonse making a den in the forest outside of Rome.⁵² The nest-like quality of this shelter echoes Bérout's text, and the natural flooring of grass, ferns, and reeds that the wolf lays (vv. 178-80) mirrors Iseut's carpet of leaves (v. 1292). However, this intertext is rewritten in *Guillaume*, as this shelter is not for fugitive lovers, but for a wolf and the child it has kidnapped.

The image of Alphonse providing shelter and a bed for Guillaume also signals and manipulates another intertextual model that is rewritten throughout *Guillaume*. In *Yvain*, the eponymous hero makes a bed for his companion lion after the animal has been injured fighting and protecting Yvain: 'An son escu li fet litiere / De la mosse et de la fouchiere' (vv. 4655-56). The *Guillaume* poet alludes to this image, particularly with the material used by Alphonse to carpet the 'fosse' in which he and Guillaume sleep. However, Chrétien's text is transformed in *Guillaume*, as it is the wolf that makes a bed for the

⁵² 'Fullie' is translated as 'Laubhütte' (leaf-hut or shelter). 'Foilliee' in Tobler, III, pp. 1980-81.

eponymous hero, rather than the other way around.⁵³ The final comments on the wolf and Guillaume in the forest stress the inversion of the role of animal and human in this scene:

Si est de lui aprivoisiés
Li fix le roi que tot li plaist
Ce que la beste de lui fait. (vv. 184-86)

Although this forest scene emphasises the human and caring nature of the wolf, it is the child who is ‘tamed’ by this creature, suggesting a redistribution of the wild nature associated with the wolf. The poet emphasises the reconfiguration of the depiction of Alphonse from wild beast to humanised creature to such an extent that this animal is able to ‘tame’ the eponymous hero.

The first forest episode signals the transformative effect of the forest on the narrative of *Guillaume*, as it is here that Guillaume is discovered by a cowherd who adopts and raises him (vv. 187-226). Above all, the depiction of the events in this space highlights rewriting of intertextual material, all the while foregrounding the developing portrayal of the werewolf of *Guillaume*. Associations between Alphonse and varied intertextual models are transformed as the poet combines elements of the wolves in *Bisclavret*, the St Eustace legend, *Guillaume d’Angleterre* and the Romulus she-wolf motif whilst simultaneously rewriting elements of Chrétien’s *Yvain*.

The notion of the forest reconfiguring the fate of Guillaume is stressed in the second episode set here, during which the eponymous hero is discovered by the Emperor of Rome. This episode culminates in Guillaume’s departure from his adopted parents and his arrival at court. These events have a great impact on the narrative by transforming Guillaume from the foundling son of the ‘vachier’ to a young nobleman who will fall in love with the Emperor’s daughter Melior and later elope with her from Rome.

The poet emphasises the importance of the forest in this episode, referring to this space four times in fifteen lines and repeating terms for ‘forest’ three times in quick

⁵³ This allusion to *Yvain* signals the important relationship between Guillaume and Alphonse, whose role as doubles of one another alludes to and transforms the relationship between Yvain and the lion in Chrétien’s romance. I will examine this intertextual link in Chapter Three, see pp. 216-20.

succession ('boschage' v. 386; 'forest' v. 390; v. 396; v. 401). Similar stress is placed on the transformative potential of this bordered space at the end of the episode, as the poet highlights the movement of Guillaume and the Emperor through the forest ('Par la forest s'en va errant', v. 603; 'Par la forest li emperere / O l'enfant qui derrier lui ere', vv. 631-32). The poet suggests that passage through this space is an intrinsic part of the reconfiguration of Guillaume's identity, aligning the young man's transformation into a young nobleman with his journey from the rural space inhabited by the 'vachier'.

This episode also presents additional examples of intertextual rewriting in *Guillaume*. As noted by Simons and Ferlampin-Acher, the Emperor's discovery of Guillaume signals the opening scenes of *Perceval*.⁵⁴ The *Guillaume* poet alludes to Perceval's encounter with a group of knights in the forest (vv. 69-363), a meeting that transforms the fate of Chrétien's eponymous hero and triggers the start of adventures in which he attempts to prove his worth as a knight. Chrétien notes Perceval's amazement at the knights' presence in the forest, who he mistakes for angels (vv. 137-38). The *Guillaume* poet signals this motif in his depiction of the meeting between Guillaume and the Emperor, rewriting his intertext by stressing that it is the Emperor who looks at the young child in wonderment:

L'enfant regarde, s'arresta:
A grant *merveille* se seigna
[...] *Merveille* soi qui il puet estre,
Ne de quel gent ne de quel estre;
Cuide chose *faëe* soit (vv. 417-23) (emphasis mine)

The use of 'merveille' and 'faëe' suggests that the Emperor takes the child for a supernatural being, rather than the other way around.

The poet signals and manipulates further material in this episode, fusing contrasting texts and redistributing elements from works previously rewritten in the

⁵⁴ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', in *Guillaume de Palerne*, pp. 74-75; Ferlampin-Acher, '*Guillaume de Palerne*: une parodie?', p. 61; Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', pp. 415-16. For discussion of the parallels between Perceval's mother and the figures of Felise and the 'vachier', see comments in Chapter One, pp. 70-72.

romance. At the start of the episode the Emperor is separated from his hunting party when he is hunting a wild boar (vv. 386-96). This image alludes to the motif of the ‘chasse merveilleux’ manipulated in *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus* that is signalled in *Guillaume* during the crossing of the straits of Messina. In the forest episode the *Guillaume* poet alludes in particular to the manipulation of this motif in *Partonopeus*, in which the hero becomes isolated when chasing a boar (vv. 583-646). However, rewriting of *Guigemar* is also emphasised, as the depiction of the Emperor’s discovery of Guillaume manipulates Guigemar’s encounter with the supernatural white doe that talks to the knight and triggers narrative change (*Guigemar*, vv. 90-122).⁵⁵

The depiction of the Emperor in *Guillaume* also rewrites the motif of the ‘chasse au blanc cerf’, as he is led to Guillaume after sighting and chasing a deer:

En une voie est arrestés.
Si comme iluec estoit tos sous,
Atant es vos que li garous
Vient devant lui .I. cerf chaçant;
De pren en pren le va sivant,
Et l’empereres cort après:
Tant l’a suï tos a eslés
Que sor l’enfant s’est embatus. (vv. 406-13)

The *Guigemar* narrative is signalled by the image of the Emperor ‘tos sous’ (v. 407), and the poet stresses that the Emperor is led to Guillaume when he follows the ‘cerf’. However, this intertextual model is manipulated in *Guillaume*, as the ‘cerf’ is not the main focus of the Emperor’s attention, but rather it is the ‘garou’ that appears before him, chasing the stag (vv. 408-09). The ‘garou’ replaces the deer as the supernatural creature that leads the Emperor to discover the quasi-‘merveilleux’ Guillaume, as the ‘garou’ is the subject of vv. 408-09, whereas the ‘cerf’ is seen only as this animal’s prey.

The poet uses the forest to signal rewriting in this episode, borrowing and transforming elements from different texts that are fused together, and thwarting the

⁵⁵ The poet also signals the same motif in the legend of St Eustace, in which the pagan Placidius encounters a ‘cerf’ whilst hunting that leads him to convert to Christianity and change his name to Eustace (vv. 191-432). Harf-Lancner, *Les Fées au Moyen Age*, p. 223; Maddox, ‘Generic Intertextuality in Arthurian Literature’, p. 12.

audience's expectations that are associated with these intertexts. For example, the presence of the 'cerf' signals *Guigemar*, but the role of this creature is displaced. Similarly, the reference to the world of the 'merveilleux', introduced in *Guigemar* and *Partonopeus* through the hunting episode, suggests to the audience that the narrative will follow these models and journey into 'l'Autre monde'. However, the Emperor's encounter introduces a different intertextual frame of reference through the manipulation of allusions to *Perceval*, although the poet similarly frustrates the expectations triggered by this text. Rather than following Chrétien's example from *Perceval* and depicting the eponymous hero immediately embarking on chivalrous adventures when he arrives at court, the poet instead follows these scenes with the portrayal of Guillaume and Melior's discovery of their sentiments for one another, introducing yet more intertextual models into the romance.

The second forest episode has a strong transformative influence, altering Guillaume's fate whilst rewriting intertextual allusions and manipulating the audience's expectations created through references to other works. The third forest episode, in which Guillaume, Melior, and Alphonse travel through Italy to Sicily, provides further examples of use of this space as a setting for narrative and intertextual transformation in *Guillaume*. The poet emphasises this setting for the lovers' escape from Rome, signalling the transformative potential of this bordered space:

Si diromes des jovenciax
 Qui encousu s'en vont es piax.
En la forest en sont entré;
 Tant ont ensamble andui erré (vv. 3169-72) (my emphasis)

The verb 'entrer' highlights the image of the forest as a clearly demarcated space, and this notion is stressed when the couple briefly leave the forest to take shelter in a cave outside the town of Benevento, 'Mais les forest lor sont faillies, / N'i voient se champaigne non' (vv. 3886-87). The lovers leave behind the forest, and their re-transgression of the border that surrounds this space is emphasised when they later leave Benevento:

Amont sor destre ont regardé,
Bien a .II. lieues et demie,
Ont *une grant forest* choisie.
[...] Tant exploitierent et errerent
Qu'*en la forest* en sont venu
Que ne furent aperceü. (vv. 4168-76) (emphasis mine)

The forest is presented as a separate and well-defined space that offers the couple safety, and the movement in and out of which marks the beginning of a new episode in the text.

Like the first two episodes set in this space, the forest is a locus for transformation. For example, the lovers undergo their second quasi-metamorphosis by donning deerskins 'parmi les bois' (v. 4341), and their passage through this space also depicts Guillaume's return to Sicily, setting the scene for the final denouement of the romance. However, the most influential change triggered by this space is the reintroduction of Alphonse into the narrative. The werewolf reappears in *Guillaume* when the location shifts from the palace to the forest, and the renewed presence of this creature facilitates the depiction of intratextual doubling between Alphonse and Guillaume.⁵⁶

The presence of Alphonse in this forest episode distorts the intertextual allusions signalled by the representation of the forest as a space of exile and refuge for the couple. In particular, the lovers' flight into and passage through the forest alludes to the depiction of Tristan and Iseut in the Morrois forest in Bérout's *Roman de Tristan* (vv. 1271-2748). Baumgartner notes that the forest is 'l'espace essentiel' in *Tristan*, and Frappier suggests that it constituted the 'épisode central' of the original version of the legend that Bérout developed.⁵⁷ The *Guillaume* poet alludes to and manipulates Bérout's depiction of this space, exploring the themes of exile, refuge, and wildness associated with the forest and the *Tristan* romance. For example, Guillaume and Melior seek shelter as soon as they

⁵⁶ The relationship between these figures will be discussed in Chapter Three. See in particular the section entitled 'The partnership between Guillaume and Alphonse', pp. 212-27.

⁵⁷ Emmanuèle Baumgartner, *Tristan et Iseut: De la légende aux récits en vers* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1987), p. 49; Jean Frappier, 'Structure et sens du *Tristan*: version commune, version courtoise', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 23 (1963), 255-80 (p. 257). See also Eugène Vinaver, 'La Forêt de Morrois', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 41 (1968), 1-13; Zovic, pp. 21-54.

enter the forest, and their refuge rewrites the ‘loge’ made by Tristan and Iseut. Rather than the elaborate hut constructed by Tristan from branches and furnished with a leaf carpet by Iseut (*Tristan*, vv. 1290-02), Guillaume and Melior search for ‘fosses ou markais’ (v. 3190) and settle on ‘.I. parfont markais et grant’ (v. 3193) in which they hide ‘Desous la raime, en la foillie’ (v. 3194). This scene distorts Bérroul’s image of a couple using the forest to make a shelter, as Guillaume and Melior do not attempt to fashion a ‘loge’ out of the woodland, but instead simply find a spot in the moorland and hide under the ‘foillie’.⁵⁸

Tristan and Iseut are depicted as ‘les maîtres incontestés du Morrois’, and Tristan’s hunting prowess and ability to provide food for the lovers is emphasised throughout the Morrois episode (vv. 1279-80; vv. 1357-58; vv. 1426-27).⁵⁹ Although this intertextual model is alluded to in *Guillaume* when the lovers take refuge in the forest, the poet rewrites Bérroul’s text by disassociating Guillaume from the image of Tristan as a hunter-gatherer. Guillaume shows no inclination to fend for himself or provide for his ‘amie’:

Si avoient molt fain amdoi;
Molt volentiers, s’eüssent quoi,
Mengassent, mais n’ont que mengier,
Ne il ne s’osent porchacier.
Par la fuelle qeut la meschine
Les nois, le glant et le faïne,
Les sauvechons, les boutonciax. (vv. 3201-07)

The poet implies that the couple dare not hunt (‘n’osent’, v. 3204), rather than suggesting that they are unable to. What is more, Melior usurps the role of provider that Guillaume is expected to fulfil, procuring berries and nuts that contrast with the prey caught by Tristan in Bérroul’s text.

The *Guillaume* poet exaggerates transformation of *Tristan* in the depiction of his eponymous hero, who in fact suggests that he ask a passer-by for food (vv. 3210-20). This proposal threatens to undermine the couple’s efforts to flee Rome incognito, as a casual

⁵⁸ There is also a contrast with the nest-like shelter provided by Alphonse for Guillaume in the first forest episode, as discussed earlier in this section.

⁵⁹ Françoise Barteau, *Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut: Introduction à une lecture plurielle* (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1972), p. 154.

request from a talking bear to a passing man would raise suspicion and reveal their identity and hiding place. Yet this suggestion also opposes and rewrites the image of the self-providing survival expert incarnated by Tristan. Guillaume implicitly acknowledges his inability to source food for the lovers by proposing to ask another human for assistance.

Further rewriting of *Tristan* is found in the contrast between Guillaume's inability to adapt to the forest and his bear-skin disguise. Tristan and Iseut return to a primitive state of being in the forest, and Tristan's ability to survive in the wild is acknowledged and stressed in the romance: "Les plains, les bois, les pas, les guez / Set formement bien, et molt est fiers" (vv. 1102-03). Indeed, this figure is seen as embodying the wildness of the woods in which he takes exile.⁶⁰ In contrast, Guillaume and Melior are unable to survive alone in the forest, and the hero is not seen as 'fiers', even though he wears an animalising disguise. The portrayal of Guillaume presents a comic distortion of Tristan in the Morrois forest that highlights use of this space to signal and transform an intertextual model.

The depiction of Guillaume and Melior also rewrites images of the eponymous hero of *Yvain*, who takes exile in the forest:

Les bestes par le bois agueite,
Si les ocit et si manjue
La veneison trestote crue.
Et tant conversa el boschage
Come hon forsené sauvage (vv. 2824-28)

Yvain regresses to the primitive state of a hunter that eats his prey raw, and his wildness creates the image of a madman (v. 2828). In *Guillaume*, the poet indicates a literal parallel between the wild state of being adopted by Yvain and the lovers' appearance as ferocious bears. However, he rewrites this motif by portraying Guillaume and Melior as unable to fend for themselves and dependent on Alphonse to provide food for them. Although Guillaume takes on an exaggerated form of wildness through his skin disguises, he

⁶⁰ Saunders, p. 89; Zovic, p. 41

possesses neither the hunting prowess of Tristan, nor Yvain's primal instincts or inclination to eat raw meat.

Guillaume continues to be overtly human in spite of his animal form in the forest, and depends on Alphonse to fulfil the role of hunter-gatherer. Guillaume recognises this dependence and prays for the wolf's safety, telling Melior that "ne vivriens sans lui .I. jor" (v. 4272). Alphonse provides for the couple on several occasions in the forest (vv. 3238-96; vv. 3334-69; vv. 3404-08; vv. 4258-63). The behaviour of this animal alludes to the role of Husdent in Bérout's *Tristan* who 'subvient aux besoins du couple, en particulier en chassant'.⁶¹ However, the wolf goes above and beyond the role of Tristan's dog. Alphonse does not simply help Guillaume to hunt, but rather acts as the sole provider for the couple. The wolf is depicted as practically waiting hand and foot on the lovers:

Li leus de quanques mestier ont
Les a porquis molt largement (vv. 3398-99)

De vin, de viandes chargiés;
Devant lor met et puis s'enfuit. (vv. 4262-63)

The poet stresses that the wolf provides the lovers with all they need, as emphasised by the adverbs 'molt largement' (v. 3399), and the live prey procured by Tristan and Husdent (vv. 1627-36) is replaced by overtly human and 'aristocratic' food sourced by the wolf, including 'blanc pain et char cuite' (v. 3257) and '.I. barisel de vin molt bon' (v. 3336).⁶²

The emphasis placed on Alphonse's role providing for Guillaume and Melior signals rewriting of *Tristan*. Although Tristan and Iseut are able to survive in the Morrois forest, their time there is marked by suffering that creates a paradox between 'la joie des fugitifs' and 'leur misère, leur dénuement, leur solitude au sein de la forêt hostile'.⁶³ The lovers must endure the challenges presented to them by this wild environment, all the

⁶¹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', in *Guillaume de Palerne*, p. 26. I will discuss the *Guillaume* poet's rewriting of the relationship between Tristan and Husdent in Chapter Three. See pp. 219-20.

⁶² Schiff, pp. 425-26. This motif of Alphonse as provider for the lovers will be further discussed in Chapter Three, pp. 219-21, and Chapter Four, pp. 249-52.

⁶³ P. Le Gentil, 'L'Épisode du Morrois et la signification du *Tristan* de Bérout', in *Studia philologica et litteraria in honorem L. Spitzer*, ed. by A. G. Hatcher and K. L. Selig (Bern: Francke, 1958), pp. 264-74 (p. 267).

while foregoing ‘all those advantages of birth and rank which they have hitherto enjoyed’.⁶⁴ Bérout emphasises the lovers’ suffering as their time in the Morrois passes:

Molt sont el bois del pain destroit,
De char vivent, el ne mengüent.
Que püent il, se lor color müent?
Lor dras ronpent, rains les decirent.
Longuement par Morrois fuïrent.
Chascun d’eus soffre paine elgal,
Qar l’un por l’autre ne sent mal (vv. 1644-50)

The lovers suffer through a lack of ‘civilised’ food, their clothes become ragged and torn, and their physical appearance is altered, and it is only their love that keeps them from despair in their suffering. In contrast, Guillaume and Melior are spared any discomfort in the forest, thanks to the actions of the werewolf:

Toudis la beste les convoie
Derriere, que nel voient pas;
Aprés les va sivant le pas
Ne sevent estre pres ne loing,
Ne les secoure a lor besoing
Trestot quanque mestier i ont,
Si que *nule souffraite n’ont*. (vv. 3402-08) (my emphasis)

The poet emphasises the role taken by Alphonse in caring for the couple, highlighting the image of the wolf following the lovers (v. 3403) with the repetition of ‘suivre’ (vv. 3404-05). Rather than mirroring the depiction of Husdent as guard dog and hunting companion in *Tristan*, this figure is transformed into a guardian angel, or ‘un protecteur attentif’, in *Guillaume*.⁶⁵ *Tristan* is further rewritten through the suggestion that the werewolf suffers instead of the lovers:

Mainte perilleuse jornee
En *a soufferte et enduree*. (vv. 3781-82) (emphasis mine)

Sovent en *sueffre* grans ahans,
Peril et mal et paors grans. (vv. 3875-86) (emphasis mine)

⁶⁴ Frederick Whitehead, ‘Tristan and Isolt in the Forest of Morrois’, in *Studies in French language and Mediaeval Literature presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1939), pp. 393-400 (p. 393).

⁶⁵ Dubost, p. 561.

The use of the singular verb in these passages separates the suffering wolf from the couple he assists, distorting the image of Tristan and Iseut and exaggerating the role of the Husdent figure.

The depiction of Guillaume and Melior in the forest signals and rewrites Bérout's text. Guillaume and Melior cannot be aligned with Tristan and Iseut because they neither master the forest in which they take refuge, nor suffer during their time there. This intertextual transformation is rendered more explicit by the lovers' animal-skin disguises. The depiction of this couple is fundamentally different from the *Guillaume* poet's intertextual model, as Bérout's iconic lovers are replaced with a hero and heroine who have undergone quasi-metamorphosis to become like wild beasts, but who are unable to survive in the forest without the help of a civilised and protective werewolf. The bordered space of the forest allows the poet to allude to and distort his intertextual model, manipulating images of the lovers' human- and animal-nature whilst developing his portrayal of the relationship between Guillaume and Alphonse, an element of the text that I will explore in Chapter Three.

The three episodes that take place in the forest in *Guillaume* emphasise use of this bordered space as a catalyst for narrative and intertextual reconfiguration. The forest is the locus for events that alter the course of the plot and transform Guillaume from abducted child to unknown foundling by providing the setting for his encounter with the Roman Emperor and for his return journey to Sicily. The most striking intertextual rewriting signalled by the forest is found in the third episode, in which the image of Tristan and Iseut is transformed in the portrayal of Guillaume and Melior in exile, particularly through the actions of Alphonse. The forest provides a backdrop for the developing portrayal of the werewolf, the representation of which is transformed by allusions to and rewriting of intertexts that associate the wolf with malevolence and savagery in the forest. In spite of appearances, the wolf is not one of the 'mainte sauvage beste' (v. 172) that live in the

forest, yet this space is nevertheless seen as his natural habitat in which he can take charge of the lovers and act as provider and protector. In order to understand the contrast between the representation of Alphonse as a ‘not-so-wild’ beast in the forest and as a savage predator in other spaces less frequently associated with this animal, it is necessary to turn to the scene that first depicts this figure in *Guillaume*, set in the bordered space of the ‘vergier’. This demarcated and ‘civilised’ space is used throughout the text as a catalyst of transformation with which the poet changes the course of the narrative, signals intertextual rewriting, and highlights the theme of transformation that lies at the heart of this self-reflexive romance.

The ‘vergier’

The ‘vergier’ is the third bordered space used in *Guillaume* to trigger narrative change and encourage the audience to recognise intertextual transformation. This space is difficult to define, translated by Tobler Lommatzsch with a range of definitions, from ‘general garden’ (‘Garten allgemein’) to ‘orchard’ (‘Obstgarten’).⁶⁶ ‘Vergier’ is often seen as a synonym for ‘jardin’, and scholars have noted that the two terms are used interchangeably.⁶⁷ However, the ‘vergier’ in *Guillaume* is a large, enclosed space situated between the palace and the forest that amalgamates the spaces of royal park, orchard, and garden.⁶⁸ This space is known to have existed in Palermo in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as historical sources cite a ‘garden-like area of contrived beauty’ at the palace that had an orchard, wild animals, a fish pond, and a walled circumference of at least two miles.⁶⁹ In order to best represent the ‘vergier’ as a composite of several spaces given

⁶⁶ ‘Vergier’ in Tobler, XI (ii), pp. 265-67.

⁶⁷ Gingras, *Erotisme et merveilles*, p. 235; Philippe Ménard, ‘Jardins et vergers dans la littérature médiévale’, in *Jardins et vergers en Europe occidentale, VIII^e-XVIII^e siècles* (Paris: Auch, 1989), pp. 41-69 (pp. 43-46).

⁶⁸ Dunn uses the terms ‘royal park’ and ‘garden’ to refer to the ‘vergier’, and Sconduto employs ‘park’ and ‘orchard’. Dunn, pp. 12-18; Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, pp. 92-93.

⁶⁹ S. A. Mileson, *Parks in Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 92-93; Dunn, pp. 49-52; John Harvey, *Medieval Gardens* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1981), p. 48.

divergent terms in modern society, I will refer to it throughout this study with the term ‘vergier’.

The ‘vergier’ is the setting for three key episodes in *Guillaume*, and this repetition signals its significance as an important space in the romance. In the first ‘vergier’ episode, Alphonse appears in Palermo and kidnaps Guillaume (vv. 61-124). The second episode takes place in Rome, where the ‘vergier’ is the setting for a meeting between Guillaume and Melior that leads to the start of their amorous relationship (vv. 1374-1760), before the same ‘vergier’ is crossed by the couple at the start of their escape from Rome into the forest (vv. 3105-71). The third ‘vergier’ episode depicts the disguised lovers in Palermo, where they are observed by Felise (vv. 4692-4704). The Queen dons a deerskin and joins them in the ‘vergier’ to seek assistance from Guillaume in defending Palermo, and the episode ends when she leads the lovers from this space into the palace (vv. 5159-5338).

The repetition of the ‘vergier’ setting emphasises its important role in *Guillaume*, and the events that take place here all transform the course of the plot. From the kidnapping of Guillaume to the couple’s flight from Rome and their entrance into the palace with Felise, characters’ movements into and out of the ‘vergier’ mark transition in the narrative. This transition is triggered and emphasised by the depiction of the ‘vergier’ as a clearly demarcated space ‘Tot clos de mur et de cyment’ (v. 66). This setting represents the poet’s most developed use of bordered space as a catalyst of narrative transformation, and is manipulated in order to signal rewritten intertexts in *Guillaume*.

Like the wild space of the forest, the ‘vergier’ was ‘un espace familier plein de connotations’, known to the audience through real-life experiences.⁷⁰ This space is prevalent in many of the works manipulated in *Guillaume*, and alludes to both the Biblical Garden of Eden and the garden of the Song of Songs, as well as the literary topoi of the

⁷⁰ Zovic, p. 13. For further information on medieval gardens, see: Alexander Kaufmann, *Der Gartenbau im Mittelalter* (Berlin: B. Grundmann, 1892); Frank Crisp, *Mediaeval Gardens* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1966); Sylvia Landsberg, *The Medieval Garden* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003).

locus amoenus and the *hortus conclusus*. Old French poets developed the *locus amoenus* topos from Classical works by Virgil and Ovid.⁷¹ Drawing on the image of this ‘agreeable space’ as ‘a beautiful, shaded natural site’ with trees, meadows, a spring or brook, and often birdsong and flowers, the ‘vergier’ embodies the characteristics of the *locus amoenus*.⁷² Texts such as Chrétien’s romances and the *romans d’antiquité* also align their description of the ‘vergier’ with the image of an enclosed space, the *hortus conclusus*: ‘les auteurs qui nous décrivent [le] jardin ou [le] verger se plaisent à insister sur leur clôture.’⁷³ Indeed, Gingras observes that ‘les lieux de plaisance du récit médiéval sont pratiquement toujours des lieux clos’.⁷⁴

Descriptions of the ‘vergier’ as an orchard, garden, or a park in works rewritten by the *Guillaume* poet insist upon the boundary that separates this ‘agreeable’ space from those that surround it, and this border is manipulated in order to trigger narrative transformation and signal intertextual rewriting. The presentation of the ‘vergier’ in the first episode set in this space emphasises its enclosed nature:

Desous le maistre tor marbrine
 Ot un vergier merveilles gent,
 Tot clos de mur et de cyment;
 S’i ot mainte sauvage beste. (vv. 64-67) (emphasis mine)

The poet stresses the presence of the wall surrounding the ‘vergier’ by noting the construction of ‘mur’ and ‘cyment’ (v. 66), and the existence of wild beasts aligns this

⁷¹ Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. by Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1953), pp. 183-200 (particularly p. 195).

⁷² Curtius, p. 195.

⁷³ Marie-Françoise Notz, ‘*Hortus conclusus*: Réflexions sur le rôle symbolique de la clôture dans la description romanesque du jardin’, in *Mélanges de littérature du moyen âge au XX^e siècle offerts à Mademoiselle Jeanne Lods*, 2 vols (Paris: Ecole Normale Supérieure de Jeune Filles, 1978), I, pp. 459-72 (p. 461). See also comments on the enclosure of the orchard in Georges Duby, *A History of Private Life: II. Revelations of the Medieval World*, trans. by Arthur Goldhammer (London: Belknap Press, 1988), p. 322.

⁷⁴ Gingras, *Erotisme et merveilles*, p. 239. See also Jean-Claude Bouvier, ‘Ort et jardin dans la littérature médiévale d’Oc’, in *Vergers et jardins dans l’univers médiéval* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications du CUER MA, 1990), pp. 41-51 (p. 45); Bożena Tokarz, ‘Transversal Gardens’, in *Space of a Garden – Space of Culture*, ed. by Grzegorz Gazda and Mariusz Golab (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2008), pp. 7-23 (p. 10).

space with the walled royal parks known to the poet and his audience.⁷⁵ The poet also immediately signals the *locus amoenus* topos by describing the beauty of the ‘vergier’ and noting that ‘.I. jor par une haute feste / I vint *esbanoier* li rois’ (vv. 68-69) (emphasis mine). The image of a natural space of joy and happiness is emphasised as the scene develops, particularly in the description of Guillaume running between his parents and picking flowers (vv. 83-84). However, this idyllic image is shattered by the transgression of the wolf into the ‘vergier’:

Saut uns grans leus, goule bae.
 Afendant vient comme tempeste;
 Tuit se destornent por la beste:
 Devant le roi demainement
 Son fil travers sa goule prent. (vv. 86-90)

The arrival of the wolf transforms the *locus amoenus* into the setting of a kidnap, and its presence is juxtaposed with the natural and floral imagery of the opening lines of this episode. As the wolf rushes through the crowd ‘comme tempeste’ (v. 87) it leaves a trail of destruction and distress in its wake:

Atant s’en va, mais la crie
 Fu après lui molt tost levee.
 Lieve li del, lieve li cris
 Del fil le roi qui est traïs. (vv. 91-94)

The repetition of ‘cri’ (v. 91; v. 93) and ‘lever’ (vv. 92-93) highlights the profound disturbance provoked by the wolf’s actions. The animal’s act of transgressing and re-transgressing the border of the ‘vergier’ sparks the first change in the narrative thread, altering the course of the plot and the fate of the eponymous hero.

The disruptive appearance of Alphonse in the ‘vergier’ suggests that the border around this space is not impenetrable, as ‘le sauvage a vite fait de venir déranger la belle

⁷⁵ Royal parks became enclosed spaces in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, used for keeping deer and other wild animals. For example, Henry I had a seven-mile stone wall constructed around his park at Woodstock in c.1110. Marilyn L. Sandidge, ‘Hunting or Gardening: Parks and Royal Rural Space’, in *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age*, ed. by Classen, pp. 389-406 (p. 393).

ordonnance du jardin'.⁷⁶ The presence of the wicked wolf also signals an intertextual allusion manipulated in *Guillaume*. In the *Roman de Thèbes*, the anonymous poet transforms an episode from Statius' *Thebaid* in which the Greeks arrive in the forest of the kingdom of Lycurgus by depicting a 'vergier'. This setting is 'une invention du poète', and is emphasised through the repetition of 'vergier' at intervals throughout the episode (v. 2169; v. 2172; v. 2255; v. 2381; v. 2424; v. 2535) as well as 'parc' (v. 2259), and 'jart' (v. 2368).⁷⁷ Like the 'vergier' in *Guillaume*, the description of this space aligns with the *locus amoenus* topos:

a un vergier qui mout ert gent;
 car onc espice ne pyment,
 arbre qu'en puist penser ne dire,
 de cel vergier ne fu a dire.
 Mout par fu bien enclos li jarz
 de murs espés de toutes parz (vv. 2169-74)

The abundance of plants, herbs, spices, and trees in the 'vergier' emphasise the agreeable nature of this setting. The text also insists on the enclosure of this space through the presence of thick walls that surround it 'de toutes parz' (v. 2174), although there is also a 'porte' by which the Greeks gain entrance (vv. 2175-78). The magnificence of this *locus amoenus* is mirrored by the maiden guarding the young son of the King of Ligurge in the 'vergier' (vv. 2187-91), whose beauty is emphasised in the romance (vv. 2188-98).

However, this idyllic 'vergier' also becomes the setting for tragic events. The young maiden leaves the child in order to help the Greeks in their search for water (vv. 2253-58), and the *locus amoenus* is penetrated by a malevolent creature:

Endementres qu'ele demeure
 vint un serpant de male part,
 issi du bois si vint el jart. (vv. 2366-68)

The poet emphasises the creature's movement into the 'vergier' (v. 2368). Like the arrival of Alphonse in the 'vergier' in Palermo, its transgression of the border surrounding this

⁷⁶ Gingras, *Erotisme et merveilles*, p. 252.

⁷⁷ Ernesta Caldarini, 'Un lieu du roman médiéval: le verger', *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études françaises*, 34 (1982), 7-23 (pp. 9-10).

space catalyses tragic narrative change. The snake discovers the child ‘tot seul sanz garde’ (v. 2372) and attacks and kills him: ‘si point l’enfant par mi le ventre / que le venim u cors li entre / [...] le cuer li part, ez le vos mort’ (vv. 2375-80).

The portrayal of the kidnapping of Guillaume in the Palermo ‘vergier’ signals this episode of *Thèbes*, as the events mirror those of the *roman d’antiquité*. Details given in *Guillaume* highlight this intertextual parallel, such as the emphasis placed in both texts on the physical contact between the animals and the children they attack. In *Thèbes* the snake bites the child ‘par mi le ventre’ (v. 2375), and in *Guillaume* Alphonse carries Guillaume ‘travers sa goule’ (v. 90). The calm and beauty of the ‘vergier’ in both works is destroyed by the intrusion of a malignant beast associated with the wild and untamed space of the woods. This link is made explicit in *Thèbes* when the snake appears ‘de male part, / issu du bois’ (vv. 2367-68) (emphasis mine), connecting the wood with wickedness. The *Guillaume* poet suggests the malevolence of the wolf by likening the beast to a storm (v. 87), and the animal is linked to the wild space surrounding the ‘vergier’ as he disappears into ‘la campagne’ (v. 106). Additional parallels are also signalled in the reaction of the Queen of Ligurge, whose monologue mourning her son (vv. 2547-52), aligns with Felise’s lament after the kidnapping of Guillaume (vv. 129-58), as discussed in Chapter One of this thesis.⁷⁸

The *Guillaume* poet alludes to several aspects of the *Roman de Thèbes* episode, yet his depiction of the abduction of Guillaume demonstrates transformation of this intertext. The poet’s compositional approach of *imitatio*, comprising *mutatio* and *mutuatio*, is highlighted by the redistribution of elements of the *Thèbes* scene that are not reproduced in the first ‘vergier’ episode of *Guillaume*. For example, the *Thèbes* poet describes a bed made by the girl for the child in the ‘vergier’: ‘A terre assiet l’enfant petit, / d’erbe et de flors li fet son lit’ (vv. 2253-54). No such bed is found in the first

⁷⁸ See discussion of this monologue in Chapter One, pp. 69-70.

‘vergier’ episode in *Guillaume*, yet the motif is used later in the portrayal of Alphonse caring for Guillaume in the forest outside of Rome:

En terre a une fosse faite
Et dedans herbe mise et traite
Et la feuchiere et la lihue
Que par dedens a esandue. (vv. 177-80)

The description of the wolf’s den signals the bed created by the maiden in the *Thèbes* ‘vergier’. However, the scene has been fundamentally transformed by a shift in setting from ‘vergier’ to forest, and by the replacement of the maiden with the animal that posed a threat to the child in the opening scene of the romance.

Further elements of the *Thèbes* ‘vergier’ episode are redistributed elsewhere in *Guillaume*. For example, this intertext portrays a group of Greeks, whose presence in the ‘vergier’ encourages the maiden to abandon the child there. The *Guillaume* poet does describe a Greek presence in the ‘vergier’, yet it is at the end of the second ‘vergier’ episode when the disguised Melior and Guillaume are spotted leaving the ‘vergier’ by a Greek man (vv. 3149-50). This detail is redundant in the narrative, and there is no clear motivation for the poet to state that the man who spots the lovers is Greek, other than to provide a signal to the intertextual rewriting of *Thèbes*. As with his manipulation of intertexts signalled by the demarcated spaces of the ‘Far’ and the forest, the poet’s rewriting and redistribution of elements from *Thèbes* highlights his compositional approach.

The first ‘vergier’ episode in *Guillaume* not only signals *Thèbes*, it also rewrites this model. The maiden in the *Thèbes* ‘vergier’ scene is transformed into two ‘gardes’ (v. 55) who take care of the young Guillaume and lead him to the ‘vergier’: ‘Celes qui l’enfant ont en garde / [...] L’ont mené avoec l’autre gent’ (vv. 73-76). The portrayal of these nurses differs from that of the *Thèbes* maiden, who is seen as a positive figure whose well-intentioned actions result in an unfortunate tragedy. When she is first asked to help the Greeks to find water the maiden conscientiously explains that she cannot leave

the child alone: “Ne l’os guerpir, ne suis tant ose” (v. 2247). However, her desire to help the Greeks leads her to go against this statement, and she leaves the child in the ‘vergiere’ in order to show them to the spring (vv. 2248-59). This action renders her responsible for the child’s fate, a fact she acknowledges when lamenting his death and the punishment she will suffer, “Par moi a il perdu la vie / quant jel lessai sanz compaignie” (vv. 2411-12). Nevertheless, the girl did not intentionally cause the child’s death, and she is not depicted as malicious.

In contrast, Guillaume’s guardians are portrayed as negative. Unlike the *Thèbes* maiden, whose kindness to others causes her to neglect the child and leads to his death, the nurses are active participants in a plot hatched by the King’s uncle to kill Guillaume, even procuring poison with which to carry out the murder (vv. 51-60). The poison aligns them with the snake that kills the child in *Thèbes*, rather than the maiden in whose care he is left. The poet explicitly states that the nurses do not care for the young child (v. 75), and curses them: ‘Celes qui l’enfant ont en garde, / Cui male flambe et maus fus arde’ (vv. 73-74).

The most striking alteration made to the *Thèbes* ‘vergiere’ model is the outcome of the guardians’ actions and the encounter between the young princes and the beasts that enter each respective ‘vergiere’. In *Thèbes*, the small act of neglect by the goodhearted maiden leads to the death of the prince of Ligurge. However, in *Guillaume* the wicked machinations of the nurses are in fact thwarted by the arrival of the wolf in the ‘vergiere’, as he kidnaps, or rather saves Guillaume. The *Guillaume* poet’s intertextual rewriting replaces murder with rescue, and this alteration to the expected course of events also occurs at the narrative level of *Guillaume*. In the opening lines of the ‘vergiere’ scene, tension is built for Guillaume’s murder:

Que s’el seüssent la dolour
Qui de l’enfant avint le jour
Par le vergier li rois ombroie
Et la roïne a molt grant joie,

Mais se [sic] sevent com lor grans dex
Lor est presens devant lor ex. (vv. 77-82)⁷⁹

The juxtaposition of ‘dolour’ and ‘jour’ (vv. 77-78), followed by the contrast between ‘ombroie’ and ‘joie’ with ‘dex’ (vv. 79-81), set the scene for tragedy, yet the audience’s expectations are thwarted when the wolf transgresses into this space and abducts Guillaume.

The events that take place in the first ‘vergiere’ episode highlight the use of this bordered space to catalyse narrative and intertextual change, as intertextual references are simultaneously manipulated alongside the developing narrative. The rewriting of *Thèbes* has been hitherto ignored by critics, yet it holds an influence over the depiction of the first events of *Guillaume*, as it also signals another work rewritten in the romance. Intertextual rewriting of *Thèbes* is found in *Partonopeus*, most notably through the association between the eponymous hero and a figure of the same name in the *roman d’antiquité*.⁸⁰ The allusion to the ‘vergiere’ episode from *Thèbes* in *Guillaume* signals this intertextual relationship, as it is Parthonopiex (Partonopeus) in *Thèbes* who emerges as the hero of the events that begin in the ‘vergiere’, finding and killing the snake that murders the son of the King of Ligurge (vv. 2651-76). In rewriting this episode of *Thèbes*, the *Guillaume* poet demonstrates an awareness of the links between intertextual models, inviting the audience to recognise the intertextual network in which the romance is situated.

The three scenes that comprise the second ‘vergiere’ episode further demonstrate the transformative potential of this space. In the first scene, Guillaume is depicted as a love-struck individual, who leaves the confinement of the palace for the adjacent ‘vergiere’ in order to contemplate his love for Melior. This space offers him a place for secluded

⁷⁹ Although Micha’s *Guillaume* corrects mistakes in Michelant’s edition, his reading of v. 81 is erroneous, and should be corrected to that given by Michelant: ‘Mais ne sevent com lor grans dex’.

⁸⁰ Eley notes that the name ‘Partonopeus’ is influenced by both Statius’s *Thebaid* and the *Roman de Thèbes*. Joris argues that *Thèbes* is rewritten in other elements of the text, such as the hero’s young age. Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, p. 26; and Pierre-Marie Joris, “‘*Thèbes avec Troie*’: *Partonopeu de Blois* ou le sens d’un retour”, in *Partonopeus in Europe*, ed. by Hanley, Longtin, and Eley, pp. 63-78 (pp. 63-70).

reflection, and the *Guillaume* poet signals the association found in other texts of the ‘vergier’ as ‘le lieu privilégié où l’homme se retrouvera dans une solitude protégée pour réfléchir’.⁸¹ When Guillaume enters this space, the poet emphasises his solitude and reflection:

En .I. vergier merveilles bel,
Desous la chambre a la meschine,
S’en est entrés, la teste encline.
[...] Vers la chambre torne son vis,
Si que ceus puet de plain veoir
Qui as fenestres vont seoir,
Ne jamais cil ne le verront,
Ja tant garde ne s’en prendront. (vv. 1280-88)

The lover’s gaze is highlighted through repetition of the verb ‘voir’ (v. 1285; v. 1287) and the stress placed on the movement of Guillaume’s face toward the window (v. 1282; v. 1284). The poet also insists upon the seclusion offered by the ‘vergier’ by stating that Guillaume is not seen by others while he contemplates Melior.

The depiction of Guillaume also manipulates the image of the ‘vergier’ as a setting for transformative events. The verb ‘entrer’ (v. 1282) implies the crossing of a boundary that separates this space from the palace and the forest that lies beyond it. Indeed, Gingras notes that ‘le choix du verbe *entrer* laisse parfois supposer une enceinte, mais sans que celle-ci soit matérialisée’.⁸² Guillaume’s movement into the ‘vergier’ suggests that change will occur in the narrative, particularly as the close proximity of the ‘vergier’ to the palace, and more importantly to Melior’s window, alludes to other texts in which poets portray lovers meeting in a ‘vergier’. For example, Marie de France depicts a transformative meeting between a couple in a ‘vergier’ adjoining a palace in *Guigemar* (vv. 219-20) and

⁸¹ Christiane Deluz, ‘Le Jardin médiéval, lieu d’intimité’, in *Vergers et jardins dans l’univers médiéval*, pp. 97-107 (p. 103). See also Geneviève Sodigne-Costes, ‘Les Simples et les jardins’, in *Vergers et jardins dans l’univers médiéval*, pp. 329-42 (p. 331); Armand Strubel, ‘L’Allegorisation du verger courtois’, in *Vergers et jardins dans l’univers médiéval*, pp. 343-57 (pp. 345-46).

⁸² Gingras, *Erotisme et merveilles*, p. 239.

Milun (v. 49).⁸³ The ‘vergier’ is depicted in many texts as a space for ‘la rencontre amoureuse’, as it provides couples with a place in which to meet in private.⁸⁴

The image of Guillaume in the ‘vergier’ manipulates the topos of this space as a meeting place for couples, and the poet plays with the audience’s expectations for a ‘rencontre amoureuse’ between Guillaume and Melior in this space, as suggested by intertextual allusions that he signals. For example, Guillaume’s position under Melior’s window makes reference to *Le Chevalier de la Charrette*, in which Lancelot crosses a ‘vergier’ before arriving at Guinevere’s window, through which he passes before spending the night with his ‘amie’ (vv. 4569-76).⁸⁵ The allusion to this scene in *Guillaume* creates the expectation for the eponymous hero’s time in the ‘vergier’ to result in the lovers’ union, whether within the adjacent palace, as in Chrétien’s text, or inside the ‘vergier’, as in passages of Marie’s *Lais*. However, this expectation is thwarted in *Guillaume*, as the eponymous hero does not attempt to reach his beloved Melior, nor try to arrange a meeting with her in the ‘vergier’. Instead, the poet insists on the passivity of this hopeful lover, exaggerating the time that Guillaume spends in the ‘vergier’:

Ens el vergier s’en *est rentrés*
[...] Vers la chambre torne son vis,
Son cuer et sa pensee toute,
Jusqu’a la nuit c’on ne vit goute,
Et *l’endemain* en tel maniere
Et *tote la semaine entiere*. (vv. 1326-33) (emphasis mine)

The stress placed on indications of time (vv. 1332-33), the verbatim repetition of Guillaume’s initial actions upon entering the ‘vergier’ (compare v. 1284 with v. 1328), and the verb ‘rester’ (v. 1326) elongates the temporal distance of this passage. The extended time period of this scene dissipates the tension created for the lovers’ rendez-vous, and the

⁸³ This space is the setting for the first meeting between Guigemar and his future ‘amie’, and for the meetings in *Milun* that result in the pregnancy that transforms the narrative (vv. 49-54). Marie de France, ‘Milun’, in *Lais de Marie de France*, pp. 220-47.

⁸⁴ Zovic, p. 13 and p. 18.

⁸⁵ Chrétien de Troyes, ‘Le Chevalier de la Charrette’, ed. and trans. by Charles Méla, in Chrétien de Troyes, *Romans, suivis de Chansons, avec, en appendice, Philomena* (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1994), pp. 501-704. See also comments in Caldarini, p. 17.

poet insists only upon the image of Guillaume contemplating his beloved. Rather than acting on his passion within the secluded and agreeable setting of the ‘vergier’, Guillaume simply sits, sulks, and sleeps.

The first scenes in the Rome ‘vergier’ emphasise the absence of Melior in this setting. However, her arrival in the ‘vergier’ more than a week later marks the start of the second scene of this episode and a renewed emphasis of the *locus amoenus* topos (vv. 1374-76). For example, Alixandrine notes the idyllic nature of the ‘vergier’ before the girls move there from the palace. She tells Melior that it is full of birdsong, and that they will see “ces herbes et ces flors / Qui tant ont fresces les colors.” (vv. 1371-72). The depiction of the ‘vergier’ in this passage includes different components of the *locus amoenus*, as listed by Curtius:⁸⁶

Ens el vergier vont ombroiant,
Les flors, les herbes regardant;
Del rousignol oent les cris,
De la tortrele et del mauvis;
Forment li plaist et atalente. (vv. 1379-83)

The term ‘ombroiant’ (v. 1379) emphasises the pleasant nature of the ‘vergier’, and different elements of the *locus amoenus* motif are signalled through the mention of flowers, grass, and birdsong. This description also alludes to other ‘vergiers’ in intertexts rewritten in *Guillaume*, such as the ‘vergier’ in *Thèbes* (vv. 2169-72). In particular, the reference to different birds singing in the *Guillaume* ‘vergier’ signals the Emir’s ‘vergier’ in *Floire et Blanchefleur* (vv. 2001-14) and the menagerie perched on the wall surrounding this space (vv. 1965-8; vv. 1980-4). In *Guillaume* the wide range of birds in *Floire* is reduced to only three, a significant number that in fact invokes *Partonopeus de Blois*, in which the poet uses sequences referring to three birds at the start and end of the

⁸⁶ Curtius, p. 195.

romance as a framing device (vv. 21-60; vv. 11803-16).⁸⁷ The *Guillaume* poet's depiction of three birds in the 'vergier' thus simultaneously signals and rewrites multiple works.

The abundance of natural imagery in the second *Guillaume* 'vergier' episode establishes this space as the setting for new love, and Melior's presence is used to rebuild tension for a meeting between her and Guillaume. However, the depiction of these figures manipulates the *locus amoenus* model and intertextual material, as the couple are portrayed as antithetical to the traditional image of lovers in the 'vergier'. The poet insists upon Guillaume's passivity towards advancing his amorous plans, and the same inertia is stressed in the depiction of Melior, who only moves to the 'vergier' because she is cajoled by Alixandrine (vv. 1366-72).

Once the maidens are in the 'vergier', the poet continues to thwart the expectations created by the notion of this space as a *locus amoenus*. The girls sit together 'desous une ente / Qui molt estoit bele et ramue' (vv. 1384-85), and this grafted tree signals different intertextual allusions that are manipulated in the text. In Bérout's *Tristan*, the lovers are spotted by the three barons lying together 'en un gardin, soz une ente' (v. 589). This scene is manipulated by Chrétien in *Cligès*, in which the eponymous hero and Fenice lie together in a 'vergier' under 'une ante' (v. 3684). However, the coppiced tree in *Cligès* bears fruit, and a pear falls onto the sleeping couple (vv. 6448-50). The pear was seen as 'un symbole sexuel, voire obscène' in the Middle Ages, and emphasises the sexual nature of Chrétien's scene.⁸⁸ This sexual symbolism is distorted in *Guillaume* by the image of Melior and Alixandrine under the 'ente', as the poet undermines the allusion to *Tristan* and *Cligès*, manipulating the image of the 'vergier' as a lovers' meeting place.

⁸⁷ This 'framing device' has been analysed by Eley and Simons, who note that it is used to 'invoke a multiplicity of symbolic and intertextual associations' as well as to offer a '*mise en question* of the principles and process of reading' in the romance. Penny Eley and Penny Simons, 'Poets, Birds and Readers in *Partonopeus de Blois*', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 36 (2000), 1-15.

⁸⁸ L. Polak, 'Cligès, Fénice et l'arbre d'amour', *Romania*, 93 (1972), 303-16 (p. 312). See also Gingras, *Erotisme et merveilles*, p. 237; Jessica Turnbull and Penny Simons, 'The Pear-Tree Episode in *Joufroi de Poitiers*', *French Studies Bulletin*, 75 (2000), 2-4.

The image of the girls under the ‘ente’ is further manipulated in *Guillaume*. The fruit tree from *Cligès* is rewritten, as the poet repeatedly insists throughout this second episode that Guillaume is seated ‘desous un pumier’ (v. 1283; v. 1327; v. 1396; v. 1407). The apple tree is highly symbolic in romance, and the primarily Biblical intertextual references it alludes to place it ‘au premier rang des arbres romanesques’.⁸⁹ The association in Western tradition between the apple tree and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Garden of Eden (Genesis, 3:3) carries connotations of knowledge, wisdom, lust, temptation, and sin.⁹⁰ However, two references to the apple tree in the Song of Songs (2:3 and 8:5) have led scholars to insist upon this fruit tree as a ‘powerful erotic metaphor’.⁹¹ The insistence upon Guillaume sitting under the apple tree is loaded with these symbolic meanings, as the young man appears as a temptation to Melior.

Melior is made aware of this temptation by Alixandrine, who observes Guillaume ‘sous .I. pumier’ (v. 1407) and encourages her to go over to him (vv. 1430-32). The poet emphasises the temptation Guillaume poses to Melior:

Devant lui sont assises lors;
Et quant la bele Meliors
Voit le vallet et sa façon,
Son nés, sa bouche et son menton,
[...] Si fu del damoisele esprise
La damoisele et embrasee. (vv. 1437-45)

Guillaume’s location under the apple tree highlights the sexual nature of Melior’s attraction to the young man, who is seen as the object of her lust. However, this image is undermined in the poet’s commentary on Melior’s thoughts towards Guillaume:

Se n’en cuidast estre blasmee,
Mien essiënt, baisié l’eüst

⁸⁹ Gingras, *Erotisme et merveilles*, p. 236.

⁹⁰ The Biblical passage does not specify which fruit grows on this tree, and a linguistic complication in the translation of Greek to Latin led to the Western Christian tradition accepting it as an apple. Michael Ferber, ‘Apple’, in *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 12-13. See also: Gertrude Jobes, ‘Apple’ and ‘Apple Tree’, in *Dictionary of Mythology Folklore and Symbols* (New York: The Scarecrow Press, 1961), pp. 112-14; Ad de Vries, ‘Apple’, in *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1976), pp. 17-19.

⁹¹ Francis Landy, ‘The Song of Songs and the Garden of Eden’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 98 (1979), 513-28 (pp. 525-26).

Plus de .C. fois, se li leüst (vv. 1446-48)

Although Melior would like to embrace Guillaume, she refuses to commit an action for which she would be chastised, as stressed by the use of the imperfect subjunctive. Melior's good behaviour thwarts the expectations established by the symbolism of the apple tree for her to give in to temptation, as the sexual nature of the *Cligès* 'vergier' scene is rewritten in *Guillaume*. The poet removes any suggestion of the lovers mirroring the actions of Cligès and Fenice, who lie together naked (v. 4633), and the presence of Alixandrine and the lengthy discussions between the three characters (vv. 1462-1709) further emphasise this intertextual transformation. It is only at the very end of these scenes that the poet conforms to the topos of the 'vergier' as a *locus amoenus*, as the conversations mediated by Alixandrine between the lovers result in the union of Guillaume and Melior:

Et cele a lui se rabandoune
Que de lui tot son plaisir face.
Dont se reprendent brache a brache,
Comme cil qui s'entrament tant. (vv. 1710-13)

This image highlights the poet more faithfully aligning with his intertextual models, as the lovers lie together in this enclosed and 'agreeable' space.

The *Guillaume* poet manipulates his depiction of the 'vergier', in these scenes, frustrating the audience's expectations and signalling rewriting. Yet he also uses this episode to transform the narrative, as the scenes end in the couple's return to the palace as lovers (vv. 1752-64). The final part of this 'vergier' episode similarly emphasises narrative transformation, as Guillaume and Melior begin their escape from Rome by crossing the 'vergier' disguised as bears (vv. 3120-71). The poet stresses the lovers' movement into and from this space, noting their entrance through the 'uis del vergier' (v. 3121) and their exit 'en la forest' (v. 3171). The couple's movement across this space

permanently alters the romance, as they leave the palace and enter the wild forest through which they journey to Sicily.⁹²

Critics note that the ‘vergiere’ occupies ‘une position intermédiaire entre deux étendues’ between the palace and the forest.⁹³ Indeed, Hüe observes that the ‘vergiere’ in Old French texts represents a ‘lieu étrange, à mi-chemin entre la nature et l’ouvrage de main d’homme’.⁹⁴ The *Guillaume* lovers’ passage across this space mirrors their existence as intermediary beings, caught between human and animal worlds. Their journey through the ‘vergiere’ presents literally the process of metamorphosis that they undergo in donning bear-skin disguises and leaving behind human civilisation, and stresses the function of the ‘vergiere’ as a one of several ‘*loci* of transformation’ in the text.⁹⁵ The poet stresses the image of the couple as animals after they leave the far side of the ‘vergiere’, noting that ‘A .IIII. piés vont comme viautre’ (v. 3147). The transformation from civilised human to wild animal appears to be complete, as the young Greek man who notices them sees them not as humans, but as bears: ‘Uns Griex estoit el gaut venus; / Quant *les ors* a aperceüs’ (vv. 3149-50) (emphasis mine). This short scene stresses once again the representation of the ‘vergiere’ as a catalyst for transformation in *Guillaume*, as the episodes set here alter the physical state of the lovers and redirect the narrative trajectory whilst signalling intertextual rewriting.

The third ‘vergiere’ episode, set in Palermo, shows a development of the image of Guillaume and Melior as intermediary quasi-metamorphosed beings in this transformative space. The events set here not only alter the narrative and rewrite intertextual models, they also create intratextual parallels with the first two ‘vergiere’ episodes, highlighting the

⁹² Bibolet notes that the ‘vergiere’ in *Perceval* and the *Chevalier de la Charrette* is ‘un endroit que l’on traverse pour aller ailleurs’. Jean-Claude Bibolet, ‘Jardins et vergers dans l’œuvre de Chrétien de Troyes’, in *Vergers et jardins dans l’univers médiéval*, pp. 31-40 (pp. 35-36).

⁹³ Jean-Jacques Vincensini, ‘Le Jardin de la fée: phénoménologie de la séduction et régulation actantielle’, in *Vergers et jardins dans l’univers médiéval*, pp. 389-404 (p. 391).

⁹⁴ Denis Hüe, ‘Reliure, clôture, culture: le contenu des jardins’, in *Rémanences: Mémoire de la forme dans la littérature médiévale* (Paris: Champion, 2010), pp. 81-100 (p. 81).

⁹⁵ Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 413.

notions of doubling and correspondence that will be explored in the following chapter. What is more, the final scenes of this episode also place emphasis on recognition, the final key theme of *Guillaume* that will be the focus of the fourth chapter of this thesis.

The depiction of the Palermo ‘vergièr’ alludes to the opening scenes of *Guillaume*, which are also set in this geographical location. The ‘vergièr’ from the first episode, described as ‘Desous la maistre tor marbrine’ (v. 64) and ‘Tot clos de mur et de cyment’ (v. 66), is invoked in the third episode through detail regarding its situation ‘sos la tor, / Clos et fermé de mur entor’ (vv. 4671-72). The walls that demarcate this space and separate it from the adjacent forest underline the way in which the ‘vergièr’ signals narrative and intertextual transformation throughout *Guillaume*. Like the two previous episodes, change is provoked by characters’ transgression of the border around this space, whilst their presence in the ‘vergièr’ alludes to and rewrites intertextual material. Yet the lovers’ presence in the ‘vergièr’ also highlights intratextual rewriting, mirroring the arrival of Alphonse in the ‘vergièr’ in the opening scene of *Guillaume*. This intratextual parallel is emphasised by the disappearance of the wolf after he guides the couple to the ‘vergièr’ (vv. 4696-97), leaving the lovers to replace him in this space and allowing the poet to insist upon intratextual doubling in the narrative. However, the first Palermo ‘vergièr’ episode is rewritten through the detail provided regarding the lovers’ arrival in this space. Unlike Alphonse in the opening scene, who suddenly transgresses the wall surrounding the apparently impenetrable ‘vergièr’ and shatters the calm of this idyllic space, the lovers are led into this space through a hole in its enclosing wall: ‘Jusc’au vergièr venu en sont / En sont *entré par une fraite*’ (vv. 4692-93) (emphasis mine). These figures slip into this now permeable space, crossing the threshold that surrounds it with apparent ease that rewrites the disruptive entrance of Alphonse in the first episode.

Although the ‘fraise’ in the ‘vergièr’ walls creates an ambiguous depiction of the ‘vergièr’ in this episode as a safe, enclosed space, the poet nevertheless insists upon

parallels between this setting and the topos of the *locus amoenus*. The depiction of Guillaume and Melior in this space highlights intertextual rewriting of multiple texts, as the poet develops allusions to the *locus amoenus* motif and intertexts manipulated in the second ‘vergier’ episode. For example, the description of this space as ‘biax et gens’ (v. 4695) stresses its idyllic nature. However, specific details signal intertextual models, such as the situation of the lovers in the ‘vergier’, who lie under a pine tree:

En .I. vaucel, un poi avant,
 El brueroi, desous .I. pin
 Se reposit jusc’au matin. (vv. 4702-04)

This description invokes two intertextual references that are simultaneously rewritten in *Guillaume*. The first of these is to depictions of Emperor Charlemagne in the *Chanson de Roland*.⁹⁶ The opening laisses of the *chanson de geste* describe Charlemagne holding counsel with his ‘douze pairs’ in a ‘vergier’ (v. 103), and the text insists that the Emperor is underneath a pine tree: ‘Desuz un pin, delez un eglenter / Un faldestoed I unt, fait tut d’or mer: / La siet li reis ki dulce France tient’ (vv. 116-18) (emphasis mine). Mickel Jr. notes the ‘association of Charlemagne and the pine tree’ that reoccurs throughout the *chanson*, and Notz has observed the link between this tree and sovereignty in the *Roland* and other texts, including the *Roman d’Alexandre*.⁹⁷ The image of Guillaume and Melior ‘desous .I. pin’ (v. 4703) signals this association, and the poet manipulates the image of Guillaume aligning with Charlemagne. The reference to Charlemagne foreshadows Guillaume’s destiny, as he will become King of Sicily and then Holy Roman Emperor through his marriage to Melior (vv. 9352-53). However, there is comic incongruity in the association between these figures, stressed by the image of Guillaume disguised in a deerskin. It is difficult to align this quasi-animal with the epic greatness of Charlemagne, as Guillaume’s disguise enables him to escape those who hunt him rather than confront

⁹⁶ *La Chanson de Roland*, ed. and trans. by Jean Dufournet (Paris: Flammarion, 1993).

⁹⁷ Emanuel J. Mickel Jr., ‘A Note on the Pine Tree in the *Chanson de Roland*’, *Romanische Forschungen*, 88 (1976), 62-66; Notz, p. 465.

them. These actions demonstrate an opposing attitude to the chivalrous bravery of the intertextual model signalled by the pine tree, highlighting rewriting of *Roland*.

The first description of Guillaume and Melior in the 'vergier' also creates an allusion to Bérout's *Tristan*, in which the lovers meet under a pine tree. Although Bérout does not specify the setting of this meeting, it is confirmed to be a 'vergier' in a discussion between Iseut and King Marc, "'Tristan, tes niés, vint soz cel pin, / Qui est laienz en cel jardin' (vv. 415-16).⁹⁸ Bérout places particular emphasis on the pine tree, as it hides King Marc while he spies on Tristan and Iseut (vv. 1-264). The King's presence in the tree is stressed in a later dialogue with Iseut in which 'pin' is repeated three times (v. 404; v. 415; v. 475). Bérout's insistence upon this image undermines the traditional association of the pine and sovereignty. Unlike Charlemagne in the *Chanson de Roland*, Marc is not under the pine tree, 'mais dans l'arbre'.⁹⁹ It is Tristan who stands beneath this tree, and his position implies sovereignty over Marc, emphasised by the adulterous relationship he conducts with Iseut. Tristan's power over Marc is further stressed by the hero's ability to fool the King in this 'vergier' scene. Indeed, Zovic notes that Marc is duped by 'le jeu improvisé [de Tristan et Iseut] dont il se croit le spectateur caché'.¹⁰⁰ Marc's reflection in the fountain alerts the lovers to his presence, and their staged dialogue (vv. 8-232) convinces him to withdraw his accusations of adultery (vv. 258-84).

Bérout's text is signalled in *Guillaume*, in which the lovers, like Tristan and Iseut, are observed together under the pine tree. However, the observer is Felise rather than a rival love interest (vv. 4896-97), and the couple do not stage a dialogue to fool the onlooker, as they remain unaware that they are being observed. Instead, the poet emphasises their status as quasi-animals when they are spotted: 'Aval regarde par le gart /

⁹⁸ Legros states that 'nous pouvons supposer qu'il s'agit d'un jardin intérieur au château'. Huguette Legros, 'Du verger royal au jardin d'amour: mort et transfiguration du *locus amoenus* (d'après *Tristan* de Bérout et *Cligès*)', in *Vergers et jardins dans l'univers médiéval*, pp. 215-33 (p. 218). The lovers 'se rencontrent souvent dans un verger' in the *Tristan* legend. See Caldarini, p. 12; Saunders, pp. 83-86.

⁹⁹ Legros, pp. 218-19.

¹⁰⁰ Marc is duped. Zovic, p. 11.

Et a veü les jovinciax / Qui *encousu erent es piax.*' (vv. 4896-98) (emphasis mine). The stress placed on the animal skins worn by Guillaume and Melior undermines the allusion to Tristan and Iseut under the pine in the 'vergier', and leaves the lovers unable to emulate their intertextual models.

The poet continues to stress the image of Guillaume and Melior as human/animal hybrids in this *locus amoenus*, referring to the couple as 'les bestes' (v. 5092). This emphasis demonstrates yet more rewriting of Bérout's text, and highlights intertextual dialogue between *Guillaume*, the *Tristan* romance, and *Cligès*. The simultaneous manipulation of Chrétien and Bérout's works in *Guillaume* is signalled in a description of Guillaume and Melior lying together:

Iluec se gisent teste a teste;
Grant joie mainent et grant feste
[...] Guillaumes est avec sa drue
Sor l'erbe verde, fresche et drue,
Iluec ensamble s'esbanient,
Jouent et parolent et rient
Et devisent de lor afaire (vv. 4905-13)

Like descriptions found in the first and second episodes, this passage aligns the 'vergier' with the *locus amoenus* topos. The couple are depicted lying happily together, as emphasised by the repetition of 'grant' in v. 4906, and the verbs 'jouent', 'parolent' and 'rient' (v. 4912). However, this image also signals and rewrites an allusion to Bérout's *Tristan*, and to Chrétien's manipulation of this model in *Cligès*.

The most striking image of Tristan and Iseut lying together is set in the Morrois forest. Here King Marc discovers the couple in their 'loge de feuillage':

Oez com il se sont couchiez:
Desoz le col Tristan a mis
Son braz, et l'autre, ce m'est vis,
Li out par dedesus geté;
Estroitement l'ot acolé,
Et il la rot de ses braz çainte. (vv. 1816-21)

Although this scene takes place in the forest rather than the 'vergier', the setting has been likened to a *locus amoenus*. Legros sees the lovers' 'loge de feuillage' as a 'verger

d'amour', and the image of the couple in this enclosed space echoes representations of the *hortus conclusus* topos.¹⁰¹ Indeed, Bérout stresses a parallel between the couple's tight embrace and the shelter of their 'loge'. However, this *locus amoenus* is not impenetrable, as Marc arrives in the forest and discovers the couple, shattering the idyllic image of happiness and triggering the events that lead to their departure from the Morrois (vv. 1987-2056).

Cligès rewrites the image of Tristan and Iseut lying in their 'loge de feuillage', providing evidence of the intertextual relationship that has been observed between the romances. Micha notes that 'l'histoire des amants de Cournouailles a hanté l'esprit de Chrétien', adding that 'à plusieurs reprises, dans le *Cligès*, il fait allusion à la sauvage légende d'amour et de mort'.¹⁰² In *Cligès*, the eponymous hero and his 'amie' lie together in a beautiful 'vergier' next to the tower in which they live in hiding (vv. 6407-11), described by Haidu as a '*locus amoenissimus*, [...] [a] hidden paradise on earth'.¹⁰³ Chrétien's allusion to *Tristan* is evident in this scene, as he notes that Fenice 'soz la flor et soz la fuelle / Son ami li loist *anbracier*' (vv. 6410-11) (emphasis mine). This intertextual reference is highlighted in particular by the presence of Bertrand who, like King Marc in the Morrois forest, discovers the couple asleep in this *hortus conclusus*: 'Soz l'ante vit dormir a masse / Fenice et Cligés nu a nu' (vv. 6432-33). However, although the description of Cligès and Fenice asleep evokes the sleeping lovers of Bérout's romance, Chrétien rewrites *Tristan* by stating that the lovers are both 'nu' (v. 6433). In *Tristan*, Bérout insists upon the clothing worn by the couple, noting Iseut's 'chemise' and Tristan's 'braies', and emphasising the virtuous nature of their embrace with the sword

¹⁰¹ Legros, pp. 221-22. See also Polak, pp. 303-04.

¹⁰² Alexandre Micha, 'Tristan et Cligès', *Neophilologus*, 36 (1952), 1-10 (p. 3). See also comments in: Borodine, *La femme et l'amour*, p. 134; James Douglas Bruce, *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance From the Beginnings Down to the Year 1300* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928), pp. 116-17; Peggy McCracken, *The Romance of Adultery: Queenship and Sexual Transgression in Old French Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), pp. 28-48; Michel Zink, 'Chrétien et ses Contemporains', in *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Lacy, Kelly, and Busby, I, pp. 5-32 (pp. 23-25).

¹⁰³ Haidu, *Aesthetic Distance in Chrétien de Troyes*, p. 101.

that lies between them (vv. 1995-2000). Indeed, Marc believes in their innocence when he perceives the sword and their clothes (vv. 2001-55). In contrast, Chrétien removes any notion of purity in his depiction of Cligès and Fenice, whose unabashed nudity under the symbolic pear tree presents an overtly sexual image.

The *Guillaume* poet alludes to and manipulates both Bérout and Chrétien's texts in his representation of Guillaume and Melior in the 'vergier', signalling the intertextual network in which his romance is situated by rewriting works that are in dialogue one with the other. For example, by describing the couple lying together 'teste a teste' (v. 4905), he parallels and manipulates Chrétien's portrayal of Cligès and Fenice 'nu a nu' (v. 6433). However, unlike Chrétien's romance, Guillaume and Melior are not undressed, and the presence of their clothing aligns them with the 'innocence' of Tristan and Iseut. The *Guillaume* poet exaggerates this detail by presenting lovers that are in fact doubly clothed, wearing animal skins over their human clothing (vv. 5094-99). The deer-skin disguises mirror the sword that lies between Tristan and Iseut, protecting the sleeping lovers' innocence and highlighting simultaneous rewriting of both *Tristan* and *Cligès*.

The animal-skin disguises are emphasised throughout the third 'vergier' episode. The lovers decide to remain in their hybrid state, yet lament their inability to see one another in their true human form:

Se plus es piax se mantenront.
Mais en la fin devisé ont
Que ja des piax n'isteront fors:
Ja ne discoverront lor cors,
Se de lor beste n'ont congié;
De ce se sont entrafichié.
Guillaumes dist soventes fois:
"Gloriox sire, pere rois,
Suer douce amie, que ferons?
Com me samble li termes lons
Que je ne vi vostre cler vis!
Ne je le vostre, dous amis" (vv. 4915-25)

The repetition of 'piax' (v. 4915; v. 4917) stresses the presence of the animal skins, which are presented in opposition to the lovers' human bodies ('cors', v. 4918). The poet

emphasises not only the double layer of the couple's clothing, but also the length of time since they saw one another as humans, rather than quasi-animals.

The representation of Guillaume and Melior in the 'vergier' contrasts starkly with the nude lovers in *Cligès* and with the image of the adulterous Tristan and Iseut in exile in the Morrois forest. Guillaume and Melior are not lovers lost in one another's embrace who engage in amorous activities in the Palermo 'vergier', but rather they are human/animal hybrids that use the *locus amoenus* as a place to hide while they 'devisent de lor afaire' (v. 4913). Although this couple may be emulating intertextual images from *Cligès* and *Tristan* as lovers in a 'vergier', the most striking image of them is that of talking 'deer' lamenting their plight. Neither human, nor animal, they cannot be considered as the same as their intertextual counterparts.

The final scenes of the third 'vergier' episode provide additional examples of use of this space to signal rewriting and alter the course of the narrative in *Guillaume*. The lovers are joined in the 'vergier' by Queen Felise, who is aware of their identity as disguised humans (vv. 5092-140). Felise dons a deerskin before entering the 'vergier' (vv. 5159-62),¹⁰⁴ and the poet describes her arrival in this transformative space:

Par .I. guichet est avalee;
Dusc'au vergier vint la roïne,
[...] Atant s'en va, plus n'i arreste:
A .IIII. piés comme autre beste
S'est entree par le guichet
Ens el vergier; tot souavet
Venue en est jusc'au prael (vv. 5162-75)

As with the earlier description of Guillaume and Melior's arrival in the 'vergier', the poet insists upon the Queen transgressing the border surrounding this space, twice noting the 'guichet' through which she gains access (v. 5462; v. 5473). Felise's movement into the 'vergier' triggers transformation, as shown in the description of her moving 'a quatre piés comme autre beste' (v. 5172). The image of Felise mirrors earlier depictions of Guillaume

¹⁰⁴ The only considerable lacuna in the manuscript occurs at this point in the text. The description of Felise's decision to dress as a deer is missing, although the French prose *Guillaume* provides the missing detail.

and Melior as animals (v. 3147), emphasising the status of all three beings in the ‘vergier’ as human/animal hybrids.

The presence of Felise in the ‘vergier’ also alludes to and rewrites the opening ‘vergier’ episode. Felise’s unannounced arrival evokes the sudden appearance of Alphonse in the Palermo ‘vergier’ and the kidnapping of Guillaume. This intratextual echo is emphasised by the fear that the Queen causes for the lovers: ‘Seignié se sont de lor mains destres, / [...] De paor tramble la meschine’ (vv. 5210-12).¹⁰⁵ However, the poet transforms Alphonse’s actions and the image of a terrifying beast, as the Queen is not threatening, and the incongruity between her royal status and her deer-skin disguise creates a comic image that is emphasised by the couple’s own animal-skin disguises. Like Alphonse, Felise’s actions trigger change in the narrative and alter Guillaume’s fate, as she takes the eponymous hero from the *locus amoenus*. However, rather than kidnapping Guillaume from the ‘vergier’, Felise invites him and Melior to join her in the palace, rescuing them from their exile and provoking positive change by allowing them to return to their fully human state (vv. 5303-53).

The third ‘vergier’ episode further demonstrates use of this space to frame and signal significant moments of change in the narrative of *Guillaume*, but also to encourage recognition of intra- and intertextual rewriting. The bordered space of the ‘vergier’ is used throughout the romance to highlight transformation in *Guillaume*, as characters are transformed by their movement in and out of this space. This image is stressed in particular by the developing portrayal of Guillaume, whose movement through the three different ‘vergiers’ changes him from prince, to abducted child, would-be lover, disguised fugitive, and finally promising hero. Indeed, the exaggerated emphasis placed on transformation in the final ‘vergier’ episode, as shown by the presence of three quasi-

¹⁰⁵ The lovers’ reaction to Felise in the ‘vergier’ will be discussed in analysis of recognition in Chapter Four. See in particular, pp. 271-73.

metamorphosed human/animal hybrids, suggests that transformation is inextricably linked to this setting.

The three 'vergièr' episodes also provide the poet with a clearly demarcated setting with which he can allude to topoi and individual intertexts. The depiction of this space as a *locus amoenus* remains dominant throughout the text, and specific details and events within each episode create links to intertextual models that manipulate this topos. From the *Roman de Thèbes* to Bérout's *Tristan* and Chrétien's *Cligès*, the *Guillaume* poet combines and reshapes diverse material in his depiction of the events set in the 'vergièr', using movement in and out of this bordered space to signal his intertextual rewriting. The repetition of this setting also enables the poet to create intratextual doubling, encouraging the audience to recognise the self-conscious construction of a romance that reflects its own composition through the transformation and doubling of material known to the audience.

Conclusion

Close scrutiny of the demarcated spaces analysed in this chapter shows that the bordered spaces are used in *Guillaume* as a catalyst of narrative and intertextual transformation. Until now, scholars have only explored the use of space as an architectural or structural device in *Guillaume*, or have limited their analysis to links between geographical locations and the romance's geo-historical context. In contrast, this detailed study has uncovered a more significant and complex aspect of the use of space that allows us to better understand the romance. The three bordered spaces of the straits of Messina, the forest, and the 'vergièr' are manipulated in order to highlight the poet's compositional process, as each one functions as a locus of narrative and intertextual transformation.

The narrative is transformed and shaped by events that occur in these spaces. Guillaume is abducted from the 'vergièr' in Rome, and is transformed into a foreign foundling by his passage to Italy across the straits of Messina. Guillaume becomes a nobleman after his encounter with the Emperor in the forest outside of Rome, and, once in

Rome, his time in the 'vergiere' leads to his union with Melior. The couple escape through the forest, re-traversing the straits of Messina, and they spend the final moments of their flight as quasi-animals in the Palermo 'vergiere'. These three separate spaces thus provide the back-drop for key events that reconfigure the course of the plot, and the poet emphasises movement in and out of each space in order to encourage recognition of influential events and the process of transformation with which the narrative is formed.

The crossing of borders around these spaces triggers change in *Guillaume*. However, these demarcated spaces also signal intra- and intertextual rewriting. Scholars have recognised poets' use of 'marqueurs' of intertextual transformation, and this analysis has shown that the *Guillaume* poet uses the frontiers surrounding these three spaces in a similar fashion.¹⁰⁶ The borders around each space stress their presence and significance, clearly marking them out as settings that allude to and rewrite intertextual material. The poet transforms intertexts, thwarting the audience's expectations and exploiting models individually and collectively. For example, the depiction of events at the straits of Messina manipulates *Guigemar* and the St Eustace legend, which are both rewritten in other intertexts transformed in *Guillaume* (*Partonopeus* and *Guillaume d'Angleterre*). The rewriting of intertexts also transforms his representation of figures within the narrative, as illustrated by the portrayal of Alphonse in the forest that reconfigures the initial depiction of this beast in the opening 'vergiere' episode. The use of space to signal rewriting relies on references to general representations of each space as well as particular details that highlight intertextual transformation. For example, within the manipulation of the general *locus amoenus* topos alluded to in the 'vergiere' episodes, references to the pine tree in Palermo are also used to signal the *Chanson de Roland* and Béroul's *Tristan*.

The *Guillaume* poet's use of space alerts the audience to the presence of intertextual rewriting through the focus he places on the transformations that these bordered spaces catalyse in the narrative. In this way, the poet highlights his compositional

¹⁰⁶ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?', pp. 59-60.

process, and the work becomes self-reflexive. Indeed, Simons has observed that the poet's structural use of space for key narrative events aligns with the notion of metamorphosis in *Guillaume*.¹⁰⁷ However, Simons neglects to comment on the process of rewriting that is stressed by the depiction of movement into and out of these spaces. This chapter has shown that the act of entering and leaving each demarcated space triggers a process of change in the *Guillaume* narrative that doubles a compositional process grounded in the transformation of existing material through *imitatio* and *mutatio*.

Analysis of rewriting in the episodes that take place in bordered spaces in *Guillaume* has also provided further examples of how intertextual material is transformed in the romance, as it is broken into constituent parts which are then redistributed throughout the romance. This approach to rewriting suggests that the poet doubles intertextual material by linking more than one aspect of his text to an individual scene or element from a work that he rewrites, and suggesting correspondence between different parts of his text. Doubling and correspondence are also highlighted through the repeated use of bordered settings. The Straits of Messina are crossed twice in *Guillaume*, and the forest and 'vergier' are each used as the setting for three separate episodes. Just as with the inter-, intra-, and extra-textual doubling stressed by the manipulation of the key female characters analysed in Chapter One, this chapter has revealed that space is used to emphasise the importance of doubling and correspondence in *Guillaume*. The poet foregrounds doubling alongside transformation, inviting the audience to recognise the two different spheres of the romance and to perceive the correspondence between them. On one level he presents a narrative that forms the structure of the text, and on another level he gestures to the intertextual current that doubles and corresponds with the narrative, aligning *Guillaume* with other romances grounded in intertextual rewriting.

Whilst Chapter One and Two have focused on transformation and have established that this theme is manipulated to highlight intertextual rewriting throughout

¹⁰⁷ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 413.

the romance, each chapter has also commented on doubling and correspondence in *Guillaume*. These notions are stressed in the narrative through the repetition of settings, such as the ‘vergier’, and through the correspondence between key women seen to be doubles, such as Alixandrine and Brande. Analyses of intertextual rewriting suggest that *Guillaume* doubles the works that it signals and transforms, and that the concepts of doubling and correspondence must be considered in order to understand the self-reflexive nature of this romance. However, although both chapters have touched on doubling and correspondence, and have indicated that there is a connection between these themes and transformation, neither chapter has fully explored the relationship between these notions. The thesis has thus far not examined the links between doubling and correspondence in the narrative and intertextual rewriting, nor has it explored how rewriting can be understood as a form of textual doubling that creates correspondence between the work rewritten and the new text.

Close analysis of doubling and correspondence is essential to this study of *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive romance, allowing it to move beyond observations regarding the reflection of the poet’s compositional process, and to discuss how the way in which the reception of *Guillaume* is also mirrored in the text. As such, I have not yet investigated how doubling underpins the relationship between the poet and audience, nor examined the notion of correspondence that is highlighted in the manipulation of doubling in *Guillaume*. I have also yet to explore how doubling and correspondence unify the themes of transformation and recognition that reflect the processes of composition and reception with which *Guillaume* is created. In order to fill these lacunae in *Guillaume* scholarship and to facilitate a comprehensive discussion of the self-reflexive nature of the text, Chapter Three will turn away from the theme of transformation that has thus far dominated this analysis, and will explore the notions of doubling and correspondence that similarly lie at the heart of the romance.

Chapter Three: Doubling and Correspondence

The notion of doubling has been recurrently noted in the first two chapters of this thesis. Chapter One indicated that the poet creates intra-, inter-, and extra-textual doubling between characters that mirror one another. For example, it discussed links between *Guillaume* Melior and *Partonopeus* Melior, between Alixandrine and Brande, and between Felise and the extra-diegetic figure of ‘contesse Yolent’ (v. 9655). Similarly, Chapter Two suggested that the repeated use of settings, such as the ‘vergier’, also creates parallels between the episodes that take place in this bordered space. Criticism of *Guillaume* has also highlighted the manipulation of doubling, and Ferlampin-Acher states that the romance is ‘hanté par la dualité, qu’il s’agisse de l’hybride garou ou du double jeu des déguisements’.¹ Ferlampin-Acher observes the ‘double nature du garou’, seen to be ‘mi-homme mi-animal’, and suggests that this dual and hybrid form is reproduced in the animal-skin disguises worn by Guillaume and Melior, which each present ‘un double rationalisé de la métamorphose’.² Similar comments are found in analyses of the *Guillaume* werewolf alongside the skins donned by the eloping lovers. For example, Douglas notes that the lovers demonstrate ‘strong elements of lycanthropy’, Scoduto comments on the ‘opposing natures’ of Alphonse and Guillaume, and Schiff observes the poet ‘doubling the story of Alphonse the werewolf with that of Guillaume and Melior donning animal skins’.³

However, the links that suggest doubling between Alphonse and Guillaume extend beyond similarities between Guillaume’s animal-skin disguises and the hybrid form of the werewolf. McCracken states that ‘critics have long noted that the lost son in the skin of a wolf is doubled in the story by Guillaume’, and Scoduto observes that these

¹ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, in *Guillaume de Palerne*, p. 108.

² Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 54; Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Guillaume de Palerne*: une parodie?’, p. 62 and p. 66. See also comments in Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Les Métamorphoses du *versipelles* romanesque’, p. 121.

³ Douglas, p. 121; Scoduto, ‘Blurred and Shifting Identities’, p. 121; Schiff, p. 421. See also Pairet, p. 66.

figures are the two heroes of the narrative, whose lives are ‘intertwined’ from the start of the romance.⁴ These comments are echoed by Ferlampin-Acher, who states that the work is constructed ‘sur deux parcours, celui d’Alphonse et celui de Guillaume, qui se partagent la vedette, même si, comme le rappelle l’épilogue, le second l’emporte’.⁵ Similarly, Micha observes the ‘double perte d’identité sociale’ presented in the narrative, Schiff comments on the romance’s ‘paired narratives of animalized identity’, and both scholars highlight the notion of doubling between the stories of Alphonse and Guillaume.⁶ Although critics such as Michelant and Tibbals have argued that of these double heroes Alphonse is ‘the real hero of the story’, most scholars believe that the werewolf is the double of the eponymous hero.⁷ This argument is stated most clearly by Pairet, who notes that ‘Guillaume de Palerne est présent tout au long du roman, mais le loup, qui est son double, sinon sa doublure, n’est jamais très loin.’⁸

Existing *Guillaume* criticism has observed the prevalence of doubling in the text by noting the werewolf’s inherent duality, commenting on the way in which Guillaume’s skin disguises mirror this figure, and observing the presence of double heroes. However, critics have not explored the manipulation of doubling in *Guillaume* in greater depth, nor sought to examine in detail the way in which Alphonse and Guillaume double one another. What is more, scholars have not perceived the link between this key narrative theme and the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume*. This chapter will address this gap in *Guillaume* scholarship through close study of doubling in the narrative, before exploring the importance of this notion to understanding *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive romance.

The analysis of doubling presented in this chapter is based on an understanding of this notion as denoting replication. The *Guillaume* poet reproduces elements of his own and others’ work and establishes doubling between figures such as Alphonse and

⁴ McCracken, ‘Skin and Sovereignty’, p. 362; Scoduto *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, pp. 90-93.

⁵ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 51;

⁶ Micha, ‘Introduction’, p. 30; Schiff, p. 419.

⁷ Michelant, p. viii; Tibbals, p. 355. See also Schofield, p. 312.

⁸ Pairet, p. 66.

Guillaume through his use of mirroring, parallels, pairs, and repetition. Doubling in *Guillaume* can be likened to the notion of twinning, although the *Guillaume* poet does not produce identical doubles (or twins), but rather emphasises the existence of non-identical doubles. For example, the depiction of Melior signals the heroine of the same name from *Partonopeus de Blois*, yet the *Guillaume* Melior is not an exact replication of her intertextual double. The presence of non-identical doubled elements in *Guillaume* invites the audience to acknowledge the resemblance between doubles, but also to question the differences and relationship between them. The audience are encouraged to perceive and interrogate the correspondence between characters and their intertextual models, between the animal appearance and human identity bound together in the werewolf's hybrid form, and between the werewolf and the eponymous hero he doubles in the narrative.

The act of interrogating doubles that is foregrounded in *Guillaume* highlights the notion of correspondence (or partnership) that has hitherto been overlooked in *Guillaume* scholarship.⁹ This chapter will explore the correspondence and doubling between Guillaume and Alphonse that has been observed by critics. By analysing the partnership depicted between the heroes, it will move from simply stating that one doubles the other to examining how this doubling functions. Correspondence and doubling together facilitate full understanding of *Guillaume*'s self-reflexive nature. Doubling unifies the narrative themes of transformation and recognition and links the form and content of the text that they in turn mirror. It also joins the poet and audience responsible for the creation of romance. Yet examination of these elements as doubles leads to acknowledgement of a correspondence between them. The new contribution of this study to *Guillaume* scholarship is its consideration of the reflection of the role of the audience as well as of the poet's compositional process in the narrative. By exploring *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive romance in which 'le texte se dédouble (se représente littéralement)', I will

⁹ I will use these terms interchangeably throughout this chapter.

interrogate the correspondence between the narrative and the processes of composition and reception that are reflected within it.¹⁰

Examination of doubling and correspondence links the analyses of transformation and recognition that form this study of *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive text. This chapter will explore the manipulation of doubling and correspondence in the romance, first presenting twelfth-century theories of doubling and correspondence and discussing examples of doubling in medieval romance, before studying the use of this notion in the representation of the werewolf and of Guillaume's animal-skin disguises. By then exploring the correspondence between Guillaume and Alphonse and analysing rewriting of intertextual models that foreground doubling and partnership, the chapter will highlight the importance of these concepts in *Guillaume*. The concluding section will link analysis of doubling and correspondence to the overarching examination of this text as a self-reflexive romance. It will also establish the framework for covering new critical ground in Chapter Four, in which this study will explore reflections in the *Guillaume* narrative of the audience's role in romance reception.

Doubling and correspondence in the twelfth century

The clearest manipulation of the notion of doubling in *Guillaume* is signalled by the presence of Alphonse the werewolf, as noted in Ferlampin-Acher's observations on the links between duality in the romance and the 'hybride garou'.¹¹ The werewolf embodies the notions of doubling and correspondence through its hybrid form, as the human mind of a man is trapped in the animal body of a wolf. Theories of duality in man abounded in medieval culture, such as the belief in the separate existence of the body and

¹⁰ Janet M. Paterson, 'L'Autoreprésentation: formes et discours', in *L'Autoreprésentation: Le Texte et ses miroirs* (Toronto: Trinity College, 1982), pp. 177-94 (p. 181).

¹¹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 108.

soul.¹² However, the most dominant belief manipulated in werewolf narratives is that of the simultaneous existence of human and animal natures in man. For example, Bruckner notes that the ‘duality of human nature’ was a ‘standard notion in medieval culture’, as the ‘oxymoronic character’ of human beings was linked to ‘Christ’s own dual nature as human and divine’.¹³ The werewolf emphasised this belief in man as a dual being, presenting ‘une figure clivée, qui laisse apercevoir l’alternance des deux dynamismes fondamentaux structurant la personnalité: l’humanité et l’animalité’.¹⁴

As a lycanthropic text, *Guillaume* is most often studied alongside two other Old French werewolf narratives, Marie de France’s *Bisclavret* and the anonymous *lai* entitled *Melion*.¹⁵ These works also highlight the notions of doubling and correspondence in their hybrid heroes, and intertextual parallels have been recognised between them and *Guillaume*.¹⁶ However, it is only Marie’s *lai* that can be seen to have directly influenced the *Guillaume* poet, as it was composed c. 1170.¹⁷ In contrast, the chronology between *Guillaume* (c. 1190-1223) and *Melion* (c. 1190-1204) remains uncertain.¹⁸ Although Ferlampin-Acher’s proposed *Guillaume* dating of c. 1270-1280 suggests that *Melion* influenced *Guillaume*, Sconduto argues for the reverse direction of influence between the texts, and Simons states that ‘the influence may be in either direction’.¹⁹ Setting aside the

¹² Carine Bouillot, ‘Quand l’homme se fait animal, deux cas de métamorphose chez Marie de France: *Yonec* et *Bisclavret*’, in *Magie et Illusion au Moyen Age* (Aix-en-Provence: CUER MA Université de Provence, 1999), pp. 67-78 (p. 70); M.-D Chenu, *La Théologie au douzième siècle* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1957), pp. 116-17; Pairet, p. 31; Marie-Christine Pouchelle, ‘Des peaux de bêtes et des fourrures: Histoire médiévale d’une fascination’, *Temps de la réflexion*, 2 (1981), 403-438 (p. 410).

¹³ Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, ‘Of Men and Beasts in *Bisclavret*’, *Romanic Review*, 82 (1991), 251-69 (p. 253).

¹⁴ Dubost, p. 552. Suard similarly notes the ‘constitution d’un couple oppositionnel humanité / animalité’ in metamorphosed animals such as the werewolf. François Suard, ‘*Bisclavret* et les contes du loup-garou: essai d’interprétation’, *Marche Romane*, 30 (1980), 267-76 (p. 271).

¹⁵ ‘*Melion*’, in ‘*Melion*’ and ‘*Biclarel*’, pp. 51-82.

¹⁶ For comments on doubling in *Bisclavret*, see Dubost, p. 553. For intertextual analysis of these texts alongside *Guillaume*, see Sconduto, ‘Rewriting the Werewolf’, pp. 23-35.

¹⁷ Laurence Harf-Lancner, ‘Introduction’, in *Lais de Marie de France*, pp. 7-19 (p. 10).

¹⁸ Amanda Hopkins, ‘Introduction’ in ‘*Melion*’ and ‘*Biclarel*’, pp. 7-50 (p. 9). See also comments in Prudence Mary O’Hara Tobin, ‘L’Elément breton et les lais anonymes’, in *Mélanges de langue et littérature françaises du Moyen Age et de la Renaissance offerts à Charles Foulon*, 2 vols (Liège: A. R. U. Lg, 1980), II, pp. 277-86 (p. 285).

¹⁹ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, pp. 66-67; Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 408 (note 7) and p. 425 (note 44). See also Dunn, pp. 9-10.

question of influence between *Guillaume* and *Melion*, the existence of this text and *Bisclavret* alongside *Guillaume* indicates that the figure of the werewolf was not uncommon in Old French narratives. All three works form part of a larger corpus of werewolf tales that originated in Antiquity with the story of Lycaon in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and a passage in the *Satyricon* by Petronius, and which all manipulate the notion of doubling.²⁰

Within this corpus, scholars have sought to categorise werewolves into two distinct types, referred to first by Smith as 'voluntary' and 'involuntary' werewolves, and later by Ménard as 'véritables' and 'faux loup-garous'.²¹ The distinction between these figures lies in their ability to take on lupine form at will, as for the latter 'seuls les maléfices d'un être malveillant les transforment en loups'.²² In contrast, 'voluntary' or 'véritables' werewolves initiate their transformation into animal form and 'perdent toute apparence d'humanité lorsqu'ils se transforment en loups' (emphasis mine).²³ Smith defines the voluntary werewolf as 'the most horrible, the most dangerous of all such creatures'.²⁴ The voluntary werewolf is commonly associated with the *versipellis*, a 'figure monstrueuse' that alternates between the forms of man and beast by physically changing its skin.²⁵ Although they maintain their human reasoning once transformed, the werewolves in *Bisclavret* and *Melion* are seen to be voluntary werewolves, as they are responsible for their transformation into lupine form.²⁶ In contrast, Alphonse is an involuntary werewolf who is metamorphosed by another figure in *Guillaume*, and whose

²⁰ For comments on these texts, see: Dubost, pp. 540-43; Sophie Quénet, 'Mises en récit d'une métamorphose: le loup-garou', in *Le Merveilleux et la Magie dans la Littérature*, ed. by Gérard Chandès (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999), pp. 137-63 (pp. 138-141); Smith, pp. 5-10.

²¹ Smith, p. 5; Ménard, 'Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge', pp. 213-17. See also Kathryn Holten, 'Metamorphosis and Language in the Lay of *Bisclavret*', in *In Quest of Marie de France: A Twelfth-Century Poet*, ed. by Chantal A. Marechal (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), pp. 193-211 (pp. 195-96); and Quénet, pp. 138-41.

²² Ménard, 'Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge', p. 213.

²³ Ménard, 'Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge', p. 217.

²⁴ Smith, p. 5.

²⁵ Smith, p. 9; Laurence Harf-Lancner, 'De la métamorphose au Moyen Age', in *Métamorphose et bestiaire fantastique au Moyen Age*, ed. by Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Ecole normale supérieure de jeunes filles, 1985), pp. 3-25 (p. 9).

²⁶ Ménard, 'Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge', pp. 217-22.

actions and behaviour remain human.²⁷ However, all three Old French werewolf tales are separated from other werewolf texts and placed alongside the medieval Latin narrative, *Arthur and Gorlagon*, as they all insist upon portraying the werewolf as a victim.²⁸ Regardless of the voluntary nature of their metamorphoses into animal form, these werewolves are all prevented from freely returning to their human state and are ‘under the curse for a fixed period of time or until released’.²⁹ Ménard notes that these texts share ‘le motif du loup doux et humain’, and Guynn notes that although these werewolves are ‘mistaken for predators’, they are in fact ‘virtuous’.³⁰

Although the lycanthropes in the four medieval werewolf narratives are positive figures, they all signal and manipulate doubling through the representation of their metamorphoses and their hybridity. Scholars have suggested that the image of a ‘tamed werewolf’ represents an attempt to attenuate ‘the horror of metamorphosis’ by repressing the animalisation triggered by their lupine transformations, yet these figures nevertheless highlight doubling.³¹ Critics have noted the medieval belief that those who transform themselves or who are transformed possess a distinct ‘doubleness’.³² This ‘doubleness’ can be aligned with the pagan belief that man possessed a ‘Double apte à changer d’aspect en se détachant du corps’.³³ This belief was erased by Christianisation in response to the conviction that only God could alter his creations, as any suggestion that man possessed

²⁷ Ménard, ‘Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge’, pp. 214-15. Smith presents Alphonse as an example of the ‘involuntary’ werewolf. Smith, p. 5.

²⁸ Charlotte Otten, *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1986), p. 8.

²⁹ Holten, p. 196.

³⁰ Ménard, ‘Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge’, p. 222; Noah D. Guynn, ‘Hybridity, Ethics, and Gender in Two Old French Werewolf Tales’, in *From Beasts to Souls*, ed. by Burns and McCracken, pp. 157-84 (p. 157). See also Sconduto, ‘Rewriting the Werewolf’, p. 23.

³¹ Bynum, *Metamorphosis and Identity*, p. 95.

³² Pamela Clements, ‘Shape-Shifting and Gender-Bending: Merlin’s Last Laugh at Silence’, in *The Future of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Problems, Trends, and Opportunities for Research*, ed. by Roger Dahood (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 43-51 (p. 51); Harf-Lancner, ‘De la métamorphose au Moyen Age’, p. 5; David B. Leshock, ‘The Knight of the Werewolf: *Bisclavret* and the Shape-Shifting Metaphor’, *Romance Quarterly*, 46 (1999), 155-65 (p. 155); Noacco, pp. 31-33 and p. 38.

³³ Claude Lecouteux, *Fées, sorcières et loups-garous au Moyen Age: Histoire du double* (Paris: Editions Imago, 1992), p. 127.

the ability to change his form was ‘une atteinte à la toute puissance divine’.³⁴ Thus, in order to explain narratives from Antiquity or contemporary literature in which man metamorphosed, theologians such as Saint Augustine affirmed that these texts presented an ‘illusion diabolique’ – an illusory metamorphosis that was an act of ‘demonic trickery’.³⁵ According to Saint Augustine, man does not change his state or being, but rather dreams that he has changed form:

I should by no means believe that the soul, or even the body, can really be changed [...] into the members and features of beasts. I hold instead that a man’s phantom [...] can in some inexplicable way present itself to the senses of others in bodily form, when their physical senses are dulled or blocked out. The actual bodies of the men are lying somewhere [...] in a torpor of the senses that is heavier and deeper than sleep. The phantom, however, may appear to the senses of other men as being embodied in the likeness of some animal, and a man may seem to himself to be such a creature. (*The City of God*, XVIII, part XVIII)³⁶

This explanation of metamorphosis presents Augustine’s notion of the *phantasticum hominis* (the phantom of man), an illusory double that appears before others and gives them the impression of a metamorphosis that in fact only exists in the dream vision of the transformed individual.³⁷ This understanding of metamorphosis is linked to doubling and correspondence, as it suggests the existence of an external and illusory double that works in partnership with the real individual who is allegedly transformed.

Scholars have suggested that werewolf narratives such as *Bisclavret* manipulate the concept of the *phantasticum hominis* by insisting upon the human nature of the lycanthropes. For example, Harf-Lancner observes that the humanisation of the hero in

³⁴ Lecouteux, p. 127; Harf-Lancner, ‘La Métamorphose illusoire’, p. 210.

³⁵ S. Lefèvre, ‘Polymorphisme et métamorphose dans les mythes de la naissance dans les bestiaires’, in *Métamorphose et bestiaire fantastique au Moyen Age*, ed. by Harf-Lancner, pp. 215-44 (p. 216); Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 17. See also: Caroline Walker Bynum, ‘Metamorphosis, or Gerald and the Werewolf’, *Speculum*, 73 (1998), 987-1013 (p. 990); Claude Lecouteux, *Fées, sorcières et loups-garous au Moyen Age: Histoire du double*, 2nd edn. (Paris: Editions Imago, 2012), pp. 116-17.

³⁶ Saint Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, trans. by Eva Matthews Sanford and William McAllen Green, 7 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1965), V, pp. 424-25.

³⁷ Harf-Lancner, ‘La Métamorphose illusoire’, pp. 209-210; Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, pp. 17-19.

Bisclavret ‘efface l’image du loup et affaiblit le thème de la métamorphose’.³⁸ What is more, she notes that by down-playing the animal nature of the hero, Marie presents ‘le même refus, le même rejet de la métamorphose’ as Augustine’s theory of illusory metamorphosis.³⁹ This study of the double heroes of *Guillaume* is informed by the concept of illusory metamorphosis and other beliefs regarding transformation and doubling that were circulating in the late twelfth century. Understanding of these notions facilitates discussion of the way in which the human/animal hybrids in *Guillaume* signal the co-existence of two contrasting forms in one being. By engaging with these concepts, this chapter can interrogate doubling in the representation of Guillaume and Alphonse, questioning how the representation of this theme at the micro-level of the narrative highlights the same doubling at the macro-level of *Guillaume*.

The relationship between the micro- and macro levels of the romance, between its content and form, similarly depends on the notion of correspondence that was prevalent in medieval thought. At the forefront of medieval minds was the belief in the notion of the macrocosm and the microcosm, which places ‘l’homme au centre du monde et suppose un réseau de correspondances rigoureuses entre le macrocosme (l’univers) et le microcosme (l’homme)’.⁴⁰ The idea that man’s existence on earth doubled that of the greater universe was explored in the twelfth century by thinkers such as Bernard Silvester. Bernard developed this Platonic philosophy in his *Cosmographia*, building on the existing belief in ‘a group of parallels between man’s configuration and the world’s’.⁴¹ Although the ‘popular’ theme of the ‘*homo microcosmum*’ was interpreted differently in the twelfth century, each development of this notion foregrounded the concept of the universe as ‘fait

³⁸ Harf-Lancner, ‘La Métamorphose illusoire’, p. 221.

³⁹ Harf-Lancner, ‘La Métamorphose illusoire’, p. 224.

⁴⁰ Zink, *Littérature française du Moyen Age*, p. 49.

⁴¹ Brian Stock, *Myth and Science in the Twelfth Century: A Study of Bernard Silvester* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), pp. 18-19. See also Chenu, p. 33; and Lynette R. Muir, *Literature and Society in Medieval France: The Mirror and the Image, 1100-1500* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1985), p. 119.

de similitudes et de reflets hiérarchiquement ordonnés'.⁴² Indeed, as Zink explains, 'la cosmologie tout entière est *faite de correspondances*, le macrocosme – l'univers – se reflétant dans le microcosme' (emphasis mine).⁴³

The notion of the microcosm and macrocosm is linked to the prevalent medieval practice of searching for a second meaning within a written or literary text. This approach was used within broad enquiries to understand the workings of the universe, yet it was also a central part of biblical and literary hermeneutics. Medieval thinkers would interrogate the parallels they observed between elements that doubled one another, such as man and the universe or the literal meaning of a work and its hidden spiritual or symbolic reading. By questioning the relationship between these doubled elements, they would use understanding of one to enlighten their interpretation of another. Stemming from approaches to biblical exegesis, medieval readers and audiences became skilled at searching for a second meaning that worked in correspondence with the literal level of the text that it doubled. Developing Augustinian exegetical writings regarding the 'sens caché des mots et des textes', theologians stressed the importance of looking beyond the literal meaning of the Bible to the spiritual sense underneath.⁴⁴ Augustine stated in the *De doctrina christiana* that words function as signs which cause us to 'think of something beyond the impression the thing itself makes upon the senses' (Book II: Chapter I: Part 1).⁴⁵ Within biblical hermeneutics, the reader had to make 'la distinction essentielle [...] entre le sens littéral et le sens spirituel', and Zink notes that 'cette recherche du sens

⁴² Stock, *Myth and Science in the Twelfth Century*, p. 198; Fabienne Pomel, 'Présentation: Réflexions sur le miroir', in *Miroirs et jeux de miroirs dans la littérature médiévale*, ed. by Fabienne Pomel (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003), pp. 17-26 (p. 23).

⁴³ Zink, *Littérature française du Moyen Age*, p. 232.

⁴⁴ Chenu, pp. 172-73. See also D. W. Robertson Jr., 'Translator's Introduction', in Saint Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, trans. by D. W. Robertson Jr. (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1958), pp. ix-xxi (p. xvi).

⁴⁵ Saint Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, trans. by D. W. Robertson Jr., p. 34. See also Archibald M. Young, 'Some Aspects of St. Augustine's Literary Aesthetics, Studied Chiefly in "De Doctrina Christiana"', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 62 (1969), 289-99.

second a été formalisée de façon à constituer le noyau de la démarche exégétique'.⁴⁶ However, these two distinct layers of meaning, literal and spiritual, could in fact be further multiplied by dividing the spiritual meaning into three separate levels, so that 'chaque passage de l'Écriture possède quatre sens: un sens littéral ou historique; un sens allégorique ou spirituel; un sens tropologique ou moral; un sens anagogique, en rapport avec l'eschatologie'.⁴⁷

Biblical exegesis encouraged the reader to focus on 'the discovery of inherent meanings', yet this interpretative approach was not unique to biblical hermeneutical practice.⁴⁸ Poets of non-religious texts developed the notion that 'toute réalité sensible ne trouve sa justification que dans ce dont elle peut être la signe', and works were endowed with a hidden meaning that was signalled within the narrative.⁴⁹ Critics note that medieval poets commonly 'évoquent la *senefiance* de leur œuvre', inviting the audience to 'lire derrière la *lettre*'.⁵⁰ Poets created texts steeped in symbolism to signal a level that doubled the literal meaning of the narrative, as the 'literary fashion' of placing a second sense 'hidden beneath the literal' became widespread beyond religious writings.⁵¹ The audience of texts such as *Guillaume* were aware of the practice of searching for a hidden meaning, and were 'apte ou habitué à chercher plus loin que la signification immédiate'.⁵² The notions of doubling and correspondence were thus linked to interpretation of texts in the

⁴⁶ Jean-Louis Benoît, 'Clef du texte, clef du royaume. La Lecture de la bible au Moyen Age comme paradigme de la littérature', in *Les Clefs des textes médiévaux: Pouvoir, savoir et interprétation*, ed. by Fabienne Pomel (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2006), pp. 303-19 (p. 305); Zink, *Littérature française du Moyen Age*, p. 231.

⁴⁷ Zink, *Littérature française du Moyen Age*, p. 231. See also: Chenu, pp. 173-75; Northrop Frye, 'Levels of Meaning in Literature', *The Kenyon Review*, 12 (1950), 246-62; and Muir, pp. 6-7.

⁴⁸ Duncan Robertson, *Lectio Divina: The Medieval Experience of Reading* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011), p. 42.

⁴⁹ Robert Guiette, 'Symbolisme et "senefiance" au Moyen Age', in Robert Guiette, *Forme et senefiance* ed. by J. Dufournet, M. de Grève, and H. Braet (Geneva: Droz, 1978), pp. 33-60 (p. 33).

⁵⁰ Benoît, p. 312.

⁵¹ James J. Sheridan, 'Introduction', in Alan of Lille, *The Complaint of Nature*, trans. by James J. Sheridan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980), pp. 1-66 (pp. 48-49).

⁵² Robert Guiette, *Questions de Littérature* (Gent: Romanica Gardensia, 1960), p. 39 and p. 41. See also comments in: Armand Strubel, 'Littérature et pensée symbolique au Moyen Age (Peut-on échapper au "symbolisme médiéval"?)', in *Écriture et modes de pensée au Moyen Age (VII^e-XV^e siècles)*, ed. by Dominique Boutet and Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Presses de l'école normale supérieure, 1993), pp. 27-45 (p. 35); Zink, *Littérature française du Moyen Age*, p. 230.

medieval mind, as the audience (or reader) were encouraged to perceive ‘un autre sens qui double la signification immédiate’ (emphasis mine), and which corresponded with the narrative’s surface level.⁵³

The *Guillaume* poet aligns his work with the practice of signalling multiple layers of meaning, alluding to this notion in the prologue to the romance. The *Guillaume* prologue ascribes to the tradition of referring to the parable of the talents (Matthew, 25:14-30) to stress the poet’s prowess.⁵⁴ Like the opening of the respective prologues to *Erec et Enide* and to Marie’s *Lais*, the poet states that he is obliged to demonstrate his knowledge within his text and not hide his talents:⁵⁵

Nus ne se doit celer ne taire,
S’il set chose qui doie plaire,
K’il ne le desponde en apert ;
Car bien repont son sens et pert
Qui nel despont apertement
En la presence de la gent.
Por ce ne voel mon sens repondre
[...] Car sens celés qui n’est oïs
Est autresi, ce m’est avis,
Com maint tresor enfermé sont,
Qui nului bien ne preu ne font,
Tant comme il soient si enclos.
Autresi est de sens repos:
Por ce ne voel le mien celer (vv. 1-17)

However, the juxtaposition of synonyms for the terms ‘to hide’ (‘celer’, ‘repondre’, ‘enfermer’, ‘enclore’) with markers of openness (‘en apert’, ‘apertment’, ‘en la presence’, ‘oïis’) could be seen to signal the practice of hiding hidden meanings in a text for the audience to discover. Even though the poet states that he will not hide the meaning of his work, the presence of these terms and the rhyme pattern of the passage indicates that the

⁵³ Daniel Poirion, ‘Qu’est-ce que la littérature? France 1100-1600’, in *What is Literature? France 1100-1600*, ed. by François Cornilliat, Ullrich Langer, and Douglas Kelly (Lexington, KY: French Forum, 1993), pp. 11-29 (p. 24).

⁵⁴ *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Ferlampin-Acher, p. 115 (note 3).

⁵⁵ ‘Erec et Enide’, p. 61 (vv. 1-18); ‘Prologue’, in *Lais de Marie de France*, pp. 22-25 (vv. 1-8 in particular). See also comments in Alfred Foulet and K. D. Uitti, ‘The Prologue to the *Lais* of Marie de France: A Reconsideration’, *Romance Philology*, 35 (1981), 242-49 (p. 245); Brewster E. Fitz, ‘The Prologue to the *Lais* of Marie de France and the Parable of the Talents: Gloss and Monetary Metaphor’, *Modern Language Notes*, 90 (1975), 558-64 (p. 558-61); Tony Hunt, ‘Tradition and Originality in the Prologues of Chrestien de Troyes’, *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 8 (1972), 320-44.

audience are nevertheless encouraged to search for a meaning ('sens') that doubles the literal narrative of the romance.

Scholars have also noted that the *Guillaume* poet uses the notions of appearance and identity to emphasise the practice of searching for a second meaning. Indeed, Sconduto notes that 'the audience's search for the hidden meaning [...] coincides with and mimics the characters' search for the hidden identities of Guillaume and the werewolf'.⁵⁶ Doubling is indicated within the figures of Alphonse and Guillaume, whose appearance doubles their hidden identity. This doubling creates what Ferlampin-Acher has termed a 'dialectique opposant le dedans et le dehors' in which 'le texte joue sur les relations, beaucoup plus complexes, entre la *nature* [...], l'*estre* [...] et la *samblance*'.⁵⁷ The dialectic highlighted by Ferlampin-Acher stresses doubling and correspondence, suggesting that the poet manipulates the 'relations' between these elements in order to signal the interpretative practice of looking for a hidden meaning. Other scholars have noted the importance of appearance and identity in *Guillaume*, suggesting that these notions work in correspondence in the text. For example, Noacco states that the werewolves of Old French narratives, including Alphonse in *Guillaume*, represent 'une invitation à interpréter la réalité [...] à dévoiler la *senefiance* derrière la *semblance*'.⁵⁸ Similarly, Sconduto notes that 'incongruity between Alphonse's appearance and his core identity' allow the poet to 'question the reliability of external signs'.⁵⁹ Characters in the *Guillaume* narrative are invited to interrogate the correspondence between the werewolf's behaviour and animal form, just as the audience are invited to perceive and question the correspondence between the narrative and a hidden meaning.

However, critics note that the poet does not endow his work with a hidden spiritual or symbolic meaning that he encourages the audience to discover, but instead

⁵⁶ Leslie A. Sconduto, 'Introduction', in *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Sconduto, pp. 1-10 (p. 1).

⁵⁷ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 80 and p. 77.

⁵⁸ Noacco, p. 45.

⁵⁹ Sconduto, 'Blurred and Shifting Identities', p. 124. See also comments on these themes in the Old English version of the romance in Houwen, "'Breme beres' and 'hende hertes'", pp. 223-38.

invites them to interrogate the notions of doubling and correspondence in order to ‘see the stories that lie beneath the skin of his tale’.⁶⁰ It is the poetics of rewriting that the audience are encouraged to recognise through the manipulation of these notions in *Guillaume*, signalled most clearly by the representation of the werewolf, who Simons notes ‘functions as an intra-diegetic metaphor’ for the strategy of rewriting adopted by the poet.⁶¹ Simons sees the hybrid form of the werewolf as embodying the poet’s approach to rewriting, which she describes as ‘a process of bringing together material from a range of sources and recombining them [...] in such a way as to leave the originals recognizable in their new setting’.⁶² For Simons, the attentive reader can discern the texts rewritten in *Guillaume* in the same way that characters can perceive Alphonse’s human identity that co-exists with his animal form. Ferlampin-Acher interprets the connection between the werewolf and the poet’s compositional approach in a different manner, stating that, as a hybrid, the werewolf was chosen by the poet to represent the ‘double discours’ upon which rewriting is founded.⁶³ Ferlampin-Acher notes that ‘écrire, surtout au Moyen Age, revient à récrire, à doubler un texte’, and similar comments are echoed in the work of scholars such as Huchet.⁶⁴ *Guillaume* is consequently ‘dans une relation double [...] avec son modèle’, and this doubling is embodied by the ‘dualité interne’ of Alphonse and Guillaume as both ‘hommes et bêtes’.⁶⁵

The work of Simons and Ferlampin-Acher highlights in particular the use of doubling in the representation of Alphonse and Guillaume in the text to signal the intertextual current that runs underneath the narrative and the compositional process by which the romance is formed. However, these critics have not fully interrogated the way

⁶⁰ Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 431.

⁶¹ Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 429.

⁶² Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 428.

⁶³ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 89.

⁶⁴ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 81; Huchet, ‘L’Enéas: un roman spéculaire’, p. 63. See also comments in Christine Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Le Roman de Thèbes, Geste de deux frères’, in *Romans d’antiquité et littérature du Nord. Mélanges offerts à Aimé Petit*, ed. by S. Baudelle, M. M. Castellani, Ph. Logié, and E. Poulain-Gautret (Paris: Champion, 2007), pp. 309-318 (p. 309).

⁶⁵ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, pp. 81-83.

in which the emphasis placed on correspondence and partnership also signals the process of romance reception. The practice of intertextual rewriting required poets not merely to double a work by reproducing it in their text, but also to alter and transform the original. They thus created a new version that was similar to yet distinct from the rewritten work (a non-identical double), and the audience were invited to interrogate the correspondence between the new and original versions in order to perceive and understand the poet's creative intertextual rewriting. Romance reception depended on this perception of the doubling and correspondence between text and intertext, and the emphasis given to both notions in *Guillaume* foregrounds their importance in the reception of the work.

By exploring micro-level specific examples of the manipulation of doubling and correspondence, this analysis of *Guillaume* examines the reflection of composition and reception at the macro-level of the text. Although Chapter Four will explore more fully the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume* through analysis of recognition, the present chapter first engages in discussion of the emphasis placed on self-reflexivity in the romance. This analysis is informed and shaped by existing methodological approaches to examining doubling in medieval works. For example, critics have commented on the 'particularly striking' use of doubling in *Cligès*, emphasised by the 'diptych structure' of the romance, the presence of two hero and heroine couples, and the two go-between figures.⁶⁶ Indeed, Maddox notes that 'la bipartition permet un jeu subtil de parallèles et de résonances entre les deux parties' in the romance.⁶⁷ Similar comments have been made of *Yvain*, in which doubling is found between Calogrenant's tale and Yvain's adventures, between the hero and the lion, and between female figures such as Laudine and the Dame de Noroison.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Carol J. Chase, 'Double Bound: Secret Sharers in *Cligès* and the *Lancelot-Graal*' in *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Lacy, Kelly, and Busby, I, pp. 169-85 (p. 170).

⁶⁷ Donald Maddox, 'Trois sur deux: théories de bipartition et de tripartition des œuvres de Chrétien de Troyes', *Œuvres et critiques*, 5 (1980-81), 91-102 (p. 99).

⁶⁸ Roger Dubuis, 'Du bon usage du "double" et du "dédoublément" dans *Le Chevalier au lion* de Chrétien de Troyes', in *Doubles et dédoublement en littérature*, ed. by Gabriel A. Pérouse (St Etienne: Publications de l'Université de St Etienne, 1995), pp. 15-25 (pp. 15-25); Allen, 'The Roles of Women', p. 150; and McGuire, p. 68.

The *Tristan* legend is also characterised by doubling, and Bruckner states that in Thomas's version of the text 'doubling occurs at every level and in every facet of the romance'.⁶⁹

Approaches to analysing doubling and to exploring the correspondence between doubled elements in medieval romance often focus on texts in which characters are reproduced in a narrative. For example, Bruckner comments on the replication of the lovers in the *Tristan* legend, as represented by *Tristan le Nain* and *Iseut aux Blanches Mains*, and Galloni explores doubling between Tristan and the figure of the wild boar.⁷⁰ Other scholars have studied narrative doubling, such as Eley's analysis of parallels between Anselot and Partonopeus in the 'Anselot episode' of the first part of the *Partonopeus* Continuation, and the 'internal repetition of elements within Anselot's story itself'.⁷¹ Analysis of doubling in romance is linked to observations regarding poets' reproduction of narrative elements, and a similar approach is found in this study of the *Guillaume* poet's manipulation of doubling through parallels and repetition.

However, although scholars have observed the various ways in which doubling is used and foregrounded by poets such as Chrétien, Thomas, and the anonymous *Partonopeus* poet, they have neglected the notion of correspondence. What is more, only a small number of critics have explored the way in which close analysis of doubling within romance narratives can shed light on the meta-level of these texts and highlight their self-reflexive nature. Ferlampin-Acher's study of the *Roman de Thèbes* stresses doubling in the romance, most clearly shown in the presentation of brothers and companions that act as doubles for one another, and she links this notion to self-reflexivity.⁷² In particular, Ferlampin-Acher stresses the poet's use of doubling to mirror his process of composition through intertextual rewriting, stating that in *Thèbes* 'la

⁶⁹ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 37 and p. 50.

⁷⁰ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, pp. 38-41; Paolo Galloni, 'Lo specchio di Tristano: Il Doppio, il desiderio e il disordine', *Quaderni medievali*, 45 (1998), 6-36 (p. 31).

⁷¹ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', pp. 181-86; pp. 139-46.

⁷² Ferlampin-Acher, '*Le Roman de Thèbes*, Geste de deus frères', pp. 309-318.

démultiplication des doubles [...] et la haine réciproque que se vouent les deux frères invitent à réfléchir sur la métaphorisation du rapport qu'entretient le roman avec ce double qu'est sa "source".⁷³ A similar methodological approach is adopted in Huchet's examination of the *Roman d'Eneas*, in which his exploration of doubling between characters such as Camille and Pallas leads him to qualify the text as a 'roman spéculaire'.⁷⁴ Huchet observes the way in which the text reflects its relationship with the Latin original that it rewrites and of which it is a 'miroir déformant', suggesting that the 'jeux de miroir' throughout the narrative 'permett[ent] au roman de saisir sa propre démarche'.⁷⁵

The comments of Ferlampin-Acher and Huchet show that doubling in a narrative signals parallels between content and form, highlighting the self-reflexive nature of a text that foregrounds and reflects its process of composition. However, neither critic discusses the importance of correspondence in these texts and the implications that this notion has on understanding their self-reflexivity. Thus, although this examination of *Guillaume* is informed by their work regarding doubling in the narrative of self-reflexive texts, it will expand their analyses to encompass discussion of correspondence in *Guillaume*. This chapter will now present close reading of the representation of Guillaume and Alphonse as hybrid beings and then as doubles working in correspondence in the narrative, before returning in its conclusion to further study of self-reflexive texts.

Alphonse and Guillaume as human/animal hybrids

The presence of Alphonse in the narrative embodies the notion of doubling. Sconduto notes that this animal/human hybrid possesses a duality that is 'expressed simultaneously', as the numerous juxtapositions between Alphonse's human behaviour

⁷³ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Le Roman de Thèbes, Geste de deus frères', p. 309.

⁷⁴ Huchet, 'L'Enéas: un roman spéculaire', pp. 66-71.

⁷⁵ Huchet, 'L'Enéas: un roman spéculaire', p. 64 and p. 75. See also Maddox, *Fictions of Identity*, p. 16.

and his animal form ‘depict the werewolf as a knight in spite of his appearance’.⁷⁶ Yet, scholars have also acknowledged that the depiction of Guillaume and Melior in animal skins suggests the poet mirroring the werewolf and manipulating doubling. For example, Miller notes that the lovers ‘become both marginal and exceptional’ in the disguises, Douglas states that they are ‘honourable shape-shifters’, and Pairet observes that ‘le motif du *versipellis* est l’objet d’un double retournement’ thanks to the presence of the animal-skin disguises and Alphonse.⁷⁷

However, *Guillaume* criticism has tended to see the couple’s disguises as mimicking Alphonse’s hybridity, as Guillaume and Melior do not fully metamorphose into animals.⁷⁸ Although this interpretation of the lovers in animal skins has rendered in-depth comparative analysis between Alphonse and Guillaume in the central section of the romance seemingly unnecessary, close reading of the portrayal of the lovers in the skin-disguises reveals an ambiguous representation of these figures as quasi-transformed hybrids that only mimic the werewolf. By focusing on the correspondence between the werewolf and the lovers in animal skins, this chapter questions the extent to which the poet reproduces the inherent duality of the lycanthrope in his representation of Guillaume in the skin disguises. It explores the similarities and differences between these figures, examining how the animal-skin motif is used to create a non-identical double of the lycanthrope. This analysis predominantly discusses the representation of Guillaume as a quasi-animal, as the overarching doubling that exists between the two *Guillaume* heroes calls for a clear and defined focus on the portrayal of Guillaume and Alphonse as doubled hybrids. However, Felise and Melior, who also don skins in the narrative, are incorporated

⁷⁶ Scoduto, ‘Blurred and Shifting Identities’, p. 121. Chapter Four will interrogate the way in which the wolf’s humanised actions indicate hidden human reasoning and trigger recognition of his identity. The present chapter instead examines use of the quasi-metamorphosis of Guillaume in animal-skin disguises to question the hybrid nature of the werewolf and to manipulate the notions of doubling and correspondence.

⁷⁷ Miller, p. 355; Douglas, p. 121; Pairet, p. 66.

⁷⁸ Miller, p. 355.

into passing commentary, so that this chapter can fully discuss the importance of the skin disguises in *Guillaume*.

The animal-skin disguises are stressed by the poet, who doubles this motif by not only presenting two lovers who don animal skins (and later Felise), but also by showing the couple wearing two different disguises.⁷⁹ Although they originally escape from Rome dressed in bearskins, Guillaume and Melior are recognised, and consequently shed these disguises in a cave outside Benevento (vv. 4159-61) before later donning deerskins provided by the werewolf (vv. 4341-90). Ferlampin-Acher mistakenly interprets a swift and seamless transition from the bearskins to deerskins by stating that the lovers change from one disguise to another in the Benevento cave: 'les peaux d'ours restent dans la caverne, d'où elles ne sortent pas, et ce sont deux cervidés qui s'échappent'.⁸⁰ However, the poet categorically states that the couple leave the cave in their human form, carrying the skins with them (vv. 4163-64). Indeed, the donning of deerskins does not happen until they are in the forest 'deus lieues et demie' from the quarries (vv. 4168-76). The poet highlights the gap between the lovers' time in bear-skin and deer-skin disguises in order to stress the presence of the deerskins. By showing the lovers briefly returning to human form before undertaking another quasi-transformation, the poet creates two distinct hybridising disguises, doubling this motif and emphasising its presence in the romance alongside the hybrid werewolf.

Although parallels are established between the eponymous hero and the werewolf before Guillaume takes on the first animalising disguise, the poet continues to build on the image of these figures as double heroes in his representation of Guillaume donning the animal skins. The suggestion that the disguises double the werewolf is made when the

⁷⁹ I will comment on Queen Felise's animal-skin disguises in Chapter Four. See in particular, pp. 271-73.

⁸⁰ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 69. By stating that the deerskins are donned in the cave, Ferlampin-Acher suggests that the motif of skin changing is an allusion to the well-known cloth trade for which Benevento was famous. Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 24-25.

animal-skin motif is first introduced into the narrative. As highlighted by the analysis of Alixandrine in Chapter One, the couple's go-between proposes the disguises:⁸¹

‘Mais se poiés des piax avoir,
Et dedens fuissiés encousu,
Ja n'estriés reconneü.
Ensi porrés, je cuit, garir
Et de la terre departir’ (vv. 3020-24)

Alixandrine's suggestion indicates that the disguises double the werewolf, an image further established through use of the term 'garir' (v. 3023). As the romance develops, the poet emphasises an association between 'garou' and the terms 'garir' (v. 3357; v. 3766; v. 4140; v. 4372, v. 4387; v. 7687) and its quasi-homophones 'garandir' (v. 3771), 'garder' (used in the third-person singular form, 'gart' v. 4140; v. 4143; v. 4157), and 'garant' (v. 4134). The poet uses these homophones to build on the association between the notion of healing or keeping safe ('garir', 'garandir', 'garder', 'garant') and the figure of the werewolf ('garou'), underlining Alphonse's role as protector for the eloping couple in the central section of the text: 'li *garox* pas nes oublie, / Ains lor *garist* sovent lor vie' (vv. 3765-66) (emphasis mine).⁸² In Alixandrine's speech, the verb 'garir' suggests a parallel between the disguises and the werewolf, indicating that the skins will ensure the lovers' safety in the same way that the werewolf later guides and protects them.

More striking parallels between the werewolf and the depiction of Guillaume in animal skins are evident in the portrayal of Guillaume's transformation into quasi-hybrid form. Chapter One noted that both heroes are transformed by a woman, Brande in the case of Alphonse and Alixandrine in the case of Guillaume, and observed that these women double one another in the narrative.⁸³ The doubling established between these women

⁸¹ For this discussion, see Chapter One, p. 82.

⁸² The placement of 'garox' and 'garist' on the third and fourth syllables of their respective lines stresses this juxtaposition. Ferlampin-Acher has commented on these paronomastic verses, noting that the poet's word play is significant. She does not, however, extend her analysis to the repeated use of the homophones of 'garir', which further stress the link between 'garou' and 'garir'. See Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 59; and Ferlampin-Acher, 'Les Métamorphoses du *versipelles* romanesque', p. 121.

⁸³ For comments on this link, see Chapter One, pp. 90-91.

indicates doubling between the humans they metamorphose, as Brande's transformation of Alphonse is mirrored by Alixandrine's transformation of Guillaume. This parallel is emphasised in the description Alixandrine gives when she suggests the skins to the lovers. The confidante tells them that, were they to be sewn up inside the skins ('dedens [...] encousu', v. 3021), they would not be recognised ('ja n'estriés reconneu', v. 3022). By explicitly stating that the disguises would completely cover the couple and fundamentally alter their appearance, the poet uses Alixandrine's speech to refer to the description he gives early in the romance of Brande transforming Alphonse. Brande covers Alphonse's body in an ointment and completely alters his external appearance: 'D'un oingnement li oint le cors / [...] Son estre et sa semblance mue' (vv. 301-05).⁸⁴ The animal skins suggested by Alixandrine fulfil the same function as Brande's 'oingnement'. These disguises entirely cover the body of the person they transform and reconfigure their 'samblance', a term translated by Ferlampin-Acher as 'apparence'.⁸⁵ This link to Alphonse's metamorphosis is emphasised by the rhyme pair 'encousu / reconneu' (vv. 3021-22), indicating doubling of Alphonse's transformation in the skins donned by Guillaume.

The depiction of Alixandrine sewing the lovers into the skins emphasises parallels between the disguises and Alphonse's metamorphosis into animal form. The skins cover the lovers' human bodies and transform their appearance:

Cele a prise la menor pel.
 [...] Sor Melior l'a estendue;
 [...] L'a encousue en la piau d'ors. (v. 3073; vv. 3075-78)

Aprés a prise l'autre pel;
 [...] A coroes longes et fors
 Li estendi desus le cors;
 [...] Li a la pel estroit cousue. (v. 3087; vv. 3089-92)

⁸⁴ I will return to use of the term 'mue' in Chapter Four as part of my discussion of the poet's use of specific terms to highlight recognition of this human/animal hybrid. See in particular pp. 265-68.

⁸⁵ *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Ferlampin-Acher, p. 112.

The description of the couple being sewn into the skins stresses the way in which the disguises cover their human bodies. The repetition of the verb ‘estendre’ (v. 3075; v. 3090) indicates that, like the ointment with which Brande covers and metamorphoses Alphonse, the skins engulf the couple and alter their appearance. What is more, the transformative effect of the disguises is further stressed in exchanges between the lovers and Alixandrine:

‘Bele, que te *samble* de moi?
 - Dame, par Dieu le souverain roi,
 S’en ceste pel ne te savoie,
 Por .C. mars d’or ne t’atendroie,
 Si *sambles* ors et fiere beste
 De cors, de membres et de teste.’ (vv. 3081-86) (my italics)

Alixandrine’s reaction to Melior in the bearskin mirrors earlier comments on the transformation of Alphonse into lupine form, stressing the notion of an altered ‘samblance’. Like the werewolf, Melior’s external appearance has taken on the form of the animal whose skin she wears, and Guillaume experiences the same transformation:

‘Bele, fait il, ne celés mie,
 Dites de moi que vos en samble.
 - Certes, sire, li cuers me tramble,
 Quant vos esgart, si samblés fier’ (vv. 3096-99)

Once again, the poet emphasises the ‘samblance’ of the couple in the disguises, whose external appearance has been changed into that of fierce bears, by repeating the verb ‘sembler’. The lovers’ animalised ‘samblance’ is highlighted again in the closing lines of this passage:

Quant es piax furent encousu,
 Si sont andoi desconneü:
 N’est nus qui tant les esgardast
 Qui autre chose li *samblast*
 Fors que d’un ors felon et fier. (vv. 3105-09) (my italics)

The poet foregrounds the image of the disguises changing the appearance of Guillaume and Melior, stressing notions of sight and perception (‘desconneü’, v. 3106; ‘esgardast’, v. 3107). The description of Guillaume donning the bearskin mirrors the transformation of

Alphonse into a werewolf, as a female figure covers the hero's human body and rendering his external appearance animal to those who look upon him.

However, the image of Guillaume putting on the bearskin and the depiction of this figure as a human/animal hybrid indicates that the poet creates a non-identical double of Alphonse. Although the disguise alters Guillaume's 'samblance', the similarities between the transformation triggered by the skin and the metamorphosis provoked by Brande's ointment do not extend as far as to suggest that the disguise alters Guillaume's 'estre' (human nature). The poet notes that Alphonse's metamorphosis causes him to become a wolf ('leus devint', v. 306), yet in contrast he is at pains to show that Guillaume's 'estre' remains fully intact underneath the disguise. He achieves this by noting that the skins donned by Guillaume and Melior are placed not only over their human bodies, but also over their human clothes. When Alixandrine disguises Melior, the poet states that the heroine is sewn into the skin 'Ensi comme ele estoit vestue / De ses garnemens les millors' (vv. 3076-77), later noting that Guillaume's bearskin is placed 'Sor la robe qu'il ot vestue' (v. 3091). The human clothing acts as a point of contact between animal skins and human bodies, keeping them separate in spite of their co-presence in the lovers' animalised form.

The clothing that Guillaume retains under the animal skin reminds the audience that the eponymous hero's physical human form is not altered by the transformation of his outer appearance. Indeed, the clothes he wears further distance him from the animal he pretends to be, as only humans wear clothing. Although Guillaume has the 'samblance' of a fierce bear, he is not fully transformed into an animal. Unlike Alphonse, whose entire being is reconfigured into that of a wolf in which only his human mind and reasoning are left intact, Guillaume's disguise does not affect his human body. Close analysis of the correspondence between the depiction of Alphonse and Guillaume as undergoing

transformation into human/animal hybrids thus indicates that the poet creates a non-identical doubling of the werewolf's metamorphosis.

The developing depiction of Guillaume in the skins emphasises the differences between his quasi-transformations into bear and stag and Alphonse's lupine metamorphosis. For example, the poet later refers to the disguises as 'la pel c'avoit vestue' (v. 3322), using the verb 'vestir' to indicate that they function as another layer of clothing that only alters the appearance rather than form of the person who wears them. The human clothing protects the human form underneath, as when the lovers shed their bearskins outside Benevento, the poet comments that 'Si demourent es bliaus / Que des piax orent lais et tains' (vv. 4160-61). Whilst reminding the audience of the presence of clothing, the poet suggests here that the skins have damaged and tarnished the garments upon which they are placed, indicating that the clothes act as a protective layer between human body and animal skin.

The clothing worn underneath the animal skins signals the preservation not only of Guillaume's fully human form, but also of his noble identity. When the lovers arrive in Palermo and are observed by Felise, the poet makes explicit reference to their clothes:

Mais les piax qu'ils orent vestues
Erent si por le chaut sechies
Et retraites et restrechies
Que contreval par les coustures
Lors saillent hors les vesteüres
Lor porpres indes et vermeilles. (vv. 5094-99)

The poet presents a detailed image of how the clothing is revealed underneath the skins that cover it, and, as will be explored in Chapter Four, this detail leads the Queen to recognise the human forms hidden underneath the layers of cloth and skin.⁸⁶ Yet detail is also given regarding the rich quality of the clothes, 'porpres indes et vermeilles' (v. 5099). Wright states that the fabric 'porpre' is 'rare', as it is 'a type of imported silk usually

⁸⁶ See comments in Chapter Four, pp. 271-72.

produced in the Levant'.⁸⁷ The fine cloth the lovers wear signals their status as members of a noble household, presenting another layer of their identity that marks them out as human and signals their social rank. By insisting upon the presence of human clothing underneath the animal-skin disguises, the poet creates a non-identical double of Alphonse in his representation of Guillaume as a human/animal hybrid. Yet he also uses the clothes to emphasise the multiple layers of Guillaume's identity as a quasi-transformed animal, showing the fusion of human and animal elements within the appearance of the eponymous hero. The animal skins that transform Guillaume's external appearance into the 'samblance' of a beast are layered upon clothing that preserves his noble status, which protects his body that remains unaltered by the transformative process of disguise.

The layers of Guillaume's quasi-metamorphosed appearance suggest a literal doubling of the hybrid form of the werewolf in *Guillaume*. Although Alphonse's exterior form is significantly more altered than that of Guillaume, as he physically becomes a wolf (v. 306), the poet insists throughout the romance that the werewolf's human reasoning and noble identity remain intact within his animal body. Indeed, Ménard notes that in spite of his animal form, Alphonse 'reste doux comme un mouton, raisonnable, bienveillant'.⁸⁸ This werewolf 'garde raison humaine' in his lupine state, and uses his sense and reasoning to perform humanised gestures in order to trigger recognition, as will be explored in Chapter Four.⁸⁹ Scoduto also observes that 'the poet portrays the beast in a chivalric role' in spite of his animal form, suggesting that the presence of a noble identity trapped within his animal exterior that differentiates Alphonse not only from other animals, but also from other humans.⁹⁰ The layers of Guillaume's appearance as hybrid mirror the contrasting facets of Alphonse's lycanthropic state of being, as they highlight the presence of human, noble, and animal elements within this hybrid.

⁸⁷ Wright, p. 46.

⁸⁸ Ménard, 'Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge', p. 214.

⁸⁹ In particular, see the section entitled 'Recognition of the werewolf in *Guillaume* and *Bisclavret*', pp. 240-55.

⁹⁰ Scoduto, 'Blurred and Shifting Identities', p. 123.

Above all the *Guillaume* poet insists upon the contrast between human and animal in the werewolf's metamorphosed form and Guillaume's quasi-transformed state, stressing the image of these figures as dual beings in order to signal the notions of doubling and correspondence. The emphasis placed on Guillaume's transformation as one of layering is used to indicate that the eponymous hero's human body is not replaced with the animal appearance he adopts, but rather that the hybridisation of this figure creates more layers of his identity. Guillaume becomes a hybrid in which animal and human exist simultaneously in one form. The clothing worn underneath his animalising disguises reminds the audience and others in the narrative of the continued presence of his human body that the garments cover, indicating the importance of perceiving the correspondence of the contrasting elements of his appearance in order for his identity to be understood.

The representation of Guillaume as a human/animal hybrid doubles the hybrid werewolf, a figure 'clivée' between humanity and animality.⁹¹ However, interrogation of the correspondence between Guillaume and Alphonse as hybrids suggests that the former presents a commentary on the latter, reproducing the metamorphosis of Alphonse in a manner that emphasises differences between them in order to shed light on the particularities of the lycanthrope's hybridity. Indeed, McCracken notes in her analysis of these figures that 'the parallel representations' of Guillaume and Alphonse 'are not just a narrative doubling; they ground each other [...] each is the background to the other'.⁹²

The most striking difference observed between Guillaume and Alphonse as transformed human/animal hybrids is the semi-permanent nature of Guillaume's quasi-metamorphosis. Critics have suggested that the poet emphasises 'the mobility of the skins' worn by Guillaume in order to highlight 'the wolf's inability to leave his skin'.⁹³ By stressing the presence of Guillaume's clothes under the skins, the poet indicates that the disguises alter Guillaume's appearance like any other layer of clothing, suggesting

⁹¹ Dubost, p. 552.

⁹² McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', p. 362.

⁹³ McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', p. 362.

that they can be removed with similar ease. What is more, Ferlampin-Acher observes the ‘dimension carnivalesque’ with which the poet imitates rather than closely doubles Alphonse’s hybrid form.⁹⁴ The entertaining nature of the disguises is stressed in particular by the depiction of the lovers eating when dressed in the skins:

Cascuns a traite sa main nue
Fors de la pel c’avoit vestue,
Car cele qui es piax les mist
A l’enkeudrè ensi le fist
Que chascun puet sa main avoir
Si com lui plaist, a son voloir.
Par les geules qui sont es piax
S’entrepassoient des morssiax. (vv. 3321-28)

The comical depiction of the couple eating whilst wearing their disguises underlines the ‘distinction between the human and the animal’ that the animal-skins foreground.⁹⁵ The juxtaposition of ‘main nue’ and ‘vestue’ (vv. 3321-22) emphasises the contrast between the lovers’ animal exterior and hidden human bodies, all the while highlighting the image of the skins as a layer of clothing that alters their external appearance. The poet insists upon the reversible nature of the transformations triggered by the disguises, noting that the skins have been adjusted by Alixandrine in such a way that the lovers are able to use their human hands (vv. 3323-26). By showing the couple removing their hands ‘fors de la pel’ (v. 3322), this passage emphasises the permanent presence of the couple’s human bodies that remain unaltered in spite of the transformative skins that they wear.

The portrayal of the couple feeding one another while dressed as bears is comical, yet it also suggests that they can shed the disguises and reverse their zoomorphic transformation if they so wished.⁹⁶ The layers of Guillaume’s metamorphosis and the indication of the ease with which he could retransform are contrasted with the complex layers of Alphonse’s transformation. The werewolf cannot simply slip out of his lupine form, and critics have thus stated that the lovers ‘only mimic a state of hybridity that for

⁹⁴ *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Ferlampin-Acher, p. 204 (note 2).

⁹⁵ McCracken, ‘Skin and Sovereignty’, p. 364. This scene is discussed in detail as part of McCracken’s analysis of the skin motif in *Guillaume*.

⁹⁶ McCracken, ‘Skin and Sovereignty’, p. 366.

Alfonso is a permanent reality'.⁹⁷ Simons notes that the transformations of Guillaume and Melior 'are no more than skin deep', and Pairet extends this critical interpretation by noting that the disguises allow the poet to counteract 'le thème de la double nature', as 'la dualité se fait duplicité, la peau de bête renvoyant à la ruse humaine'.⁹⁸ The reconfiguration of Guillaume into an animal-like being is portrayed as a temporary change to his external form rather than a result of inherent duality, and Pairet observes the 'proximité du motif du déguisement avec le thème de la métamorphose illusoire qui circulait dans les milieux cléricaux'.⁹⁹

In particular, the representation of the eponymous *Guillaume* hero as a quasi-transformed human/animal hybrid is aligned with the portrayal of lycanthropy in the *Topographica Hibernica*, written by Gerald of Wales (Giraldus Cambrensis).¹⁰⁰ Created in c. 1187-88, the *Topographica* is split into three main sections, of which the second is entitled 'De mirabilis Hiberniæ et miraculis' (Of the wonders and miracles of Ireland').¹⁰¹ Chapter XIX of this section presents Gerald's account of werewolves, and the description of an encounter outside the village of Ossory between a priest and two wolves emphasises the notion of illusory and skin-deep metamorphosis.¹⁰² The Ossory wolves are represented as lycanthropes, a man and a woman that are forced to undergo metamorphosis from human to animal form and who must spend seven years as werewolves and outcasts. Gerald explains that the werewolves encounter a priest outside Ossory, and that the male

⁹⁷ Miller, p. 355.

⁹⁸ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 423; Pairet, p. 67.

⁹⁹ Pairet, p. 67.

¹⁰⁰ Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Volume 5*, pp. 3-204. For an English translation, see Giraldus Cambrensis, *The Topography of Ireland*, trans. by Thomas Forester and ed. by Thomas Wright (Cambridge, ON: Medieval Latin Series, 2000), pp. 11-92 <http://www.yorku.ca/inpar/topography_ireland.pdf> [accessed 1 October 2014].

¹⁰¹ J. S. Brewer, James F. Dimock, and George F. Warner, 'Preface' in Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Volume 5*, pp. vii-xc (p. xlix); Jeanne-Marie Boivin, 'Le Prêtre et les loups-garous: un épisode de la *Topographia Hibernica* de Giraud de Barri', in *Métamorphose et bestiaire fantastique au Moyen Age*, ed. by Harf-Lancner, pp. 51-69 (p. 51); John J. O'Meara, 'Introduction', in Gerald of Wales, *The History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 11-18 (p. 15).

¹⁰² This passage is found in the following: Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Volume 5*, pp. 101-07; Giraldus Cambrensis, *The Topography of Ireland*, pp. 44-47.

wolf approaches the priest, asking him to administer the last rights to the female wolf, who is dying.

Ménard comments on the unusual nature of this lycanthrope, noting that ‘le loup, tout quadrupède qu’il est, conserve la raison, le langage et même la foi religieuse des hommes’.¹⁰³ The depiction of the wolf speaking is exceptional amongst medieval werewolf narratives, as the *Topographica* is the only text to portray a lycanthrope using speech to communicate rather than mute humanised gestures.¹⁰⁴ However, this act of speech is not enough to convince the priest of the hidden human nature of this transformed being, as the cleric is hesitant to perform the viaticum with the beast. Thus, in order to prove his hidden humanity, the animal peels back the wolf-skin of his partner to reveal the woman underneath:

Et ut omnem abstergeret dubietatem, pede quasi pro manu fungens, pellem totam a capite lupe retrahens, usque ad umbilicum replicavit: et statim expressa forma vetule cujusdam apparuit.¹⁰⁵

Critics have observed the unusual nature of this scene, in which the metamorphosis is presented as having been achieved by covering the body in ‘une enveloppe extérieure’.¹⁰⁶ The image of a human body hidden underneath the wolf’s outer skin has been aligned with the Augustinian principle of illusory metamorphosis that Gerald evokes later in chapter XIX.¹⁰⁷ Gerald notes that stories of transformation can be explained by Augustine’s theory of the ‘phantasm’, and his depiction of the wolf’s hybrid form

¹⁰³ Ménard, ‘Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge’, p. 215.

¹⁰⁴ Boivin, p. 53; Ménard, ‘Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge’, p. 215; Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 28.

¹⁰⁵ Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Volume 5*, pp. 102-03. Forester translates this as follows: ‘To remove all doubt, using his claw for a hand, he tore off the skin of the she-wolf, from the head down to the navel, folding it back. Thus she immediately presented the form of an old woman.’ Giraldus Cambrensis, *The Topography of Ireland*, p. 45.

¹⁰⁶ Ménard, ‘Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge’, p. 216. See also Suard, p. 269.

¹⁰⁷ Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, pp. 30-32.

suggests that these transformations are in some way false or illusory, as they have not reconfigured the human forms hidden underneath the exterior wolf-skins.¹⁰⁸

Boivin highlights the singular nature of Gerald's lycanthropic tale, stating that it is 'absolument unique dans les récits de loups-garous et constitue, à la limite, une négation du thème de la métamorphose: la lycanthropie est réduite à un déguisement'.¹⁰⁹ These comments suggest links between the text and the animal-skin disguises in *Guillaume*. The false nature of the Ossory werewolves' transformation aligns with the skins donned by Guillaume and Melior, and Pairet observes 'les parallèles entre la scène rapportée dans la *Topographia Hibernica* et le motif de la fausse peau, tel qu'il apparaît dans *Guillaume*'.¹¹⁰ Both works present a striking literal representation of the hybrid form of a werewolf such as Alphonse. The disguises worn by Guillaume on top of his human body and clothing align with the human form that is revealed underneath the she-wolf's skin in the *Topographica*, and both texts offer a 'traduction visuelle' of the 'opposition entre l'extérieur – l'apparence animale – et l'intérieur – l'intelligence humaine conservée' that a werewolf's hybridity represents.¹¹¹

The quasi-transformation of the eponymous hero in *Guillaume* is achieved when the animal skin that is placed over him marries his human body and an animal appearance together in one form. Like the wolves in the *Topographica*, the poet suggests that this alteration to Guillaume's appearance can be reversed by removing the skins to reveal the human body that remains unaffected by the apparent metamorphosis. Indeed, Bynum notes that 'the whole romance plays with the idea that an appearance is a skin put on'.¹¹² These comments indicate that appearance can be easily altered by removing the transformative skins, highlighting links between these human/animal hybrids and the

¹⁰⁸ Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Volume 5*, pp. 106-07; Giraldus Cambrensis, *The Topography of Ireland*, p. 46.

¹⁰⁹ Boivin, p. 56. For a contrasting interpretation of the false nature of the metamorphosis, see comments in Harf-Lancner, 'La Métamorphose illusoire', p. 218.

¹¹⁰ Pairet, p. 67. See also Bynum, *Metamorphosis and Identity*, pp. 108-09.

¹¹¹ Boivin, p. 56.

¹¹² Bynum, *Metamorphosis and Identity*, p. 109.

versipellis. Ménard emphasises the closeness between Gerald’s depiction of the Ossory werewolves and the Latin term *verspellis*, used to describe a man who changes his skin.¹¹³ This critic notes that the *Topographica* stresses ‘l’idée que la peau de loup constitue l’apparence extérieure du garou, qu’elle se revêt et s’ôte tour à tour, [et] que l’aspect humain subsiste par-dessous’.¹¹⁴ The *versipellis* is classed by Smith in the category of voluntary werewolves, and critics have observed links to this notion and voluntary metamorphosis signalled by the animal-skin disguises in *Guillaume*.¹¹⁵

However, both *Guillaume* and the *Topographica* present an ambiguous depiction of the ease with which the skins can be removed, and question the voluntary nature of these transformations. Although the Ossory werewolves can reveal their human form to the priest, Gerald notes that they are bound to their metamorphosed state of being for seven years. The male-wolf explains the nature of their transformation:

‘There are two of us, a man and a woman, natives of Ossory, who, through the curse of one Natalis, saint and abbot, are *compelled* every seven years to put off the human form, and depart from the dwellings of men. *Quitting entirely* the human form, we assume that of wolves. At the end of the seven years, if they chance to survive, two others being substituted in their places, they return to their country and their former shape.’¹¹⁶
(emphasis mine)

The description of the wolf peeling back the skin of his partner that follows this passage could suggest that the wolves are able to return to human form at will, yet Gerald stresses here that these figures are not voluntary werewolves. They have been forced (‘compelled’) to become wolves and must remain in this form for the duration of the curse. The details of the nature of their transformation align with Holten’s definition of

¹¹³ Ménard, ‘Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge’, p. 216.

¹¹⁴ Ménard, ‘Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge’, p. 216.

¹¹⁵ Smith, pp. 9-10; Pairet, pp. 66-67; Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Les Métamorphoses du *versipelles* romanesque’, pp. 120-21.

¹¹⁶ Giraldus Cambrensis, *The Topography of Ireland*, p. 44. Translated from the Latin original: ‘De quodam hominum genere sumus Ossiriensium. Unde, quolibet septennio, per imprecationem sancti cujusdam, Natalis scilicet abbatis, duo, videlicet mas et femina, tam a formis quam finibus exulare coguntur. Formam enim humanam prorsus exuentes, induunt lupinam. Completo vero septennii spatio, si forte superstites fuerint, aliis duobus ipsorum loco simili conditione subrogatis, ad pristinam redeunt tam patriam quam naturam.’ Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Volume 5*, p. 102.

the involuntary werewolf, who is ‘the victim of some [...] external power and is under the curse for a fixed period of time’.¹¹⁷ Thus, the text indicates that although the metamorphoses experienced by the Ossory werewolves may be in some way false or illusory, as they do not alter the couple’s human bodies, the impact and the restrictive nature of this transformation are nevertheless akin to the complete reconfiguration of the human form of other werewolves, such as Alphonse.

Similar ambiguity surrounds the voluntary nature of Guillaume’s quasi-metamorphosis, and parallels are manipulated between this figure and Alphonse. This involuntary werewolf is transformed against his will by Queen Brande, and remains trapped in his lycanthropic form until Brande uses magic to release him (vv. 7728-51). In contrast, Guillaume’s metamorphosis appears to be carried out at his request and is easily reversed when he sheds his deerskin in the Palermo palace (vv. 5337-44). Guillaume asks Alixandrine to procure the bearskins (vv. 3035-56), and the poet twice insists that Alixandrine disguises the lovers ‘Par le commant au damoiseil’ (v. 3074; v. 3088). Guillaume’s willingness to undergo quasi-transformation is presented in direct opposition to the zoomorphic reconfiguration of Alphonse, and the portrayal of the skins as a layer of clothing that can be donned or shed at will indicates that this metamorphosis is reversible. However, close analysis of the representation of Guillaume in animal skins indicates that, although his disguises do not fully reproduce the hybrid form or permanent nature of Alphonse’s lycanthropic state, there is a closer correspondence between the hybridity of these beings than critics have hitherto suggested.

In *Guillaume*, Alphonse’s metamorphosis is depicted as a prison that covers and traps his human form, reconfiguring him into a wolf. This image is emphasised by Queen Brande when she arrives in Palermo to retransform Alphonse, telling him: “‘Ci sui por toi garir venue / Et toi geter de ceste *mue* / Qui tant longement t’a *covert*” (vv. 7687-89) (emphasis mine). The use of ‘*mue*’ (here ‘prison’) and ‘*covert*’ stresses the notion of

¹¹⁷ Holten, p. 196.

Alphonse as trapped in his animal form, making it clear that only the actions of Brande can release him from this hybrid state. The notion of metamorphosis as a restrictive covering is suggested in the description of Alixandrine dressing Guillaume in the bearskin. Alixandrine covers the lovers in the skins in the same way that Brande's metamorphosis covers and traps Alphonse:

Sor Melior l'a estendue;
 [...] L'a encousue en la piau d'ors.
 Quant en la pel fu enfermee (vv. 3075-79)

Li estendi desus le cors;
 [...] Li a la pel estroit cousue.
 Quant de la pel fu revestis
 Et bien fu ens laciés et mis (vv. 3090-94)

Alixandrine is the active subject of these passages who transforms Guillaume and Melior, the grammatical objects of the passage. The image of the lovers being placed and trapped inside the skins is emphasised by the terms 'encousu' and 'enfermee' (vv. 3078-79). The skins are not just placed on the lovers like clothing, but rather these coverings are sewn up around their human bodies so that they are sealed ('enfermee') within them. Less than a hundred lines later the couple are described as 'des jovenciâx / Qui encousu s'en vont es piâx' (vv. 3169-70), and the insistence upon the way in which the skins have been sewn around the lovers suggests that they act like the 'mue' that covers and transforms Alphonse.

The descriptions of Guillaume and Melior, and later of Felise, being placed into and wearing the skins also stress the verb 'lacier'. Tobler defines 'lace' or 'lacet' as a snare or a trap (often a net) used to capture an animal, such as the 'laçun' (v. 96) or 'laz' (v. 99) in which the nightingale is ensnared in Marie de France's *L'Aüstic*.¹¹⁸ Similarly, the verb '(en)lacier' is employed in texts such as *Narcisus et Dané* to describe how the god of love controls those whom he ensnares ('enlace', v. 165), as he has power over them 'Des que l'a pris et *enlacié*' (v. 410) (emphasis mine). The *Guillaume* poet's use of

¹¹⁸ 'Enlacier' in Tobler, III, pp. 438-40; 'Lacier' in Tobler, V, pp. 36-40; Marie de France, 'L'Aüstic', in *Lais de Marie de France*, pp. 210-19 (pp. 214-15).

‘lacier’ is recurrent in his portrayal of the disguises. For example, when Felise’s advisor explains that the ‘deer’ she sees in the ‘vergier’ are really two disguised lovers, he states that “‘En .II. piax d’ors *misent* lor cors. / Bien s’i *enlacierent* et *misent* [...] Qu’il ne fuissent reconneü” (vv. 5132-35) (emphasis mine). The verbs ‘mettre’ and ‘enlacier’ emphasise the images of the lovers being enclosed within the animal skins, and the passage notes the transformative effect of the disguises on their appearance (v. 5135). When Felise dons a deerskin and joins the couple in the ‘vergier’, the poet once again stresses the image of the disguises ensnaring those who wear them: ‘Et bien *lacie* et bien *cousue*, / Et *enlacie* et *atornee*’ (vv. 5160-61) (emphasis mine). The terms ‘enlacier’, ‘enfermer’ and ‘encoudre’ are employed throughout the description of the lovers and Felise in the animal skins. These terms suggest that the disguises trap the characters’ human forms and bind those who wear them in the same way that Alphonse’s transformation traps his human mind in an animal form.

Yet more elements of the depiction of Guillaume in animal skins suggest closer parallels with the hybrid form of Alphonse, as the poet questions the extent to which Guillaume’s quasi-metamorphosis is imposed on him by others. Although Alixandrine follows Guillaume’s orders to transform the lovers (v. 3074; v. 3088), this go-between is nevertheless depicted as the catalyst for their metamorphosis, and is ‘at the origin of the lovers’ existence in their animalized form’.¹¹⁹ The animal-skin disguises are suggested by Alixandrine in response to the couple’s plea for help (vv. 2991-3027). This is the only option for escape that the lovers consider, as neither they nor Alixandrine propose an alternative, and they accept the go-between’s plan without hesitation: “‘Mais or pensés qu’ensi soit fait, / N’avons mestier de plus de plait” (vv. 3035-36). Alixandrine hastily procures the disguises, fetching them unaided from the kitchen and bringing them to the couple (vv. 3054-66). The lovers immediately ask her to dress them in the skins

¹¹⁹ Behrmann, p. 343. See also Brown-Grant, pp. 90-91.

(vv. 3068-72), and she continues to be the active agent of the scene, transforming their appearance by sewing them into the bearskins (vv. 3073-94).

The swift progression from Alixandrine's suggestion to her actions emphasises her active role in the episode. The lovers passively accept her proposal and allow themselves to be placed into the disguises, and the description of Alixandrine controlling the situation suggests that she in some way imposes the quasi-transformations upon them. This suggestion is reinforced by the narrative links between Alixandrine and Brande and the connection that these women both have with magic. Brande is explicitly characterised in *Guillaume* as a malevolent woman who manipulates magic to transform Alphonse: 'Molt sot la dame engien et mal; / Sorceries et ingremance / Avoit molt apris de s'enfance' (vv. 286-88). Similarly, a link is suggested between Alixandrine and magic that is established through her proposal of a 'herbe' for Melior (v. 1086), and which is manipulated through intertextual allusions to Thessala in *Cligès* that were explored in the first chapter of this thesis.¹²⁰

The poet builds upon the association between Alixandrine and magic by creating parallels between her transformation of the lovers and Brande's metamorphosis of Alphonse, rendering the confidante's reconfiguration of Guillaume and Melior ambiguous. The doubling between Alixandrine and Brande indicates a potentially magical nature to the animal-skin disguises, yet it also suggests that, like Brande's actions towards Alphonse, Alixandrine in some way imposes the disguises upon the lovers. Although the couple are happy to take on an animal form, this transformation is not their idea, and nor is it of their own doing, as Alixandrine suggests, procures, and places the disguises on the lovers. Their metamorphosis is thus neither fully voluntary nor involuntary, as although they don skins in a manner that alludes to the voluntary nature of the *versipellis*, Alixandrine's actions signal the 'external power' that Holten notes is responsible for the

¹²⁰ For discussion of this intertextual link, see Chapter One, pp. 85-90.

transformation of involuntary werewolves.¹²¹ This scene highlights manipulation of doubling between Guillaume's disguises and Alphonse's metamorphosis, as the ambiguity surrounding the voluntary nature of the eponymous hero's transformation indicates that he mirrors the figure of the involuntary werewolf more closely than is suggested by other passages in *Guillaume*.

Further ambiguity surrounding the voluntary nature of Guillaume's zoomorphic transformation is created when the lovers don their second animal disguises. After taking off their bearskins in the Benevento cave, the couple spend time in human clothing, 'Se descousirent de lor piaus, / Si demourerent es bliaus' (vv. 4159-60). However, a little more than two hundred verses later they re-enter their hybrid state by adopting deer-skin disguises (vv. 4341-90). Just as before, the lovers do not procure the skins themselves, but instead 'c'est la bête elle-même qui leur fournit de nouveaux déguisements'.¹²² While the couple discuss how to continue in their flight, Alphonse appears before them and kills a stag (vv. 4341-51), before returning and slaying a doe (vv. 4361-69). Although Schiff states that 'the werewolf handles the skinning duties' of these creatures, the poet in fact only states that Alphonse kills the beasts, and similarly little detail is given regarding the donning of these new disguises.¹²³ Nevertheless, the poet indicates that they undergo quasi-transformation into the form of deer, as locals later find the skinned hart and hind and the abandoned bearskins (vv. 4393-94), and conclude that the couple 'es deus piax s'en vont en cers' (v. 4398).¹²⁴

Guillaume and Melior replace one quasi-metamorphosis with another by exchanging the bearskins for deerskins, and the voluntary nature of these transformations is questioned in the romance. The idea of returning to hybridising disguises is imposed on

¹²¹ Holten, p. 196.

¹²² Pairet, p. 66. Douglas notes Alphonse's provision of the deerskins, but incorrectly states that the werewolf provides both sets of disguises. Douglas, p. 120.

¹²³ Schiff, p. 432.

¹²⁴ It is ironic that, after having taken care to ensure that they escape Benevento unnoticed by carrying their bearskins with them, the lovers leave these skins behind alongside the bodies of the skinned deer, and thus allow the form of their new disguises to be discovered (vv. 4391-96).

them by the werewolf, who appears unannounced after the lovers discuss how to continue in their flight ‘C’on ne perçoive lor afaire’ (v. 4340). Alphonse’s arrival and the disguises he provides have been interpreted as a positive action that highlights the image of this beast as a guardian angel for Guillaume and Melior.¹²⁵ However, Alphonse appears without warning and forces the dead body of the stag onto the couple without their consultation, before immediately disappearing: ‘Devant les .II. amans l’a pris / Et quant il l’ot mort et ocis, / Si s’en reva grant aleüre’ (vv. 4349-51). Although the couple understand that they can use the deer’s skin as a new disguise and state their hopes for a second skin with which to complete their new incognito appearance (vv. 4352-57), they are forced to accept a transformation that is not their own idea, and the lack of alternative options emphasises the imposed nature of this solution. Just like the bearskins procured by Alixandrine, the lovers passively accept the transformative disguises suggested and provided by another.

The voluntary nature of Guillaume’s second animal quasi-metamorphosis is rendered more ambiguous by the role Alphonse plays in transforming the couple. By showing the werewolf providing the disguises of his own accord and obliging the eponymous hero to accept this new quasi-metamorphosis, the poet suggests that Alphonse wishes Guillaume to return to an animalised form that more closely resembles his own hybrid state. The bear- and deerskins allow Guillaume and Melior to closely interact with Alphonse by occupying the ambiguous space between the human and animal worlds. A later discussion between the lovers in the Palermo ‘vergièr’ further suggests that the werewolf encourages this animalised appearance, and that his presence forces the couple to remain in a state that mirrors his own hybridised form:

Et devisent de lor afaire,
 Comment a chief en porront traire,
 Se plus es piax se mantenront.
 Mais en la fin devisé ont
 Que ja des piax n’isteront fors:

¹²⁵ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 114; Dubost, pp. 561-62.

Ja ne descoberront lor cors
Se de lor beste n'ont congié;
De ce se sont entrafichié. (vv. 4913-20)

This passage emphasises the notion of the lovers trapped in their disguises due to their association with the werewolf, adding to the depiction of their transformation as involuntary. The couple state that they will not leave the skins and return to the human form until they have leave from their beast ('congié', v. 4919), and their comments highlight the importance of his presence for their transformed state. Indeed, McCracken notes the way in which this passage emphasises the lovers' obedience to the werewolf, whose power over them becomes akin to that of a sovereign.¹²⁶ The poet suggests that Alphonse is responsible for the couple's retransformation, as they will not consider shedding the disguises while he continues to guide and protect them. The depiction of the lovers undergoing their second quasi-transformation, coupled with their decision to remain in disguises, indicate that their metamorphoses are more involuntary in nature than they first appear to be and highlight additional parallels with Alphonse as an involuntary werewolf.

The lovers' conversation in the Palermo 'vergié' stresses the ambiguous nature of their zoomorphic transformations and emphasises the image of the hybrids as trapped in their animal form. As the couple discuss whether or not to shed their disguises, the poet stresses that although they decide not to leave the skins, they still have the option to do so. In contrast with Alphonse, the lovers can become fully human by simply removing the skins, whereas Alphonse is powerless to trigger his re-transformation to human form. However, the poet indicates that Guillaume is unwilling to reverse his metamorphosis, and that his reluctance is linked to the presence and actions of the werewolf. The text suggests that in spite of the ease with which Guillaume can move between his animal and human states of being, he nevertheless mirrors Alphonse as a human imprisoned in animal form. Indeed, Scoduto notes that the disguised hero is 'trapped in a limbo-like existence

¹²⁶ McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', pp. 366-67.

between the human and animal world', just as Alphonse's lycanthropic form renders him neither wolf nor man.¹²⁷

The *Guillaume* poet insists upon the image of the lovers acting and appearing like animals in their skin disguises:

Et quant voient que il est jors,
Si vont a .IIII. piés comme ors.
Mais une riens sachiés por voir,
Que molt plus lait sont a veoir
Quant il sor les .II. piés estoient,
Que quant a .IIII. se metoient. (vv. 3385-90)

Guillaume and Melior attempt to appear like animals by not only altering their external appearance through the donning of animal skins, but also by copying their movement. Ferlampin-Acher incorrectly states that the lovers make their way from Rome to Sicily 'en alternant les nuits amoureuses sous forme humaine et les jours où ils voyagent dans des peaux d'ours', suggesting that they remove their animal skins periodically and with ease each day.¹²⁸ However, at no point does the poet state that they remove their skins at night. In fact, the text stresses the continued presence of the skins. First, the poet refers to the couple as 'lait' (v. 3388) when they walk on two feet, using this adjective to indicate the unnatural sight of two 'bears' moving around on their hind legs rather than on all fours. Later, he emphasises the novelty of the lovers' brief return to human form outside Benevento, noting the tarnishing effect that the continued presence of the skins has had on their clothing (vv. 4159-64). The text indicates that the skins have not been removed before the Benevento scene, showing that although the lovers are able to remove the disguises, they only do this in the extreme situation that arises when they are identified by the townspeople (vv. 3940-54).

Although Guillaume removes his bearskin in the Benevento cave, the second depiction of his return to human form highlights the importance of an external agent to facilitate retransformation, further aligning the eponymous hero's hybridity with the

¹²⁷ Sconduto, 'Blurred and Shifting Identities', p. 122.

¹²⁸ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 68.

figure of the werewolf. Guillaume and Melior's time as human/animal hybrids is brought to an end by Felise when they enter the Palermo palace with her: 'Ele meïsme a .I. coutel / A chascun mis fors de sa pel' (vv. 5337-38). Just as the depictions of Guillaume donning the disguises stress his passivity and indicate that, like the lycanthropic form of Alphonse, Guillaume's metamorphoses are imposed upon him by another, the poet emphasises the Queen's actions in a manner that alludes to the retransformation of the werewolf by Brande. The role played by Felise in this scene adds to the existing parallels between Felise and Brande, as explored in the first chapter of this thesis, and underlines yet more doubling between Guillaume's quasi-transformation and Alphonse as a human/animal hybrid.¹²⁹

The depiction of Guillaume in animal skins creates an image of the eponymous hero as an 'honourable shape-shifter' who doubles Alphonse's reconfigured state as a werewolf.¹³⁰ Yet it is not only the ambiguous portrayal of Guillaume's transformation as voluntary and reversible that highlights links between the two heroes of *Guillaume*, as the contrast between animal appearance and hidden human nature is also stressed in the depiction of both figures. Bacou notes that in werewolf narratives 'se transformer en loup [...] implique d'en acquérir les vertus particulières', suggesting that these human/animal hybrids gain possession of animal characteristics by taking on an animal form.¹³¹ In *Guillaume*, the poet emphasises the fierce appearance of Guillaume and Melior in the bear-skin disguises (v. 3085; vv. 3098-99), indicating their animal transformation. However, Ferlampin-Acher notes that the *Guillaume* poet stresses the juxtaposition between the couple's animal-like appearance and their inability to act like bears: 'ces deux ours blancs sont incapables de se nourrir alors qu'ils ont l'apparence du roi des animaux,

¹²⁹ For comments on the link between these women, see Chapter One, pp. 77-78.

¹³⁰ Douglas, p. 121.

¹³¹ M. Bacou, 'De quelques loups-garous', in *Métamorphose et bestiaire fantastique au Moyen Age*, ed. by Harf-Lancner, pp. 29-50 (p. 34).

prédateur redouté'.¹³² The contrast between Guillaume's appearance and actions as a human/animal hybrid aligns with the portrayal of Alphonse throughout the romance, as the depiction of the werewolf's behaviour emphasises that 'la nature humaine, la noblesse, la générosité se sont maintenues merveilleusement intactes sous la peau de l'animal'.¹³³

Alphonse appears to act more like a wild animal than Guillaume, as he is depicted hunting other animals, such as the stag and doe (vv. 4345-69). However, as will be explored in Chapter Four, the manipulation of this animalistic behaviour in *Guillaume* in fact underlines the human reasoning of this beast.¹³⁴ Alphonse is not portrayed killing animals as his prey, but rather in order to source disguises for the lovers, and his prey are aligned with the targets of knights' hunting exploits, such as Guigemar's pursuit of the white doe in Marie's *lai* (vv. 76-104). In spite of his animal appearance, the poet stresses that this creature 'N'iert mie beste par nature' (v. 275), and his human nature is indicated by his actions which Sconduto notes also signal his identity as a knight.¹³⁵

Analysis of Alphonse's behaviour also foregrounds the portrayal of this beast as a guardian angel for Guillaume, who repeatedly puts himself in danger and in a position of suffering in order to protect the lovers.¹³⁶ As noted in Chapter Two, and as will be explored in the following chapter, the poet insists upon the contrast between the ferocious appearance of the wolf and his caring, human behaviour.¹³⁷ First presented as 'uns grans leus' (v. 86) who kidnaps the young prince, the paradoxical nature of Alphonse as a hybrid being is highlighted when the beast looks after the young Guillaume (vv. 166-86). The animal appearance of this being is not matched by an animalised nature, just as Guillaume's animal skin disguises do not render him fully animal.

¹³² Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 68.

¹³³ Dubost, p. 563.

¹³⁴ See in particular pp. 252-54.

¹³⁵ Sconduto, 'Blurred and Shifting Identities', p. 124. See also Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, pp. 90-126.

¹³⁶ Dubost, pp. 561-62. See also Aðalheiður Guðmundsdóttir, 'The Werewolf in Medieval Icelandic Literature', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 106 (2007), 277-303 (p. 293). The depiction of Alphonse protecting the lovers will be explored in Chapter Four. See pp. 249-52.

¹³⁷ For this discussion, see Chapter Two, pp. 127-29 and pp. 137-39.

Ferlampin-Acher interprets the insistence upon the image of the werewolf retaining his humanity as an example of manipulation of illusory metamorphosis in *Guillaume*, observing that ‘conformément à la conception augustinienne la métamorphose n’affecte que l’apparence et non l’être, ce qui garantit que le garou reste humain’.¹³⁸ Scoduto echoes these comments: ‘Alphonse appears to be acting *like* a wolf from time to time, but it is obvious that he never becomes one. It is just an illusion’.¹³⁹ Although Alphonse’s transformation is more real than Guillaume’s quasi-metamorphosis, as the lycanthrope physically becomes a wolf, the poet nevertheless emphasises the contrast between animal form and human nature in these hybrid beings that double one another in the text. By highlighting ambiguity regarding the voluntary, permanent, and illusory nature of the metamorphoses of both heroes, the poet stresses the close correspondence between them.

Rather than portraying Alphonse as a ‘real’ hybrid and Guillaume as only mimicking the werewolf, the text in fact suggests that there is no clear-cut distinction between these transformed individuals. This close doubling is emphasised by a phrase used in *Guillaume* to refer to both the eponymous hero and Alphonse. First, when Guillaume laments his inability to fulfil the role of knight whilst in the animal-skin disguises, he notes that, were he to have at his disposal his relevant accoutrements, others would see “‘Quel beste ceste piax acuevre”” (v. 4054). The same phrase is later repeated verbatim when Brande retransforms Alphonse, as she tells him “‘Mais or verrons tot en apert, / Ançois que je fenisse m’uevre, / Quel beste ceste piax acuevre”” (vv. 7690-92). In both instances the term ‘beste’ is used to emphasise the presence of a human underneath the animalising skin, as ‘beste’ functions in an ironic manner to stress the contrast between the beastly appearance and hidden human nature of these human/animal hybrids. The repetition of this phrase suggests that despite the differences in the exact form of their

¹³⁸ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 62.

¹³⁹ Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 121.

transformations, the representations of Guillaume and Alphonse as hybrids correspond more closely than has been hitherto suggested. For example, although Pairet states that Guillaume's animal skins function as a disguise that does not change his human nature, she neglects to note that the same observation can be made about the animal form of Alphonse.¹⁴⁰ Just as stress is placed on the very real presence of a human body underneath Guillaume's disguises, Brande's comment indicates that a human also lies trapped underneath Alphonse's animal exterior. Indeed, McCracken states that in *Guillaume* 'the "beast" under the skin is always a human'.¹⁴¹ Above all, the image of Guillaume and Alphonse's animalising transformations as a skin that can be removed to reveal the human trapped underneath emphasises the dialectic of appearance and identity, once again highlighting the correspondence between inside and outside that has been observed in *Guillaume*.¹⁴²

The zoomorphic reconfigurations of Guillaume and Alphonse's external appearances foreground manipulation of doubling and correspondence in *Guillaume*. The poet establishes doubling between these heroes by insisting upon the co-existence of human and animal within the hybrid forms of both characters, even though the ambiguous depictions of their metamorphoses as voluntary, permanent, and real are not identical. Analysis of the parallels and differences between the transformations of these heroes stresses the importance of correspondence in *Guillaume*, as examination of Guillaume as a quasi-metamorphosed individual sheds light on Alphonse's lycanthropic state. However, doubling and correspondence are manipulated in additional elements of the depiction of these figures, and in particular through the developing portrayal of the interaction between Guillaume and Alphonse in the narrative. The characters are portrayed as doubles not only through links between their metamorphoses, but also through the representation of a partnership between them that this chapter will now examine.

¹⁴⁰ Pairet, p. 66.

¹⁴¹ McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', p. 374.

¹⁴² Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 80 and p. 77.

The partnership between Alphonse and Guillaume

Alphonse is not only portrayed as a lycanthrope echoed by Guillaume's animal-skin disguises throughout the main section of *Guillaume*, the werewolf also becomes a companion to and protector for the eponymous hero and his beloved. The poet establishes the notions of doubling and correspondence between Guillaume and Alphonse by portraying them as doubles of one another, manipulating first and foremost the figure of the 'double positif' from other medieval werewolf narratives. In her analysis of werewolf texts, Bacou notes that 'le loup, pour retourner dans la société des hommes, doit d'abord passer par la rencontre de son double positif'.¹⁴³ In *Arthur and Gorlagon*, *Melion*, and *Bisclavret*, the werewolf depends on his 'double positif', the king, to recognise the wolf's inherent humanity and take him into his care, thus ensuring the beast's successful reintegration into human society.¹⁴⁴

The pivotal role played by the werewolf's 'double positif' has been recognised by critics, who have observed the correspondence and 'bond' between the lycanthrope and his human double in these texts.¹⁴⁵ In *Guillaume*, this motif is alluded to in the relationship between Alphonse and Guillaume. It is thanks to Guillaume's actions in Palermo and his protection of Alphonse that the werewolf is returned to his human form (vv. 7243-7751). The behaviour of Alphonse towards his 'double positif' and links with the *Bisclavret* model will be discussed more fully in Chapter Four as part of an examination of recognition in *Guillaume*.¹⁴⁶ However, before turning to this analysis this chapter will first complete its study of doubling and correspondence in the romance by

¹⁴³ Bacou, p. 44.

¹⁴⁴ Bacou, pp. 41-45.

¹⁴⁵ Bruckner, 'Of Men and Beasts in *Bisclavret*', p. 263; June Hall McCash, 'Melion and *Bisclavret*: The Presence and Absence of Arthur', in "*Moult a sans et vallour*": *Studies in Medieval French Literature in Honor of William W. Kibler*, ed. by Monica L. Wright, Norris J. Lacy, and Rupert T. Pickens (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2012), pp. 233-49 (pp. 243-49); Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, pp. 45-47.

¹⁴⁶ See in particular pp. 240-55 of this thesis.

exploring the depiction of Guillaume and Alphonse as doubles who are in a partnership with one another.

In the main section of *Guillaume*, the werewolf is portrayed as a companion upon whom Guillaume depends after he and Melior elope from Rome.¹⁴⁷ Alphonse is vital for the couple's survival in the forest and wild spaces through which they travel. Critics have also acknowledged the important part he plays in facilitating the final denouement of the romance, as it is he who reveals Guillaume's identity (vv. 8096-8128).¹⁴⁸ The presence of Alphonse is key in *Guillaume*, and particular emphasis is placed on the interaction between the werewolf and his positive double, the eponymous hero. However, the relationship between these figures also signals human/animal partnerships that are unconnected to the positive double motif of lycanthropic texts. The poet links his representation of the doubling between Alphonse and Guillaume to the interaction between man and beast in texts such as *Yvain*. What is more, the werewolf and Guillaume are also aligned with human partnerships found in intertexts rewritten in *Guillaume*, as the humanised image of Alphonse is manipulated in order to rewrite allusions to pairings such as Tristan and Gouvernal in the *Tristan* tradition. These intertextual references have been hitherto neglected in *Guillaume* scholarship, as critics have limited their examination of intertextual parallels to the sphere of werewolf narratives. However, by examining rewriting of diverse models of partnership, this analysis not only sheds light on the representation of Guillaume and Alphonse as doubles, it also further highlights the manipulation of doubling and correspondence in the romance.

One intertextual model of human/animal partnership manipulated in *Guillaume* is Chrétien's depiction of the interaction between eponymous hero and lion in *Yvain*. Critics

¹⁴⁷ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 59; McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', p. 363; Miller, p. 355. Critics have noted that the close relationship between Alphonse and Guillaume also stresses an association between the wolf and the bear, aligning with links made between these animals in literature and folklore. Ferlampin-Acher, 'Les Métamorphoses du *versipelles* romanesque', p. 122; Sophie Bobbé, *L'Ours et le loup: Essai d'anthropologie symbolique* (Paris: Editions de la Maison de sciences de l'homme, 2002).

¹⁴⁸ Behrmann, p. 334; Miller, pp. 358-59.

have noted the representation of the lion in this romance as ‘un double d’Yvain’, and Chrétien insists upon the ‘lien d’appartenance [...] le plus étroit’ between the beast and the eponymous hero.¹⁴⁹ After Yvain saves the animal from the ‘serpant’ that attacks him, the lion makes gestures of submission to the eponymous hero (vv. 3392-3406) and henceforth remains by his side.¹⁵⁰ The lion becomes Yvain’s faithful companion, and Chrétien emphasises the close bond between these figures by depicting the beast’s reaction to the supposed death of his human partner, who faints upon his return to the fountain:

Li lions cuide mort veoir
 Son compaignon et son seignor.
 Ains de rien nule duel greignor
 N’oïstes conter ne retreire,
 Come il an comança a feire!
 Il se detort et grate et crie
 Et s’a talant, que il s’ocie
 De l’espee, don li est vis,
 Qu’ele et son buen seignor ocis. (vv. 3506-14)

Chrétien exaggerates the lion’s sorrow by portraying the beast attempting suicide. The human nature of the animal’s reaction is stressed in this scene, which Bichon notes ‘s’inspire de ce que ferait un homme, non pas un lion’.¹⁵¹

The *Guillaume* poet uses the model of humanised animal companion from *Yvain* in his depiction of the werewolf. Although Ferlampin-Acher has observed the overarching parallels between the behaviour of Alphonse and Yvain’s lion, she has not explored this intertextual link in detail, and has neglected to observe the particular allusion to *Yvain* in the depiction of Alphonse displaying humanised grief early in *Guillaume*.¹⁵² When Alphonse discovers that the young Guillaume has been taken from the make-shift den made by the wolf in the forest outside of Rome, the poet insists upon the animal’s grief:

Et quant l’enfant n’a retrouvé,
 Onques nus hon de mere né

¹⁴⁹ Dubuis, p. 22; Jean Bichon, *L’Animal dans la littérature française au XII^{ème} et au XIII^{ème} siècles*, 2 vols (Lille: Service de reproduction des thèses, Université de Lille, 1976), I, p. 279.

¹⁵⁰ The behaviour of the lion towards Yvain will also be analysed in Chapter Four. See pp. 245-46 of this study.

¹⁵¹ Bichon, I, p. 278.

¹⁵² Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Guillaume de Palerne*: une parodie?’, p. 64.

Ne vit a beste tel duel faire.
 Qui li oïst ullaer et braire
 Et les piés ensamble detordre
 Et la terre engouler et mordre,
 Esrachier l'erbe et esgrater
 Et soi couchier et relever,
 Et comme il s'ocit et confont,
 Et querre aval et querre amont
 Et les larmes fondre des ex,
 Bien peüst dire si grans dex
 Ne fu par nule beste fais. (vv. 233-45)

Although Alphonse's behaviour mimics the grief expressed by Felise one hundred lines earlier, the poet also uses this passage to signal allusions to the humanised grief of Yvain's lion.¹⁵³ For example, both poets note that the animals display the most profound expression of sorrow ever seen (*Yvain*, vv. 3508-41; *Guillaume*, vv. 234-35, vv. 244-45), and stress the way in which the beasts vocalise their distress (*Yvain*, v. 3511; *Guillaume*, v. 236). The tears shed by Alphonse also allude to an earlier description of the lion's behaviour, in which he cries when Yvain rescues him from the 'serpent': 'Et tote sa face moilloit / De lermes par humilité' (vv. 3400-01). The exaggerated grief in *Yvain* is expressed through the lion's suicide bid, and in *Guillaume* through the description of the wolf pulling up the grass around him (v. 239) in a manner that alludes to the motif of characters pulling out their hair in moments of emotional torment.¹⁵⁴

Chrétien's portrayal of the lion's attempted suicide also stresses the beast's inseparable bond with Yvain, which is alluded to in the *Guillaume* poet's depiction of the partnership between Guillaume and Alphonse. In both texts, the close relationship between these pairings affects the developing identity of the respective knights, as Yvain and Guillaume each become defined by their animal double. In *Yvain*, the lion is an

¹⁵³ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?', p. 64; Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 95.

¹⁵⁴ For example, see *Erec et Enide*, v. 4610, and *Yvain*, vv. 1158-59. See comments in: Virginie Greene, 'Le Deuil, mode d'emploi, dans deux romans de Chrétien de Troyes', *French Studies*, 52 (1998), 257-78 (p. 261); Carine Bouillot, 'La Chevelure: la tirer ou l'arracher, étude d'un motif pathétique dans l'épique médiéval', in *La Chevelure dans la littérature et l'art du Moyen Age*, ed. by Chantal Connochie-Bourgne (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 2004), pp. 35-46.

‘animal totémique’ for the hero, who dubs himself the “Chevalier del Lion” (v. 4613) even though he does not in fact wear an image of the lion.¹⁵⁵ A similar association is created in *Guillaume*, as Guillaume ‘se pose en Chevalier au Loup’, asking for his shield to be decorated with the image of a wolf (vv. 5394-97).¹⁵⁶ This heraldic symbol causes others to call him the knight “qui le leu en l’escu porte” (v. 6581), and to even refer to him directly as “li leus” (v. 6583), highlighting the close link between the eponymous hero and his animal companion and signalling the intertextual reference to the *Yvain* model of human/animal partnership.¹⁵⁷

In *Yvain*, Chrétien insists upon the beast’s devotion to its human companion. The lion attempts to mimic Yvain’s death, signalling that it is willing to steadfastly remain with his human partner. Chrétien explicitly stresses the image of the lion following Yvain:

Puis si se remet a la voie.
 Et li lions lez lui costoie;
 Que ja mes ne s’an partira,
 Toz jorz mes avuec lui ira;
 Que servir et garder le viaut. (vv. 3411-15)

The bond between these figures is emphasised by the detail regarding the lion’s wish to serve and protect the knight who he accompanies (v. 3415). The *Guillaume* poet’s depiction of Alphonse following Guillaume similarly insists upon the closeness between man and beast:

Si se remetent a la voie;
 Toudis la beste les convoie
 Derriere, que nel voient pas ;
 Après les va sivant le pas
 Ne sevent estre pres ne loing,
 Ne les secoure a lor besoing
 Trestot quanque mestier i ont,
 Si que nule souffraite n’ont. (vv. 3401-08)

¹⁵⁵ Denis Hüe, ‘De quelques transformations animales’, in *Magie et Illusion au Moyen Age* (Aix-en-Provence: CUER MA Université de Provence, 1999), pp. 235-53 (p. 249); Gerald J. Braut, *Early Blazon: Heraldic Terminology in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries With Special Reference to Arthurian Heraldry* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), p. 49.

¹⁵⁶ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 71.

¹⁵⁷ Sconduto, ‘Blurred and Shifting Identities’, pp. 122-23.

This passage strongly alludes to Chrétien's text, signalling the partnership of Yvain and lion in the relationship between Alphonse and Guillaume. Like the lion, Alphonse remains near to Guillaume, and the poet stresses the image of the beast serving and protecting his human companion so that he and Melior do not suffer at all (v. 3408).

The inseparability of Alphonse and Guillaume in the romance is stressed by the repetition of passages that describe the wolf following, protecting, and providing for the eponymous hero and Melior. The animal is twice referred to as 'li garox qui nes oublie' (v. 4258; v. 3765), and once as 'li leus qui nes oublie' (v. 4345). The poet insists upon the hardships Alphonse experiences in his endeavours to serve his human double to such an extent that critics have interpreted the beast as a Christ-like figure.¹⁵⁸ In particular, there is a contrast between images of the lovers as safe and cared for with repeated passages that describe the wolf's 'grant travail' (v. 3778; v. 3875). The third-person singular form of the verb 'souffrir' (v. 3782; v. 3875) is used to show that the wolf suffers so that the lovers do not have to, and the poet notes that the beast 'En aventure se metoit / Pour eus garandir et deffendre' (vv. 3770-71).

The image of Alphonse putting himself in danger in order to protect his human companion highlights allusions to human/animal partnerships rewritten in *Guillaume*. In *Yvain*, Chrétien emphasises the lion's behaviour protecting the eponymous hero in combat, firstly when Yvain fights to save Lunete (vv. 4538-48), and later when Yvain fights at the 'Château de Pire Aventure' (vv. 5526-35; vv. 5594-5671). In both episodes the lion is initially kept out of the fight, yet even though the hero does not call upon the animal's aid, the beast engages in combat in order to defend Yvain. Indeed, Chrétien notes that the beast feels a duty to protect his human companion (vv. 5595-99) and senses when the knight is in need of his assistance (vv. 4509-11). However, the lion's actions expose him to peril and he is injured whilst fighting (vv. 4548-49), an image alluded to in

¹⁵⁸ Scoduto, 'Blurred and Shifting Identities', p. 124.

Guillaume through the poet's insistence upon the way in which Alphonse puts himself in danger in order to protect his human double.

Alphonse's actions protecting his human companion also allude to the model of the human/animal partnership of Anselot and the greyhound Noon in the Continuation of *Partonopeus*. Although the date of composition of this episode is uncertain, Eley believes that it was in circulation before 1188, and, along with Simons, argues that it was in fact composed before *Yvain* (c. 1176-81).¹⁵⁹ Their argument for an alternative chronology between *Yvain* and *Partonopeus* than that most commonly accepted by scholars is in fact supported by examination of intertextual parallels between the lion in *Yvain* and Noon in *Partonopeus*, and the belief that Chrétien forged the lion in order to rewrite and outdo the *Partonopeus* greyhound.¹⁶⁰ However, regardless of the direction of influence between these works, close analysis of the relationship between the double heroes of *Guillaume* indicates that the poet knew and manipulated both romances. The actions of Noon are mirrored in the image of Alphonse going to extreme lengths to protect the eponymous hero, as the greyhound is dubbed by Eley as 'companion, protector and alter ego for his master'.¹⁶¹ Like *Yvain*, who rescues the lion from death, Anselot saves Noon's life by taking him from a shipwreck (vv. 11128-33), noting that "“Si l'acoilli en compaignie”" (v. 11134). In return, Noon protects Anselot, in particular rushing to his aid when the dog is attacked by the Emperor's lion that it has killed (vv. 11307-15). Anselot describes Noon's companionship and the role the animal plays protecting and serving him, painting an image that aligns with the relationship of *Yvain* and his lion:

‘Od moi erroit, od moi colchoit,
Od moi gisoit et nos gaitoit
Et nos faisoit char chascun jor
Et traioit od moi la dolor.’ (vv. 11165-68)

¹⁵⁹ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', p. 185 and pp. 147-48; Eley and Simons, '*Partonopeus de Blois* and Chrétien de Troyes', pp. 332-39. See also comments in Chapter One of this thesis, pp. 48-49.

¹⁶⁰ Eley and Simons, '*Partonopeus de Blois* and Chrétien de Troyes', pp. 337-40.

¹⁶¹ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', p. 141.

Like Yvain's lion, Noon remains close to its master and serves him, just as Alphonse tirelessly follows and protects Guillaume and Melior. The close bond found in the human/animal partnerships in *Partonopeus*, *Yvain* and *Guillaume* stresses the link between and interaction of these figures, highlighting doubling and correspondence in each text.

The description of Noon's actions emphasises another element of the human/animal partnerships found in *Partonopeus* and *Yvain* that is manipulated in the representation of Alphonse and Guillaume, and which signals an additional intertextual model. Anselot describes Noon providing food and stresses the beast's hunting prowess:

‘Tant ert delivres et ligiers
Et savoit tant de beste prendre,
Ne s'en pooit nule defendre.
Il pernoit [les ors et le lous],
Les oribles et les hisdos.’ (vv. 11146-50)

The portrayal of Noon as a hunting dog aligns with images of Yvain's lion, who Bichon notes is portrayed as a 'chien de chasse' in Chrétien's text.¹⁶² In *Yvain*, the lion works with the eponymous hero to hunt for food during their time in the wild (vv. 3432-52). This beast's behaviour invokes another romance hero's animal companion, the dog Husdent in Bérout's *Tristan*. In this text, Bérout notes that the lovers 'a grant mestier li chiens / A mervelles lor fait grans biens' (vv. 1627-28). Tristan trains Husdent to hunt silently (vv. 1593-1626), and the dog helps him to provide food for the exiled lovers by hunting both with and without his human master (vv. 1628-36).

Ferlampin-Acher has observed that the *Guillaume* poet alludes to the model of Tristan's animal hunting companion in his representation of Alphonse, stating that 'le loup-garou est un sorte de Husdent qui, fidèle, subvient aux besoins du couple, en particulier en chassant'.¹⁶³ However, Ferlampin-Acher neglects to observe that, as the actions of Husdent are reproduced in Chrétien's portrayal of the lion in *Yvain* and in the

¹⁶² Bichon, I, p. 277.

¹⁶³ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 26.

behaviour of Noon in *Partonopeus*, the *Guillaume* reference to *Tristan* can therefore be seen as an allusion to all three works. What is more, Ferlampin-Acher has not explored the way in which the motif of Husdent-inspired hunting dog is in fact rewritten in *Guillaume*. Husdent, the lion, and Noon all assist their masters by helping them whilst they hunt, or by catching prey for them to cook. Indeed, in *Yvain*, Chrétien notes that the eponymous hero prepares and cooks the meat that the lion has caught (vv. 3446-67). In contrast, Alphonse does not help Guillaume to find food, but rather single-handedly provides for the couple, who are unable to fend for themselves. The wolf brings them ‘blanc pain et char cuite’ (v. 3257) and ‘.I. barisel de vin mult bon’ (v. 3336) that he takes from a passing peasant and a nearby cleric. Unlike the lion, Husdent, and Noon, Alphonse does not hunt other animals for Guillaume to prepare, but instead procures ‘human’ food for his companion.¹⁶⁴ What is more, the poet insists upon the image of Alphonse acting alone rather than with Guillaume, as the beast lays the food and drink before the lovers and immediately disappears (vv. 3282-97; vv. 3345-51).

The *Guillaume* poet transforms the human/animal hunting partnership found in his intertexts, distorting the role of ‘chien de chasse’ in his depiction of Alphonse by replacing the other heroes’ hunting companions with a delivery service of pre-prepared food. The wolf goes above and beyond the role of Tristan’s dog, Yvain’s lion, and Anselot’s greyhound, and is depicted waiting hand and foot on the lovers:

Li leus de quanques mestier ont
Les a porquis molt largement (vv. 3398-99)

De vin, de viandes chargiés;
Devant lor met et puis s’enfuit. (vv. 4262-63)

The relationship between Alphonse and Guillaume is one of dependency, and the wolf takes up the role of sole provider for the couple. This contrasts with the other human/animal partnerships which emphasise reciprocity. For example, Grimbert notes

¹⁶⁴ Schiff, pp. 425-26.

that Yvain and the lion are in ‘une relation étroite d’aide réciproque’.¹⁶⁵ Similarly, Eley comments that the relationship established in *Partonopeu* between Noon and Anselot is one of ‘mutual dependency’, as ‘Noon owes his life to Anselot just as much as Anselot owes his life to Noon’s hunting and lion-killing skills.’¹⁶⁶ In contrast, the *Guillaume* poet makes it clear that the eponymous hero is entirely dependent upon his animal companion, provider, and protector, and the lovers acknowledge that “‘ne vivriens sans lui .I. jor”” (v. 4272). Ferlampin-Acher notes the lovers’ inability to survive in the forest without Alphonse, and Sconduto notes that throughout the romance ‘Guillaume is not the protector of the werewolf but instead is protected by the werewolf’.¹⁶⁷

The *Guillaume* poet manipulates the notion of partnership between Guillaume and Alphonse as double heroes and human/animal companions. The image of Guillaume as Alphonse’s ‘double positif’ from lycanthropic texts is rewritten, as the eponymous hero depends on the werewolf, rather than offering him the protection given to werewolves by their positive doubles in *Bisclavret*, *Melion* and *Arthur and Gorlagon*.¹⁶⁸ However, the poet also alters the dynamic of the human/animal partnerships found in non-lycanthropic intertexts. The relationship between Guillaume and Alphonse is not one of reciprocity like those of man and beast in *Yvain*, *Tristan*, and *Partonopeus*, but one of dependency. Although Alphonse mirrors the behaviour of the animal companions in *Guillaume*’s intertexts, he far exceeds the role of hunter-gatherer taken by his intertextual counterparts. The beast’s human companion does not assist him, and Guillaume in fact takes a passive role in their partnership. The interaction depicted between Guillaume and Alphonse distorts intertextual models of human/animal partnership by fusing them with allusions to human/human partnerships known to the *Guillaume* audience. As will be explored in the next chapter, the poet insists upon the human qualities of the werewolf, a human/animal

¹⁶⁵ Grimbert, *Yvain dans le miroir*, p. 154.

¹⁶⁶ Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, pp. 140-41.

¹⁶⁷ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, pp. 67-68; Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 114.

¹⁶⁸ Bacou, pp. 141-45.

hybrid, throughout the romance, and in particular in his representation of Alphonse's behaviour protecting the eponymous hero. By emphasising the human nature of Guillaume's animal companion, the poet draws parallels between this figure and the close male companions of Tristan, Yvain, and Partonopeus, who have also been referred to as the doubles of their respective eponymous heroes.

In *Yvain*, Chrétien insists upon a close association between Yvain and Gauvain and portrays their companionship in a manner that aligns with the partnership between Yvain and the lion. For example, just as the lion is depicted remaining close by to Yvain, Chrétien notes that 'Car departir nel leissera / Mes sire Gauvains d'avuec lui' (vv. 2668-69). Some critics have suggested the existence of a homoerotic relationship between the two figures, yet above all they are seen to be doubles of one another in the romance, and Dubuis notes that 'on a du mal à voir en lui [Gauvain] autre chose qu'un double d'Yvain'.¹⁶⁹ This doubling is evidenced by the love intrigue depicted between Lunete and Gauvain that parallels the relationship of Laudine and Yvain (vv. 2415-23), and Chrétien even suggests that one male double is able to replace the other when Yvain fights in Gauvain's place during the episode of Harpin le Montagne (vv. 3370-4303). A similarly close relationship is established between Tristan and Gouvernal in Béroul's romance. Although Gouvernal is only present in certain episodes of the text, Béroul nevertheless underlines the partnership between the two figures by showing them together securing the lovers' escape to the Morrois forest (vv. 1259-73). Gouvernal accompanies Tristan and Iseut to the forest and protects them, most notably by killing and beheading one of the treacherous barons (vv. 1685-1711). Béroul underlines the correspondence between Gouvernal and Tristan by noting that those who discover the headless body believe the murder to have been carried out by Tristan (vv. 1712-8), indicating close parallels between the two figures.

¹⁶⁹ E. Joe Johnson, *Once there were two true friends: Idealized Male Friendship in French Narrative from the Middle Ages through the Enlightenment* (Birmingham, AL: Summa, 2003), pp. 34-47; Dubuis, p. 19. See also Grimbert, *Yvain dans le miroir*, p. 70.

The *Guillaume* poet manipulates the model of human double for the eponymous heroes in his intertexts, using his portrayal of Alphonse to signal and rewrite both the animal companions of *Tristan* and *Yvain* and the human doubles found in these works. For example, although the humanised behaviour of Yvain's lion is reproduced in *Guillaume*, the emphasis placed on the image of Alphonse as a knight in spite of his animal form signals parallels established between Yvain and Gauvain as equally matched valorous knights. Similarly, Alphonse provides food for Guillaume and Melior in a manner that evokes Husdent's hunting skills, yet the role he plays protecting the couple aligns his behaviour with the actions of Gouvernal.

Alphonse is also aligned with figures that represent models of both human and animal partnership and doubling in *Partonopeus*, in which the poet suggests that the eponymous hero is doubled by a human figure, Anselot. Anselot is first introduced in the text as Partonopeus's pagan squire, named Guillemot (vv. 5569-92), who later converts to Christianity at the request of Partonopeus and takes the name Anselot (vv. 5670-88).¹⁷⁰ The two men share a close bond as master and squire that is stressed by the poet: 'Partonopex l'avoit si chier / Qu'a lui sol voloit il bailier / La garde de soi el perrin' (vv. 5586-88). However, the image of them as doubles is not emphasised in the portrayal of their relationship with one another, but rather in the correspondence between their separate adventures in the text. This doubling is highlighted in 'Anselot's story', a section of the first part of the *Partonopeus* Continuation lasting some 600 lines (vv. 11107-11682) that Bruckner states can be easily detached from the rest of the Continuation.¹⁷¹ Eley notes that in this episode, 'Anselot's trajectory parallels that of Partonopeus'.¹⁷² In particular, the echoes of Partonopeus's adventures from the main body of the romance

¹⁷⁰ The poet in fact notes that Anselot/Guillemot's real name is Sorsin, but that Partonopeu gives him the more French name of Guillemot (vv. 5581-84).

¹⁷¹ Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, 'From Genealogy to Romance and Continuation in the Fabulous History of *Partonopeu de Blois*', *L'Esprit Créateur*, 33 (1993), 27-39 (pp. 37-38).

¹⁷² Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', p. 140.

within 'Anselot's story' establish this character as a 'double, or *mise en abîme* of the hero figure'.¹⁷³

The portrayal of Alphonse in *Guillaume* foregrounds fusion of the models of human and animal companion from *Partonopeus*. The werewolf's role guiding the lovers echoes Anselot's actions assisting Partonopeus on his journey, and the transformation of Alphonse at the end of the romance from werewolf to human parallels the conversion of the young squire from pagan to Christian. However, it is the narrative doubling between Anselot and Partonopeus that is more clearly manipulated in *Guillaume*. Eley notes that this narrative replication is highlighted from the start of Anselot's story, in which the poet shows Anselot 're-enacting both of the hero's journeys into the Ardennes simultaneously'.¹⁷⁴ Narrative doubling is found in *Guillaume*, as the plight of Alphonse as a disinherited and transformed prince echoes the events that befall Guillaume at the start of the romance (compare vv. 23-124 with vv. 270-325).¹⁷⁵ The poet fuses the figures of Anselot and Noon into his representation of Alphonse, who is not only the animal companion of the eponymous hero, but who also echoes Partonopeus's narrative double.¹⁷⁶

The *Guillaume* poet's representation of Alphonse as companion and double to the eponymous hero combines the human and animal companions of his intertextual models, foregrounding doubling and correspondence between Alphonse and Guillaume by indicating that their interaction with one another parallels multiple partnerships. Although Alphonse's exterior form signals animal companions, the poet stresses the continued and exaggerated existence of the beast's human nature and aligns the werewolf with the

¹⁷³ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 424.

¹⁷⁴ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', p. 141.

¹⁷⁵ Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 98.

¹⁷⁶ Additional signals to *Partonopeus* have also been recognised by Simons in her analysis of space in *Guillaume*, as she perceives the presence of the white bear-skin disguises to be an allusion to the romance. She notes that the *Guillaume* poet combines the white coat of Noon with the Sardinian bear killed by the dog, highlighting further rewriting of *Partonopeus* in the romance. Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 428.

human figures that work in partnership in *Guillaume*'s intertexts. Alphonse's human actions do not suggest that he is only mimicking the behaviour of Yvain's lion, for example, but rather signal his hidden human identity that also aligns him with Gauvain. Aspects of both human and animal models are fused into the depiction of the werewolf, and the audience are encouraged to consider the correspondence between the double heroes, between the different elements of their hybrid identities, and between these figures and their intertextual models.

The rewriting of human/animal and human/human partnerships in *Guillaume* not only emphasises the doubling and correspondence between Guillaume and Alphonse, it also further highlights the doubling and correspondence between the human nature and animal form of the werewolf, whose behaviour alludes to both animal and human models. What is more, by insisting upon Guillaume's dependency on Alphonse, the poet foregrounds the importance of the werewolf in the text. Alphonse is seen as the secondary hero of *Guillaume*, particularly as the story focuses on the adventures of Guillaume and Melior and the werewolf in fact disappears for several sections of the narrative (for example, vv. 410-3238; vv. 4909-5839). However, Alphonse's actions guiding, protecting, and providing for the lovers overshadow those of the eponymous hero during their time together. The parallels between the werewolf's hybrid form and Guillaume's hybridising disguises, which he dons after Alphonse has entered the narrative, suggest that Guillaume in fact doubles the werewolf, rather than the other way around. Understanding Guillaume as a reflection of Alphonse places emphasis on the importance of this figure in *Guillaume*, whose existence as a lycanthrope embodies not only the key notions of doubling and correspondence, but also those of transformation and recognition. Alphonse is a transformed being who seeks recognition of his hidden human nature, and who is inherently dual as a hybrid being. He is doubled by the eponymous hero with whom he works in correspondence and forms a partnership in the main body of the narrative.

However, although Guillaume's dependence upon Alphonse in the forest and the important role played by the werewolf suggest an unequal dynamic in their partnership, the poet stresses the correspondence rather than dominance between these double heroes. Guillaume does not function as positive double and protector for the werewolf in the forest, yet he fulfils this role in the latter section of the narrative by facilitating the werewolf's retransformation. First, Guillaume protects Alphonse after he appears in the Palermo palace:

De totes pars saillent la gent;
As lances corent et as dars,
Prendent guisarmes et faussars ;
Aprés le leu est grans li cris.
Ja fust de totes pars ocis,
Quant li bers Guillaumes saut sus
Et jure Dieu et ses vertus,
Se nul i a qui mal li face,
Ja n'iert tex hom, tres bien le sache,
N'en prenge de son cors venjance. (vv. 7218-27)

The wolf becomes dependent on his human companion in the palace, and Guillaume calls for Brande to be brought to Palermo to retransform the werewolf after Alphonse has been recognised by the King of Spain (vv.7364-72). The poet emphasises their interaction and companionship before Brande's arrival, showing them sharing a bedchamber and noting that 'Si sont et per et compaignon / Ne s'entr'eslongent nuit et jor (vv. 7622-23). Guillaume even takes charge of the wolf when he attempts to attack Brande upon her arrival, holding the beast back from violence and calming him (vv. 7648-50).

The notions of doubling and correspondence between Guillaume and Alphonse are emphasised throughout the romance. These figures are unified as corresponding doubles, aligning with the Bruckner's comments regarding doubling in Thomas's *Tristan*: 'Thomas [...] fuses different materials of his text through his own (re)invention of doubles [...] [which] remain unified through repetition and doubling'.¹⁷⁷ A similar notion is explored in Pomel's analysis of the motif of the mirror in medieval literature, as she

¹⁷⁷ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, pp. 57-58.

comments on the way in which mirrored elements fuse into one object: ‘le miroir opère comme un tropisme: il inaugure une quête d’adéquation, de fusion avec l’objet vu au miroir’.¹⁷⁸ The *Guillaume* poet invites the audience to perceive and question the correspondence between the human and animal elements that are joined in the hybrid form of these heroes, and to interrogate the correspondence between these figures as non-identical doubles and partners of one another.

Conclusion

The notions of doubling and correspondence are emphasised throughout *Guillaume*, and the poet manipulates the varying interpretations and manifestations of these concepts found in contemporary literary and theological spheres. For example, the werewolf signals notions of doubling and duality that dominated the medieval mind, and the representation of Guillaume and Alphonse as double heroes echoes romances that foreground doubling as a narrative technique, such as Thomas’s *Tristan*. Close analysis of the representation of Guillaume in animal-skin disguises as a double of the lycanthrope suggests that the parallels between these figures are more significant than have hitherto been acknowledged in *Guillaume* scholarship. Although the eponymous hero’s metamorphosis does not fundamentally alter his physical form, the poet insists upon an ambiguous depiction of the voluntary, real, and reversible nature of this transformation.

The ambiguous depiction of the doubling between Guillaume as a quasi-animal and Alphonse as a werewolf is used to emphasise the close links between these figures, all the while highlighting the dialectic of appearance and identity in the romance. The identities of both Guillaume and Alphonse are concealed within their hybrid forms, signalling a hidden layer that is represented literally in the emphasis placed on the presence of Guillaume’s human clothing and body underneath his skin disguises. The poet

¹⁷⁸ Pomel, p. 19. See also comments in: Christine Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Perceforest et ses miroirs aux alouettes’, in *Miroirs et jeux de miroirs*, pp. 323-38 (p. 329); Robert Javelet, *Image et Ressemblance au douzième siècle: De Saint Anselme à Alain de Lille. Tome 1, Texte* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1967), p. 377; Sabine Melchior-Bonnet, ‘Préface’, in *Miroirs et jeux de miroirs*, pp. 15-16.

underlines the importance of perceiving the correspondence between the appearance and identity of these characters in order to signal a veiled layer of meaning underneath the narrative. The notion of a hidden meaning aligns with the practices of biblical exegesis and wider literary interpretation, as audiences and readers were encouraged to look for further meaning beyond the surface layer of a text.

The *Guillaume* audience is invited to perceive the intertextual allusions that are rewritten in the romance, and the analyses presented in this study thus far have discussed multiple examples of intertextual rewriting that are foregrounded in the text. By presenting allusions to intertextual material transformed throughout the romance, the poet highlights his compositional approach. *Guillaume* is presented as a work in permanent contact with the intertexts that it rewrites, and one in which emphasis is placed upon the correspondence between the narrative and the intertextual current that doubles the surface layer of the text. Just as the manipulation of transformation in the narrative signals the reconfiguration of intertextual material, so the notions of correspondence and doubling are stressed, creating a romance with self-reflexive qualities. The notions of correspondence and doubling permeate and underpin the auto-referential nature of *Guillaume*, as the audience are encouraged to perceive the doubling between and interrogate the correspondence of the micro-level of the narrative and the macro-level of intertextual rewriting that shapes the composition of *Guillaume*.

Scholars have aligned rewriting in Old French romance with the notion of doubling, as poets are seen to have doubled a text by rewriting it in their own work.¹⁷⁹ What is more, as highlighted in the work of Huchet and Ferlampin-Acher on the *Roman d'Eneas* and the *Roman de Thèbes* respectively, poets contemporary to *Guillaume* stressed their transformation of intertextual material by emphasising the notions of doubling and

¹⁷⁹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 81; Ferlampin-Acher, '*Le Roman de Thèbes, Geste de deus frères*', p. 309; Huchet, 'L'Enéas: un roman spéculaire', p. 63.

mirroring in the narrative of these texts.¹⁸⁰ Chapter One and Chapter Two of this thesis explored the use of the theme of transformation in *Guillaume* to reflect the poet's compositional approach within the narrative, expanding Simons's comments regarding the way in which emphasis of rewriting in the romance produces 'a self-reflexive commentary on the process of rewriting itself'.¹⁸¹ However, critical studies of self-reflexive literature stress that a self-reflexive work comments on 'its own processes of production *and* reception' (emphasis mine).¹⁸² These processes work in correspondence with one another and are associated with the figures of poet and reader (or audience), who form a partnership for the creation of a text. Indeed, Dällenbach describes the reader and author as a 'symmetrical opposite of the other'.¹⁸³ Analyses of self-reflexive works stress the emphasis these texts place on the role of the reader, who is 'asked to question the process by which the text has come into existence' and to 'reflect upon his own role in constructing its meaning' through reception.¹⁸⁴

Criticism of self-reflexive literature highlights the way in which self-reflexive works emphasise the partnership and correspondence between author and reader, or, in the context of medieval romance, between poet and audience. The notion of partnership is stressed in *Guillaume*, as observed in close analysis of the interaction between Alphonse and Guillaume. This chapter has shed new light on intertextual rewriting of models of human/animal and human/human companions in the *Guillaume* poet's depiction of the partnership between the double heroes of the romance. However, it has also provided additional evidence of the particular stress placed on correspondence in the romance, a

¹⁸⁰ Ferlampin-Acher, '*Le Roman de Thèbes*, Geste de deus frères', p. 309; Huchet, 'L'Enéas: un roman spéculaire', p. 64 and p. 75.

¹⁸¹ Simons, 'The Significance of Rural Space', p. 418. See also Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 80-81.

¹⁸² Hutcheon, *Narcissistic Narrative*, p. xii. See also Linda Hutcheon, 'Introduction', in *L'Autoreprésentation*, pp. 7-14 (pp. 8-9).

¹⁸³ Dällenbach, p. 78.

¹⁸⁴ Anne Stone, 'Self-reflexive Songs and their Readers in the Late 14th century', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 180-94 (p. 182). See also Hutcheon, *Narcissistic Narrative*, pp. 36-37; and Susan R. Suleiman, 'Introduction', in *The Reader in the Text*, ed. by Suleiman and Crosman, pp. 3-45 (p. 4).

notion that is integral to understanding *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive text in which the processes of both composition and reception are mirrored in the narrative.

In order to fully explore *Guillaume* as a self-reflexive text this study must now examine the way in which the the role of the audience is reflected within the narrative. Having established that poet's compositional process is mirrored through the theme of transformation in *Guillaume*, and having explored how the notion of self-reflexivity is emphasised through the stress placed on doubling and correspondence, this study will now turn to the notion of recognition that doubles and corresponds with transformation in the romance. The audience are invited to peel back layers of the narrative and reveal the works rewritten in *Guillaume*, not only perceiving the correspondence between the surface level of the text and its intertextual make-up hidden underneath, but also recognising the transformation of intertexts. The importance of recognition in *Guillaume* has been overlooked in criticism of this text, yet this notion lies at the heart of the romance, doubling and corresponding with transformation. Recognition is highlighted by the representation of Alphonse and Guillaume as metamorphosed individuals, as the transformations experienced by these figures in the narrative must be recognised in order for them to be returned to their true form. Doubling and correspondence are stressed between the themes of appearance and identity throughout the romance, and these notions in turn signal doubling and correspondence between transformation and recognition. What is more, the association between transformation and recognition also functions at the meta-level of the romance, as these themes map on to the respective roles of poet and audience in romance creation, the latter of which will now be explored in the final chapter of this thesis.

The intertextual game of romance in which poet and audience participate requires the interaction of both figures in the partnership of romance creation. Analysis of recognition in *Guillaume* will question the extent to which the roles of both audience and

poet are mirrored in the narrative of this self-reflexive romance. The framework for this examination will be grounded in the approach of other studies that analyse recognition in medieval romance, all the while incorporating discussion of theories of reader response and reception. This approach will facilitate close study of the way in which the notion of recognition reflects the audience's role in the reception of medieval romance at the end of the twelfth century.

Chapter Four: Recognition and Reading

This study of *Guillaume de Palerne* as a self-reflexive romance has thus far examined the way in which the notions of transformation, doubling, and correspondence are manipulated in the narrative in order to reflect the poet's compositional process of intertextual rewriting and to emphasise the notion of self-reflexivity. However, the main hypothesis tested by this thesis rests upon the suggestion that the processes of romance production and reception are mirrored within the *Guillaume* narrative. This chapter will examine how the poet uses recognition in the text to mirror the role of the *Guillaume* audience in the intertextual game of romance.

Recognition is a dominant theme in the *Guillaume* narrative, and is linked to the notion of transformation in both the internal and external spheres of the text. The positive denouement of *Guillaume* is dependent upon recognition of the real identity of two transformed figures, Alphonse and Guillaume. Yet recognition is also imperative to the reception of the romance, as the audience is encouraged to recognise the intertextual transformation with which the poet composes the text. Transformation and recognition double one another and work in correspondence in the narrative, and in the work's extra-diegetic sphere these notions are mapped onto the figures of poet and audience, who function as doubles working in partnership in the creation of romance.

To date, the only study focused on recognition in this romance is Miller's analysis of ideology and recognition in *Guillaume*, published in 2012.¹ Miller examines different recognition scenes in the narrative, although her article explores an ideological reading of recognition that is inspired by Althusser, and which is tied to her interpretation of constructions of identity and nobility in *Guillaume*.² This methodological approach prevents her from engaging with more elementary questions relating to the broader

¹ Miller, pp. 347-60.

² Miller, p. 352.

concept of recognition, and she neglects to interrogate the correspondence between recognition and transformation. Thus, this chapter will address the lacunae surrounding recognition in *Guillaume* scholarship, examining this notion alongside transformation in order to analyse how the role of the audience is reflected in this text.

Analysis of recognition in *Guillaume* will align with Aristotle's definition of recognition in literary texts, rather than engaging with the philosophical exploration of the term, as examined in the work of Hegel, or more recently by Ricœur.³ Recognition scenes in *Guillaume* conform to the Aristotelian poetics of recognition, both with regard to the type of recognition they present and the way in which this recognition is facilitated. In chapter XI of his *Poetics*, Aristotle defines recognition (*anagnôrisis*) as 'a change from ignorance to knowledge'.⁴ This definition aligns with the depiction of recognition in *Guillaume*, as characters are portrayed gaining knowledge about the identity of an unknown figure, such as the revelation of the werewolf's human identity (vv. 7275-7340). In chapter XVI of the *Poetics*, Aristotle also provides a taxonomy of 'kinds of recognition', listing ways in which recognition can be catalysed by signs, such as tokens (congenital marks or acquired objects), events which trigger characters' memory, or by the inference of a person's identity based on the events that occur around them.⁵ Aristotle lists the ways in which characters use signs for recognition, and this chapter will explore the portrayal of these markers in *Guillaume*, such as the humanised behaviour of the werewolf. Finally, Aristotle also links recognition to moments of important narrative change that demonstrate reversal (*peripeteia*) in a text, stating that 'recognition is best

³ G. W. F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. by A. V. Miller (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), pp. 111-19; Paul Ricœur, *Parcours de la reconnaissance: Trois études* (Paris: Stock, 2004). For comments on recognition in Hegel, see the following: Sybol Cook Anderson, *Hegel's Theory of Recognition: From Oppression to Ethical Liberal Modernity* (London: Continuum, 2009), pp. 100-37; Stephen Houlgate, *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 83-97.

⁴ Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. by Malcolm Heath (London: Penguin, 1996), pp. 18-19. See also comments in Terence Cave, *Recognitions: A Study in Poetics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), pp. 1-3.

⁵ Aristotle, *Poetics*, p. 26-27; Aristotle, *Art of Poetry: A Greek View of Poetry and Drama*, ed. by W. Hamilton Fyfe and trans. by Ingram Bywater (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940), pp. 44-47. See comments in Cave, p. 38; and Malcolm Heath, 'Introduction', in Aristotle, *Poetics*, pp. vii-lxvii (p. xlix).

when it occurs simultaneously with a reversal'.⁶ The *Guillaume* poet expands on the association between recognition and reversal, linking key recognition scenes in the narrative to pivotal moments that reverse transformations which had altered the course of the plot. For example, the recognition and retransformation of Alphonse triggers the identification of the eponymous hero, leading to the text's happy denouement.

The framework used in this chapter for analysis of recognition in *Guillaume* aligns with other studies that present close reading of recognition scenes in order to explore poets' manipulation of this notion in French romance. *Guillaume* features numerous scenes which manipulate Aristotelian principles of recognition, and which also signal moments of recognition in texts known to the audience and rewritten in *Guillaume*. For example, Chrétien manipulates recognition in the Noauz tournament episode of *Le Chevalier de la Charrette* (vv. 5495-6040). Lancelot tries to avoid recognition (vv. 5510-11) by changing his identity to that of the red knight (v. 5643), yet Guinevere identifies her incognito lover and sends him messages (vv. 5636-45). Chrétien emphasises recognition and highlights the use of signs to fully facilitate Guinevere's identification of Lancelot, as although she is sure of his identity (vv. 5702-03), Guinevere requires 'a process of proof stretched over two days and three messages' in order to confirm that the unidentified knight is her ami.⁷

A similar episode is found in *Partonopeus de Blois*. The eponymous hero takes part in a tournament as an unknown knight (vv. 7877-9629), and is recognised in turn by Urraque, Persewis, and Melior. The poet highlights recognition by leaving Melior's identification of Partonopeus until mid-way through the second day of the three-day

⁶ Aristotle, *Poetics*, pp. 18-19. See also comments in: Roselyne Dupont-Roc and Jean Lallot, 'Notes chapitre 11', in Aristotle, *La poétique*, trans. by Roselyne Dupont-Roc and Jean Lallot (Paris: Seuil, 1980), pp. 231-34; Stephen Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 212-13; and Humphrey House, *Aristotle's Poetics: A Course of Eight Lectures* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1967), pp. 96-98.

⁷ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, pp. 70-77. See also Douglas Kelly, *Sens and Conjointure in the 'Chevalier de la charrette'* (The Hague: Mouton, 1966), pp. 140-43. The image of a knight fighting incognito in different coloured armour is found in *Cligès*, the romance that preceded the *Chevalier de la Charrette* (see *Cligès*, vv. 4575-4959).

tournament (vv. 8531-8620), even though Melior almost recognises him at the dubbing ceremony (vv. 7393-7516). Bruckner notes the ‘pleasurable rise in “tension”’ during the tournament scenes, adding that Melior’s ‘ultimate recognition’ of Partonopeus is ‘deferred and then doubled’ as the number of participants in the tournament increases, and as Partonopeus is recognised by other figures in the text.⁸

Some analyses of recognition in medieval romance have given philosophical or psychoanalytical interpretations of this notion. For example, Bateman suggests that recognition scenes in *Partonopeus* signal characters’ self-understanding, and Simpson uses Lacanian theories to explore misrecognition in medieval French narratives.⁹ This chapter does not follow these interpretative approaches to recognition, but instead aligns with other studies that explore the links between transformation and recognition in medieval romance. Many of the recognition scenes in *Guillaume* and its intertexts depict characters identifying an individual they once knew who has been transformed, emphasising the correspondence between transformation and recognition. However, these scenes also suggest that alongside Aristotle’s definition of recognition as a move from ignorance to knowledge, recognition scenes also emphasise the rediscovery of existing knowledge. Indeed, Cave notes that “‘ana-gnōrīsis”, like ‘re-cognition’, in fact implies a recovery of something once known’, as people, objects, or events are recognised in a new setting, context, or form.¹⁰

This understanding of recognition as ‘re-knowing’ is highlighted in *Guillaume* and its intertexts. The poet presents encounters between characters that recognise one another after one or both of them have undergone transformation, suggesting that the

⁸ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 152. See also Bruckner, ‘From Genealogy to Romance and Continuation’, p. 35.

⁹ J. Chimène Bateman, ‘Problems of Recognition: the Fallible Narrator and the Female Addressee in *Partonopeu de Blois*’, in *Partonopeus in Europe*, ed. by Hanley, Longtin, and Eley, pp. 163-79; James R. Simpson, *Fantasy, Identity and Misrecognition in Medieval French Narrative* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000), p. 3 and pp. 260-61.

¹⁰ Cave, p. 33. See also Lise Michel and Françoise Heulot-Petit, ‘L’Étude de la reconnaissance comme scène et comme principe d’action: un instrument critique’, in *La Reconnaissance sur la scène française (XVII^e-XXI^e siècle)*, ed. by Françoise Heulot-Petit and Lise Michel (Arras: Artois Presses Université, 2009), pp. 7-18 (p. 9).

metamorphoses that they have experienced challenge others' existing knowledge of them. For example, the werewolf's lycanthropic form acts as a new context for his identity that tests his father's knowledge when the King of Spain recognises him. Similarly, in *Partonopeus* the recognition scene between Urraque and Partonopeus in the Ardennes forest (vv. 5925-6028) stresses the impact that transformation has on characters' ability to recognise those they know.¹¹ The emotional torment experienced by Partonopeus transforms his appearance to such an extent that Urraque struggles to identify the hero, and she only does so as a result of his reaction when he learns her name (vv. 5925-6028).

Yvain also emphasises the way in which recognition is affected by transformation of a figure's appearance. Lacy notes that the identification of Yvain by a servant of the Dame de Noroison, who finds him in an animal-like state of madness (vv. 2888-2912), highlights 'the importance of armor [sic] and dress (or undress) for recognition', noting that Yvain's nakedness 'makes him unrecognizable' (vv. 2897-91).¹² Indeed, Yvain is only recognised due to a scar which functions as a physical marker of his identity (vv. 2903-08). Elsewhere, Chrétien insists that recognition of Yvain is affected by the transformations he experiences, as neither Gauvain nor Laudine are able to recognise him when he reappears as the 'Chevalier du Lion' (vv. 4580-4629; vv. 5998-6000).

The impact of transformation on recognition is also explored in the anonymous *Folie Tristan* texts.¹³ In the *Folie Tristan de Berne* and the *Folie Tristan d'Oxford* Tristan disguises himself as a fool in order to gain an audience with Iseut, who then refuses to recognise the transformed figure as Tristan. Like the tournament episode in *Partonopeus*, the *Folies* stress recognition by showing Brengain (*Berne*, vv. 321-23) and Husdent

¹¹ Hanning, *The Individual in Twelfth-Century Romance*, pp. 80-102.

¹² Norris J. Lacy, 'On Armor and Identity: Chrétien and Beyond', in "*De sens rassis*", ed. by Busby, Guidot, and Whalen, pp. 365-74 (p. 368).

¹³ 'La *Folie Tristan* de Berne', in *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, suivi de La Folie Tristan de Berne et La Folie Tristan d'Oxford*, trans. by Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Ian Short and ed. by Félix Lecoy (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003), pp. 300-37; 'La *Folie Tristan* d'Oxford', in *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, suivi de La Folie Tristan de Berne et La Folie Tristan d'Oxford*, pp. 350-415.

(*Oxford*, vv. 909-10) recognising Tristan before Iseut identifies the fool as her lover.¹⁴ The recognition of Tristan by these figures highlights Iseut's inability to look beyond the transformed state of her beloved, and Hoepffner notes that 'Brangäne [...] [und] Husdent haben ihn bereits erkannt, nur Isolde, die er am meisten geliebt und die ihn zuerst hätte erkennen müssen, schwankt noch und zweifelt'.¹⁵ Critics have speculated on the reasons for Iseut's refusal to recognise Tristan, suggesting that she is outraged by the fool's words or that she suspects a trap.¹⁶ Above all, both texts stress that reconfiguration of Tristan's appearance prevents Iseut from recognising her lover, an image emphasised in the *Folie Tristan d'Oxford*, in which Tristan also alters his voice (v. 212).¹⁷ The drawn out process of recognition in both *Folies* indicates that 'le héros dissimule si bien son apparence [...] qu'il devient impossible de l'identifier', highlighting the impact that transformation has on recognition.¹⁸

This chapter will examine the effect of transformation on the recognition of metamorphosed figures in *Guillaume*, using close reading of recognition scenes and moments of near identification or misrecognition. Basing its methodological approach on studies that have discussed the correspondence between recognition and transformation in *Partonopeus*, *Yvain*, *Lancelot*, and the *Folies Tristan*, it will move beyond these analyses by investigating how the animal metamorphoses experienced by figures in *Guillaume* affect recognition of these characters. In particular, it will focus on Alphonse, a figure used to stress the relationship between transformation and recognition, as the werewolf

¹⁴ Ernst Hoepffner, 'Die Berner und die Oxforder *Folie Tristan*. (Schluß)', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 39 (1919), 672-99 (pp. 674-82).

¹⁵ 'Bregain [...] [and] Husdent both recognise him immediately, only Iseut, whom he loves most, and who ought to have been the first to recognise him, continues to hesitate and doubt' (own translation). Hoepffner, p. 677.

¹⁶ Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Ian Short, 'La *Folie Tristan* de Berne et La *Folie Tristan* d'Oxford: Introduction', in *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas*, pp. 285-98 (p. 287); Jacqueline T. Schaefer, 'Specularity in the Medieval *Folie Tristan* Poems or Madness as Metadiscourse', *Neophilologus*, 77 (1993), 355-68 (p. 361).

¹⁷ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, pp. 18-23.

¹⁸ Yasmina Foehr-Janssens, 'Le Chien et l'anneau: parcours de la reconnaissance dans les *Folies Tristan*', in *Des Tristan en Vers au Tristan en prose: hommage à Emmanuèle Baumgartner*, ed. by Laurence Harf-Lancner et. al (Paris: Champion, 2009), pp. 273-91 (p. 289).

encourages others to look beyond his animal exterior and to recognise the human trapped within his lupine form.

The chapter will first discuss the manipulation of the recognition of Alphonse by exploring the way in which the werewolf's behaviour triggers identification of his hidden human nature and identity. This analysis will draw on and examine parallels between Alphonse's actions and the behaviour of the werewolf in *Bisclavret*, in which the lycanthrope uses gestures to solicit others' recognition of his identity. An examination of the success of Alphonse's actions to trigger recognition will then be undertaken with analysis of the terms characters use to refer to the human/animal hybrid. The chapter will then turn to further analysis of recognition in *Guillaume* by exploring identification of the quasi-metamorphosed figures of Guillaume, Melior, and Felise.

This analysis will highlight the inextricable link between transformation and recognition in *Guillaume*, all the while exploring how the poet emphasises the importance of reading and interpreting signs of recognition. Finally, this study will investigate the way in which recognition is used in *Guillaume* to signal the meta-level of text reception. By examining the association between transformation and recognition in the text, it will question the way in which the narrative mirrors the correspondence between poet and audience. In order to analyse the links between the notion of recognition and the *Guillaume* audience's role, it will be necessary to engage with theories of reader response and reception. However, the chapter will first explore recognition in the *Guillaume* narrative, rather than viewing the text through a theoretical lens. Above all, this chapter will provide evidence with which this thesis can question in its conclusion the extent to which the roles of both audience and poet are mirrored in the narrative of this self-reflexive romance.

Recognition of the werewolf in *Guillaume* and *Bisclavret*

The depiction of Alphonse in *Guillaume* stresses the link between recognition and transformation, as the lycanthrope is dependent on others' identification of him as a transformed beast in order for his real human identity to be restored. The portrayal of Alphonse also foregrounds the effect that reconfiguration of a character's external identity has on recognition, as the beast struggles to be recognised in his animal form. In particular, the poet highlights the werewolf's use of gestures and actions to solicit acknowledgement of his human identity, aligning with the model presented in *Bisclavret* of a lycanthrope seeking recognition.¹⁹ Alphonse and Bisclavret are not able to communicate verbally, and instead rely on their behaviour to bring about the recognition that will lead to their retransformation into human form. Indeed, Guynn notes that *Bisclavret* explores 'the expressiveness of mute gestures' made by the werewolf, and this text is used and rewritten in *Guillaume*.²⁰

The *Bisclavret* and *Guillaume* werewolves signal their hidden reasoning through their contact with humans, inviting others to recognise that they each 'conserve, sous sa forme animale, "entente et sens"'.²¹ In Marie's *lai*, the werewolf throws himself at the King's feet:

Des que il a le rei choisi,
vers lui curut querre merci.
Il l'aveit pris par sun estrié,
la jambe li baise e le pié.
Li reis le vit, grant poür a;
ses cumpaignuns tuz apela.
'Seignur', fet il, 'avant venez
e ceste merveille esgardez,
cum ceste beste s'umilie!
Ele a sen d'ume, merci crie.
[...] Ceste beste a entente e sen. (vv. 145-57)

The image of the beast bowing before the King, emphasised by the verb 's'umilier' (v. 153), presents what Sconduto refers to as a 'display of human and courtly

¹⁹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 65. See also Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 115.

²⁰ Guynn, p. 169.

²¹ Pairet, p. 61.

behaviour'.²² Bichon notes that these actions signal to the King and Marie's audience that 'c'est un esprit d'homme [...] qui habite le corps de ce loup'.²³ However, as the beast kisses the King's leg and foot, he also mimics the submission of knight to lord, transforming the feudal homage ceremony. Freeman notes 'the unusual behaviour of the *beste* in a human posture of fealty', and other critics have commented that Marie reworks the homage motif in the animal's actions.²⁴

In *Bisclavret*, the King perceives that the beast displays human behaviour and takes him into his household. However, although he notes the presence of the creature's 'sen d'hume' (v. 154), the King does not fully recognise the significance of the animal's actions, seeing the beast only as a 'merveille' (v. 152).²⁵ The King does not interpret the human behaviour as evidence that the wolf is a man who has been subjected to a zoomorphic transformation, and remains ignorant of the werewolf's human identity, even though the creature continues to act in a humanised manner at court.²⁶

True recognition of Bisclavret as a metamorphosed knight occurs much later in the *lai*. This recognition is triggered not by human actions, but rather by Bisclavret's animalistic attacks on his wife and her new husband (vv. 196-206; vv. 231-36). Bruckner notes that this behaviour 'strikes the court as alien to the beast's identity', and the attacks lead others to recognise the creature as more than a 'merveille' (vv. 240-60).²⁷ The King's barons realise that Bisclavret is a human trapped in the form of a beast and that his human identity is connected to the figures he attacks. Recognition thus has two parts in *Bisclavret*: the recognition of the wolf as a hybrid creature that has been subjected to

²² Sconduto, 'Rewriting the Werewolf', p. 25. See also comments in: Tovi Bibring, 'Sexualité douteuse et bestialité trompeuse dans *Bisclavret* de Marie de France', *French Studies*, 63 (2009), 1-13 (p. 11); Dubost, p. 553; and Noacco, pp. 40-41.

²³ Bichon, I, p. 276.

²⁴ Michelle A. Freeman, 'Dual Natures and Subverted Glosses: Marie de France's *Bisclavret*', *Romance Notes*, 25 (1985), 288-301 (p. 294). See also: Faure, pp. 350-51; and Edgard Sienaert, *Les Lais de Marie de France. Du conte merveilleux à la nouvelle psychologique* (Paris: Champion, 1978), p. 88.

²⁵ Edith Joyce Benkov, 'The Naked Beast: Clothing and Humanity in *Bisclavret*', *Chimères*, 19 (1988), 27-43 (p. 33); Freeman, 'Dual Natures and Subverted Glosses', p. 295.

²⁶ Leshock, pp. 161-62.

²⁷ Bruckner, 'Of Men and Beasts in *Bisclavret*', p. 261.

transformation; and the recognition of the human identity of the knight who has been metamorphosed. Marie stresses that acknowledgment of the human sense of the animal does not suffice, emphasising the correspondence between recognition and transformation by insisting that the hybrid must be seen as a man transformed before his true human identity can be recognised and restored.

The depiction of Alphonse in *Guillaume* alludes to the manipulation of recognition and transformation in *Bisclavret*, particularly when the werewolf is recognised by his father. After the defeat of the Spanish forces, the werewolf appears before the assembled court and throws himself at the feet of the King of Spain in a plea for recognition:

Atant es vos que li garous
Par mi la sale, voiant tous,
Tres devant le roi s'agenoille,
De lermes tot les piés li moille.
A ses .II. poes prent son pié,
Estroitement l'a embracié;
Ensement par samblant l'opose
C'on l'aprovast d'aucune chose.
Atant s'en part et puis l'encline
Et puis Guillaume et la roïne
Et les puceles ensement. (vv. 7207-17)

The poet stresses the human qualities of the wolf's behaviour and aligns Alphonse's gestures with those of Bisclavret. This intertextual model is stressed when the beast kneels before the King and embraces his foot (*Bisclavret*, vv. 147-48; *Guillaume*, vv. 7210-12), demonstrating 'submission in a feudal gesture of homage' to his father that echoes Bisclavret in Marie's *lai*.²⁸ However, the *Guillaume* poet rewrites his intertext, altering the context of the animal's actions and changing the character to whom the beast gestures in submission. In *Bisclavret*, the lycanthrope throws himself at the feet of the King who becomes his 'double positif' in the text, as noted by Bacou and explored in Chapter Three

²⁸ McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', p. 370). See also Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 117; and Scoduto, 'Rewriting the Werewolf', pp. 31-32.

of this thesis.²⁹ In *Guillaume*, although the eponymous hero functions as Alphonse's positive double in the narrative, the werewolf's act of homage is towards his father.

A more striking alteration is found in the outcome of the lycanthrope's humanised gestures. Unlike the King in *Bisclavret*, who perceives that the animal before him is more than just a beast, but who does not recognise that it is his faithful knight transformed into a wolf, Alphonse's father recognises the werewolf as his son. McCracken observes that the wolf's actions are 'read as a communication', adding that Alphonse's behaviour 'causes the Spanish king to remember stories he had heard about his wife's transformation of his elder son into a wolf'.³⁰ The wolf's mute gestures trigger recognition not only of his metamorphosed form, but also of his hidden human identity, contrasting with the outcome of the actions in *Bisclavret* that they echo. Moreover, the context of this scene is altered from *Bisclavret*, in which the wolf's submission to the King marks the start of the werewolf's reintegration to the court and leads to the recognition of his human identity. In *Guillaume*, Alphonse's submission occurs much later in the text, after he has spent a considerable amount of time in contact with humans and has already attempted to solicit their recognition of his true identity through actions that signal his hidden human nature.

The depiction of Alphonse in *Guillaume* portrays a wolf which 'se révèle peu à peu humain', and whose overtly human actions mirror those of *Bisclavret*.³¹ Throughout his time in the company of people, the wolf uses gestures to 'transcend his state of non-linguistic animality and send messages to his human charges'.³² These gestures are emphasised and exaggerated as the narrative progresses and Alphonse multiplies his attempts to achieve recognition of his true form. However, *Bisclavret*'s behaviour is rewritten in *Guillaume*, as this figure is alluded to in scenes throughout the main section of the text. The single scene of submission in *Bisclavret*, which also functions as an

²⁹ Bacou, p. 44. See comments in Chapter Three, pp. 214-15.

³⁰ McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', pp. 370-71.

³¹ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 62.

³² Schiff, p. 426.

entreaty for recognition, is split into three scenes that take place at separated intervals in *Guillaume*, the last of which is Alphonse's gestures towards his father. The first two scenes develop the motif of the beast bowing, which Ferlampin-Acher notes Alphonse does on several occasions 'presque mécaniquement', each time signalling *Bisclavret* and highlighting manipulation of this intertextual model.³³

The werewolf disappears from the narrative after he has led Guillaume and Melior to Palermo (vv. 4696-97), where they become part of Felise's household and Guillaume leads the battle against the invading Spanish forces. However, after the first day of fighting, Guillaume, Melior, Florence, and Felise look down from the palace tower to the neighbouring 'vergier' and are met with the appearance of Alphonse:

Gardent aval, el vergier voient
 Ou li garox i ert venus.
 Mais tel merveille ne vit nus:
 Les piés ot joins, et sor la teste
 Les avoit mis la fiere beste;
 Si se drece sor ceus derriere.
 A simple vis, a simple chiere
 Encline la chambre et la tor
 Et les dames et le signor,
 Puis se refiert en la gaudine. (vv. 5838-47)

The wolf's behaviour is overtly human and signals Marie's *lai*. Like *Bisclavret*, Alphonse acts in order to provoke recognition of his human reasoning and his metamorphosed state. The animal's human gestures are stressed by the term 'encliner' (v. 5845), as Alphonse bows to those who observe him in a manner that alludes to *Bisclavret* kneeling before the King. However, the human nature of Alphonse's actions are exaggerated in *Guillaume* through the depiction of the beast forming a deliberate pose of submission and obeisance, as he joins his paws and places them on his head whilst bowing (vv. 5841-42).

Although Alphonse's actions highlight allusions to *Bisclavret*, this scene also signals the gestures of non-lycanthropic animals that perform humanised actions, such as

³³ Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 65.

the lion in *Yvain*.³⁴ Yvain's lion acts as his companion after the knight saves the beast's life, and the animal pays homage to Yvain:

Que il li comança a feire
Sanblant, que a lui se randoit,
Et ses piez joinz li estandoit
Et vers terre ancline sa chiere,
S'estut sor les deus piez deriere
Et puis si se ragenoilloit
Et tote sa face moilloit
De lermes par humilité. (vv. 3394-3401)

As the lion bows before Yvain, Chrétien makes reference to Marie's *lai* and the gestures of Bisclavret. Like the King, Yvain sees the lion's actions as submission: 'Mes sire Yvains par verité / Set, que li lions l'an mercie / Et que devant lui s'umelie' (vv. 3402-04). However, Chrétien does not create an identical reproduction of Marie's lycanthrope. The lion not only bows before Yvain, it also joins its paws together in a sign of homage, and raises itself up on its hind legs (vv. 3396-98). This behaviour is alluded to in Alphonse's actions, as the beast joins his paws before putting them on his head (v. 5841) and rears up on his back legs (v. 5843). The *Guillaume* poet manipulates *Yvain* alongside *Bisclavret* in his representation of the werewolf's gestures, aligning the beast with non-hybrid creatures who use humanised actions to indicate their allegiance to man.

The motif of Alphonse bowing is manipulated once again in a second scene set in the 'vergier'. The wolf reappears before Guillaume and the assembled group of women:

Gardent aval, el vergier voient
Ou revenus ert li garous.
A terre ot mis les .II. genous
Devant Guillaume et la roïne
Et les puceles, ses encline
Mult simplement .II. fois la beste (vv. 6374-79)

The wolf's actions replicate the earlier 'vergier' scene, and the poet again aligns this figure's behaviour with that of Marie's Bisclavret by showing the animal bowing in submission to those who observe him. However, Alphonse's gestures are altered in the

³⁴ For comments on the companionship of Yvain and the lion, see Chapter Three, pp. 213-18.

scene, as this time the beast does not place its paws on its head, nor raise itself on its hind legs. Instead, it kneels down (v. 6376) and bows ‘.II. fois’ (v. 6379).

The depiction of Alphonse in the ‘vergiere’ highlights the beast’s efforts to encourage others to recognise his human nature. In both episodes, the poet evokes *Bisclavret*, yet his lycanthrope ‘exagère ses saluts’ in order to ‘se faire reconnaître’.³⁵ However, it is not only Alphonse’s actions that allude to Marie’s *lai*, but also the reactions of those who watch him. Scoduto observes that like the knights ‘who are amazed at Bisclavret’s courtly demeanour’, the observers in *Guillaume* ‘marvel at the unusual display of such chivalrous behaviour’.³⁶ In particular, Felise’s reaction to the werewolf’s gestures in the first ‘vergiere’ scene signals close parallels with *Bisclavret*. The poet notes that, ‘Mult s’esmerveille la roine / De ce que la beste voit faire’ (vv. 5848-49), adding that Felise turns to the others and asks “‘Avés vos merveille veüe” (v. 5853). Felise’s comments align with the reaction of the *Bisclavret* King to the gestures of the wolf that falls at his feet:

Le reis le vit, grant poür a;
ses cumpaignuns tuz apela.
‘Seignur’, fet il, ‘avant venez
e ceste *merveille* esgardez’ (vv. 149-152) (my italics)

The King’s main response is one of wonderment, and this reaction is mirrored and stressed in *Guillaume* through repetition of ‘merveille’ (v. 5848; v. 5853). In *Bisclavret* the werewolf’s ‘double positif’, the King, marvels at the animal’s behaviour and tries to interpret his communicative gestures. Contrastingly, in *Guillaume*, it is not the werewolf’s positive double, the eponymous hero, who tries to understand its gestures, but rather Queen Felise.

Felise understands the wolf’s actions as a sign, and questions what the beast could be trying to communicate, asking the other observers whether they have ever seen

³⁵ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 79. See also Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?*’, pp. 64-65.

³⁶ Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, pp. 115-16.

anything as marvellous as that which the wolf “‘fait *samblant* nos a ci fait?’” (v. 5855) (emphasis mine). In contrast, Guillaume believes that the wolf is not trying to make a sign, but rather that the wolf is a sign, ‘a premonition’: “‘Je cuit la beste nos destine / Honor et bien mon essiënt, / Qui nos venra prochainement’” (vv. 5858-60).³⁷ A similar reaction is found in Felise and Guillaume’s respective responses to Alphonse’s gestures in his second ‘vergiere’ appearance. Once again, the poet emphasises Felise’s astonishment at the beast’s behaviour, stating that ‘La roïne voit la *merveille* / [...] Forment se prent a *merveillier*’ (vv. 6381-83) (my emphasis). The Queen’s attempt to interpret the wolf’s actions is once again stressed in the text, as she questions the duplication of his gestures and wonders what the animal is trying to communicate:

‘Ceste beste qu’a et que velt,
 Qui nos requiert? De coi se delt?
 Ier nos enclina ensement
 Par une fois, mult simplement,
 Et ore .II.. N’est pas doutance
 Que ce ne soit *senefiance*’ (vv. 6387-92) (emphasis mine)

Felise’s emphatic reaction stresses the impact that Alphonse’s humanised behaviour has on those who observe him. The scene highlights the way in which the wolf’s actions cause others to question what he is doing, and to interrogate the reasons for his gestures and the message he is trying to communicate. The poet insists that the animal’s gestures trigger not only wonderment but also a cognitive process of interpretation, as emphasised by the questions posed by Felise (vv. 6387-88).

The emphasis placed on Felise’s actions in attempting to interpret Alphonse’s behaviour suggests that she is represented as an inscribed reader in the *Guillaume* narrative. The notion of an inscribed reader in medieval texts is adapted in the work of Krueger from reader-response theory, which will be explored in the final section of this chapter. Krueger’s work examining female readers of romance leads her to not only analyse extra-diegetic figures who read and received these works, but also to explore the

³⁷ McCracken, ‘Skin and Sovereignty’, pp. 368-69.

‘numerous examples of women acting as storytellers, readers, or interpreters of events’, the depiction of which mirrors ‘the literary and interpretative activities of women within the audience’.³⁸ Indeed, Krueger defines inscribed readers as ‘characters within the fiction who appear as readers or who fulfill [sic] the functions of an audience’.³⁹ Krueger is not the only critic to comment on inscribed readers in medieval narratives, as Hanning also notes that in the early part of *Partonopeus* the eponymous hero is depicted as ‘the special private audience for whom Mélior works her magic, and as such he becomes an adequate emblem of the romance-audience’.⁴⁰ Felise is represented as an inscribed reader who mirrors the external audience receiving the romance. As they witness Alphonse’s behaviour in the ‘vergier’, the Queen and those around her function as an inscribed audience for the beast’s gestures. However, only Felise attempts to ‘read’ meaning in his actions and recognise the significance of his behaviour, indicating that she parallels the role of the audience who not only receive the romance, but who also actively engage in recognition of intertextual rewriting. The image of Felise as an inscribed reader is returned to and stressed throughout the narrative, as this chapter will note, highlighting yet more ways in which the narrative of his romance mirrors and signals its extra-diegetic reception.

However, despite Felise’s perceptive questions and efforts to ‘read’ Alphonse’s actions, she does not successfully interpret the wolf’s attempt to gain recognition. Although she sees ‘senefiance’ (v. 6392) in Alphonse’s gestures, Felise does not explicitly perceive or comment on their human quality. The representation of her as an inscribed reader thus suggests that not all readers are able to interpret texts or recognise poets’ intertextual allusions. Indeed, as will be explored in this chapter, the poet develops the image of inscribed readers misreading events in the narrative.

³⁸ Krueger, *Women Readers and the Ideology of Gender*, p. 3.

³⁹ Krueger, *Women Readers and the Ideology of Gender*, p. 28.

⁴⁰ Hanning, ‘The Audience as Co-Creator’, p. 17. His comments are echoed in Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 112.

The lack of recognition of Alphonse in the ‘vergier’ highlights further rewriting of *Bisclavret*, in which the King interprets the animal’s human reason and sense (‘entente e sen’, v. 157), even though he does not fully recognise that the beast is a transformed man. Like Felise, the *Bisclavret* King is an inscribed reader who interprets the animal’s actions. In contrast, the ‘reading’ of Alphonse’s behaviour in *Guillaume* is not successful, and the poet signals his manipulation of the *lai* by noting that the werewolf’s ‘double positif’ ignores altogether the significance of Alphonse’s actions. Guillaume makes no attempt to ‘read’ meaning in the animal’s gestures, and McCracken states that he again ‘casts the wolf’s gesture as a sign rather than as a communication’ by repeating that the animal is a good omen (vv. 6397-98).⁴¹

The two scenes that depict Alphonse bowing in the ‘vergier’ highlight manipulation of *Bisclavret* and stress Alphonse’s continued efforts to solicit recognition of his identity. Recognition is also aligned with reading in the narrative, as Felise’s attempts to interpret the beast’s actions suggest that she is an inscribed reader. However, the werewolf is unsuccessful in his attempts to be identified as a metamorphosed man, as the only reaction he triggers is one of amazement, indicating misreading of the meaning behind his communicative gestures. The beast’s endeavours are more ineffective than those of *Bisclavret*, whose actions immediately result in the perception of his human sense, even if they do not lead straightaway to the recognition of his identity. In *Guillaume*, this identification only explicitly occurs in the third scene depicting Alphonse’s humanised actions in Palermo, in which he throws himself at his father’s feet. What is more, in all three passages Guillaume does not try to interpret the animal’s gestures. The poet alters the image of the werewolf being recognised as more than an animal by its ‘double positif’, as Alphonse does not bow in submission to Guillaume, but rather to his father.

⁴¹ McCracken, ‘Skin and Sovereignty’, p. 369.

It is not only during his time in the Palermo palace that the wolf seeks recognition. His behaviour whilst caring for Guillaume and Melior during their flight from Rome is also overtly human. Critics have commented on the representation of Alphonse as a guardian angel, noting that the poet indicates a divine connection between Guillaume and Melior's prayers for help (vv. 3236-37) and the reappearance of the werewolf (vv. 3238-95).⁴² However, the poet also insists upon the beast's human nature when it puts its life in danger in order to safeguard Guillaume and his amie: 'En aventure se metoit / Por eus garandir et deffendre' (vv. 3770-71). Indeed, the deliberate distractions created by the wolf during the journey to Sicily highlight his human reasoning. First, Alphonse diverts the attention of an approaching mob set on capturing the couple outside Benevento (vv. 4075-4176). Later, he dives from the boat in which they cross the straits of Messina so that the lovers can disembark unnoticed (vv. 4596-4632).

Alphonse's behaviour indicates the meditated actions of a human mind set on helping the lovers, rather than the animal instincts of a wolf who wishes only to defend the couple. The werewolf could have attacked the approaching crowd outside Benevento, yet he instead chooses to kidnap the provost's son (vv. 4082-90). The importance attached to this child, whose father leads the hunt for Guillaume and Melior, indicates that the wolf selects his target in order to ensure that the maximum amount of attention is diverted away from the escaping lovers. Similarly, when crossing the straits of Messina the wolf could have attacked the sailors in order to allow Guillaume and Melior safe passage. Instead, Alphonse creates a distraction by jumping from the boat, timing his actions precisely at the Sicilian side of the 'Far' so that the couple can go ashore unobserved: 'Mais la beste qui s'estoit mise / Pour aus delivrer en la barge / Saut en la mer *pres del rivage*' (vv. 4602-04) (emphasis mine). The wolf's conduct stresses his human faculties of reasoning in behaviour motivated by a desire to protect the couple, and the careful execution of each action betrays his hidden nature.

⁴² Dubost, p. 562; Douglas, pp. 119-22; and Sconduto, 'Blurred and Shifting Identities', p. 124.

Other elements of the portrayal of Alphonse accompanying the lovers emphasise his efforts to trigger recognition of his identity. As explored in Chapter Three, Alphonse mirrors the actions of the hunting companions of Tristan, Yvain, and Anselot by providing food for Guillaume and Melior.⁴³ The poet notes that Alphonse is aware of the couple's hunger: 'Bien set qu'as .II. amans convient [...] Si avoient andui molt fain' (vv. 3252-55). 'Savoir' and 'convenir' (v. 3252) stress Alphonse's understanding of the lovers' situation and their need for his assistance. By acting upon his perception of the couple's needs, the werewolf highlights his human reasoning, making a conscious decision to help them.

Alphonse's human nature is emphasised by the food he provides, as he gives the lovers prepared 'human' food (cooked meat, bread, wine) rather than raw meat. Schiff notes that the wolf sources 'aristocratic' food which 'ensures that the fugitive lovers continue to participate in human culture', yet which also signals his own 'aristocratic tastes'.⁴⁴ This behaviour is emphasised through repetition of the image of the werewolf finding 'human' food:

Fist tant et quist et porchaça
 C'as .II. enfans est repairiés,
 De vin, de viandes chargiés
 Devant lor met et puis s'enfuit. (vv. 4260-63)

The food procured suits the couple's human appetite, and the verb 'porchacer' (v. 2460) implies a search for pre-prepared goods rather than a hunt after living prey. Although Tobler defines 'porchacier' as 'etwas betreiben, verfolgen' ['to pursue'], he provides an alternative definition of the term as 'berbeischaffen, verschaffen, besorgen' ['to fetch, to find, to get'].⁴⁵ This second sense implies an act of retrieval of an object already prepared, such as the cooked meat and bread procured by Alphonse, and the poet thus does not suggest that the werewolf chases after a wild animal. This indicates that the beast procures

⁴³ See discussion in Chapter Three, pp. 214-224.

⁴⁴ Schiff, pp. 425-26.

⁴⁵ 'Chacier', in Tobler, II, pp. 154-56; and 'Porchacier', in Tobler, VII, pp. 1484-90.

'human' food in a manner which further highlights his own hidden nature, encouraging the couple to recognise his true identity.

The depiction of Alphonse's efforts to solicit recognition aligns with Bisclavret's gestures who throws himself at the King's feet in a bid for recognition. However, unlike Marie's lycanthrope, Alphonse does not indicate his human nature to his 'double positif' by begging for Guillaume's protection. Instead, Alphonse appears before the lovers to help and guide them, and that this behaviour appears to cause Guillaume to perceive that the beast is more than an animal. When Alphonse provides the lovers with deer-skin disguises (vv. 4341-69), Guillaume wonders at the providential beast, suggesting that his behaviour indicates human sense and reasoning:

'Bien pens et croi que entendés
Et que raison et sens avés.
Je ne sai que ce est de vous,
Què an nule riens ne fus lous' (vv. 4377-80)

Just like the King in *Bisclavret*, Guillaume deduces 'raison' and 'sens' in Alphonse's actions. As Guillaume wonders whether the animal truly is a wolf, the poet suggests that he is an inscribed reader, as he 'reads' sense and reason in the beast's behaviour. However, Guillaume does not go beyond this recognition and unsuccessfully reads the wolf's gestures, failing to realise that Alphonse is a transformed man. Although Scoduto states that Guillaume 'pierces the illusion' of Alphonse's metamorphosed state and perceives 'a man concealed behind his appearance', Guillaume's later lack of response to the werewolf's gestures in the 'vergier' suggests that he has not identified the animal's hybrid nature.⁴⁶ Although Guillaume sees Alphonse as a more than a wolf, he does not state that the beast is a man.

Guillaume's lack of recognition of Alphonse as a human/animal hybrid is emphasised in the narrative. Although other characters refer to Alphonse as a 'werewolf', Guillaume does not employ this term to refer to the beast. As an inscribed reader,

⁴⁶ Scoduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 114.

Guillaume is unable to correctly read and interpret the behaviour of the werewolf for whom he is the ‘double positif’. For example, when Guillaume and Melior discuss Alphonse’s behaviour at Benevento, the poet insists upon Guillaume’s lack of recognition of the animal as a metamorphosed man. The terms ‘garir’ and ‘garandir’ are repeated four times (v. 4134; twice in v. 4140; v. 4143) in the space of less than ten lines in the lovers’ dialogue (vv. 4126-45). The last chapter discussed the association made in the text between the werewolf and his role protecting the couple, emphasised by manipulation of ‘garou’ and the quasi-homonym ‘garir’.⁴⁷ However, although ‘garir’ and ‘garandir’ are repeated in the lovers’ conversation, neither Guillaume nor Melior use the term ‘garou’. The marked absence of ‘garou’ suggests that although the couple understand that the wolf acts to protect them, they do not realise that he is a human/animal hybrid. This incomplete recognition and misreading of Alphonse’s behaviour is echoed in Guillaume’s reaction to the werewolf in the Palermo ‘vergier’, as he sees the wolf’s actions as a sign of good luck, rather than an attempt at communication.

The depiction of Alphonse’s behaviour in *Guillaume* emphasises his efforts to solicit recognition, highlighting the way in which his transformed state affects others’ ability to see him for who he really is, and to correctly read and interpret his behaviour. In spite of his exaggerated efforts, Alphonse struggles to achieve recognition of his true form. Characters only acknowledge the unusual nature of the wolf’s behaviour, and are unable to look beyond the surface layer of the beast’s appearance. The poet highlights parallels between the interpretative efforts of inscribed readers and the process of interpretation adopted by the audience, insisting upon the interpretative actions of those such as Felise and Guillaume who try to ‘read’ the beast in the narrative.

Most strikingly, although the eponymous *Guillaume* hero perceives Alphonse’s sense and reasoning, he does not explicitly state that the beast is a werewolf. However, this term is employed by others in the text, contrasting with *Bisclavret* in which the

⁴⁷ See comments in Chapter Three, p. 188.

animal is never referred to directly as a werewolf, or even as a wolf. Guynn notes that ‘there is no mention of a *lou*’, and Sienaert observes that the animal is only referred to as ‘*beste*’ or with ‘le hapax *bisclavret*’. Characters use ‘*beste*’ in the narrative (the King, v. 153, v. 157, v. 159; the King’s advisor, v. 251, v. 257, v. 286), and only the narrator employs the term ‘*bisclavret*’. The *Guillaume* poet uses ‘wolf’, ‘beast’, and ‘werewolf’, all of which are employed by characters. The use of these terms, and in particular ‘werewolf’, raises questions regarding the extent to which transformed characters are recognised by others in the narrative, suggesting that certain figures recognise Alphonse’s lycanthropic form before he is identified by the King of Spain.

However, as yet, no analysis has been undertaken to fully explore the use of these referents in *Guillaume*. This is particularly striking given the importance of the relationship between words and meaning in the Middle Ages, as explored in scholars’ analyses of medieval semantic theories.⁴⁸ Critics note that medieval philosophers explored not only the value of an expression, but also the way in which an expression gained its semantic value.⁴⁹ This value was seen most often to have been imposed upon a word by an individual, or ‘impositor’, who may or may not have had a perfect understanding of the object or thing they were designating.⁵⁰

The key semantic notion in the Middle Ages was *significatio*. Scholars state that ‘an expression’s *significatio* [...] gives rise to an understanding’, as philosophers developed Aristotle’s belief that a word is a symbol of a concept rather than of an actual

⁴⁸ Margaret Cameron, ‘Meaning: Foundational and Semantic Theories’, in *The Oxford handbook of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by John Marenbon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 342-62. See also comments in Jan Pinborg, ‘Bezeichnung in der Logik des XIII. Jahrhunderts’, in *Medieval Semantics: Selected Studies on Medieval Logic and Grammar*, ed. by Sten Ebbesen (London: Variorum Reprints, 1984), pp. 238-57 (pp. 244-52).

⁴⁹ Cameron, pp. 342-43.

⁵⁰ Cameron, pp. 346-49.

object.⁵¹ For Aristotle, the concept evoked by a word brings to mind an object, and the concept thus mediates between word and object.⁵² Medieval philosophers therefore understood *significatio* as the power of a word to arouse in the mind of the hearer (or utterer) a thought that refers to a thing, rather than just the thing itself. This theory aligns with Augustine's definition of a sign as something which calls to mind an object other than itself, highlighting the belief in steps of interpretation within semantic and hermeneutic theories that is stressed in the emphasis placed in *Guillaume* on looking beyond a surface meaning, as explored in Chapter Three of this thesis.⁵³

This chapter will now undertake close study of the occurrences of 'wolf', 'beast', and 'werewolf' in *Guillaume* by examining the context of each utterance, exploring who uses the terms and when, and studying the adjectives employed to qualify each term. Although this study will not engage directly with medieval semantic theories, their existence nevertheless emphasises the important link between words and meaning in the medieval mind. In particular, the importance of interpretation stressed by medieval semantic theories aligns with the aim of this lexical analysis, which will question how characters' use of a particular term relates to their interpretation of Alphonse. By looking at the referents employed, it will interrogate whether the respective semantic value of the terms is understood by characters, and whether they are used intentionally to signal characters' recognition of Alphonse as a hybrid being. This examination will continue to engage with the notion of inscribed readers in *Guillaume*, as it explores the way in which different terms indicate how Alphonse is 'read' by characters in the narrative.

⁵¹ Cameron, p. 344. See also U. Eco, R. Lambertini, C. Marmo and A. Tabarroni, 'On Animal Language in the Medieval Classification of Signs', in *On the Medieval Theory of Signs*, ed. by Umberto Eco and Costantino Marmo (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1989), pp. 3-41 (pp. 4-6); Umberto Eco, 'Denotation', in *On the Medieval Theory of Signs*, ed. by Eco and Marmo, pp. 43-77 (pp. 47-49); Jan Pinborg, 'Some Problems of Semantic Representations in Medieval Logic', in *Medieval Semantics*, pp. 254-78 (p. 256).

⁵² Stephen Read, 'Concepts and Meaning in Medieval Philosophy', in *Intentionality, Cognition, and Mental Representation in Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by Gyula Klima (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015), pp. 9-28 (pp. 14-15).

⁵³ Cameron, p. 344. Saint Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, trans. by D. W. Robertson Jr. (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1958), p. 34. See also comments in Young, pp. 289-99. See also comments in Chapter Three, pp. 179-85.

Recognition of Alphonse as wolf, beast, and werewolf

When Alphonse first appears in *Guillaume* he is described only as a wolf, with no indication of his hybrid form: ‘Saut uns grans *leus*, goule bace’ (v. 86) (emphasis mine). However, less than seventy lines later this animal is referred to by Felise as a werewolf: “‘Or es a *leu garoul* peuture” (v. 151) (emphasis mine). Although the poet does not provide additional description of the creature, the Queen’s use of ‘werewolf’ indicates that she recognises that Alphonse is more than a wolf, and that she successfully ‘reads’ this figure and perceives his transformed state. Felise’s suspicions are soon confirmed to the audience by the poet’s use of ‘werewolf’ and his portrayal of the beast caring for Guillaume: ‘La nuit le couche joste soi / Li *leus garous* le fil le roi’ (vv. 181-82) (emphasis mine). The juxtaposition between the animal’s exterior appearance and his human behaviour is further explained by the description of Alphonse’s transformation from Spanish heir to werewolf (vv. 270-340). The poet comments that ‘Li *leu warox* dont je vous di / N’iert mie beste par nature’ (vv. 274-75), adding that the creature ‘Ançois ert hom et fix a roi’ (v. 277).

Felise’s use of ‘werewolf’ has been the subject of critical commentary. Dunn remarks on the striking occurrence of the term, noting that the Queen ‘can have no idea that he is anything more than a normal wolf’.⁵⁴ Both Dunn and Micha criticise the poet for ‘unnecessarily’ revealing the animal’s hybrid nature in Felise’s monologue and in the passage describing Alphonse’s metamorphosis, arguing that the poet consequently ‘enlève de l’intérêt’ from the romance which lacks ‘un effet de surprise dans la scène où la bête est délivrée de l’enchantement’.⁵⁵ Scoduto argues against this criticism, suggesting that by revealing the wolf’s hybridity, the poet allows the audience to ‘focus on how Alphonse

⁵⁴ Dunn, p. 115.

⁵⁵ Dunn, p. 115; Micha, p. 32. However, Micha does concede that the true nature of the beast does need to be understood by the audience in order for the wolf’s strange behaviour to be explained in the narrative.

will manage to regain his human identity'.⁵⁶ Ferlampin-Acher does not criticise the poet, but instead questions how the wolf can be 'identifié par la mère de Guillaume, au premier regard, sans qu'il y ait complément d'informations, comme un 'leu garoul'?'⁵⁷ This question is left unanswered by Ferlampin-Acher, who accepts Felise's statement at face value and notes that the Queen identifies 'le ravisseur comme étant un loup-garou'.⁵⁸ However, the Queen's use of 'werewolf' appears unmotivated, particularly given the lack of a physical description of Alphonse. Although critics have noted the unusual use of 'werewolf' in this passage, they have not probed the semantic significance of this term, nor examined whether Felise indeed recognises Alphonse as a werewolf. This is significant given the depiction of the Queen throughout the romance as an inscribed reader, as the poet suggests that Felise's use of 'werewolf' is a reflection of her successful 'reading' of Alphonse as a transformed human.

Guillaume scholarship has neglected to explore how the referents used to indicate the beast suggest recognition of his hybrid form and link to the representation of inscribed readers interpreting this figure in the narrative. Dunn and Sconduto note that the poet refers to Alphonse with three distinct terms, used 'indifferently' as 'synonyms' for one another: werewolf, wolf, and beast.⁵⁹ By stating that the terms are synonymous, their conclusions imply that Felise's utterance does not indicate recognition of Alphonse as a human/animal hybrid, suggesting that 'leu garoul' could have been substituted for 'beste' or 'leu' in this line, both terms used by Felise (v. 132), without alteration to the meaning of her words. However, this is not the case. Although these terms may be used synonymously and would have been selected according to the rhyme and syllables required for each verse, the three referents are not identical in meaning. Close reading of *Guillaume* finds that 'wolf', 'werewolf', and 'beast' are used by characters in varying

⁵⁶ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 100.

⁵⁷ Ferlampin-Acher, '*Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?*', p. 65. See also Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 62 (note 2).

⁵⁸ Ferlampin-Acher, '*Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?*', p. 66.

⁵⁹ Dunn, p. 115 (note 8); Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 98.

circumstances and with different qualifying adjectives, often suggesting a deliberate selection of each individual term.

The only description of Alphonse is the image of a great wolf with gaping jaws in the opening ‘vergier’ scene (v. 86). The poet divulges no information regarding the colour of Alphonse’s coat or the relative size of the beast compared to other animals.⁶⁰ No evidence is provided concerning physical signs of the werewolf’s transformation, and there is no indication as to whether the animal is truly wolf-like in appearance or whether it can be recognised as a werewolf by its exterior form alone. Indeed, Ferlampin-Acher observes that ‘il est impossible de décrire un loup-garou’, noting that medieval werewolf narratives including *Guillaume* and *Bisclavret* instead present ‘un homme puis un loup’.⁶¹ In order to construct an image of Alphonse, the audience therefore relies on others’ perception of this beast, as signalled by terms with which characters refer to the wolf.

Of the three terms, ‘wolf’ (‘leus’ nominative, ‘leu’ oblique) provides the clearest image of a definite form of this animal as a specific, identifiable zoological species.⁶² Of the five adjectives that qualify ‘leu’, (‘grand’, ‘blanc’, ‘mirabillous’, ‘boschage’, ‘sauvage’), only ‘mirabillous’ sits at odds with the term ‘wolf’, as the others align with depictions of wolves as large, wild creatures.⁶³ The poet uses ‘leu’ forty-four times to refer to Alphonse.⁶⁴ Twelve of these instances are by nine different characters (Queen Felise; the Provost; Guillaume; Moisans, the priest; the King of Spain; messengers to Brande; Brande; Alphonse; messengers to Nathaniel). In contrast, only six characters use

⁶⁰ Although Felise dreams of ‘uns blans leus’ accompanying ‘dui blanc ors’ (v. 4731), the poet does not specify at any point in the narrative that Alphonse’s fur is white.

⁶¹ Christine Ferlampin-Acher, *Merveilles’ et topique merveilleuse dans les romans médiévaux* (Paris: Champion, 2003), p. 152. See also comments in Benkov, p. 27.

⁶² ‘Loup’ in *Le Petit Robert* (Paris: Le Robert, 2012), p. 1484. Tobler defines ‘lou’ as ‘Wolf’. ‘Lou’, in Tobler, V, pp. 687-95.

⁶³ The verse numbers for these adjectives are as follows: ‘grand’, v. 86; ‘blanc’, v. 4731; ‘mirabillous’, v. 7503; ‘boschage’, v. 7696; ‘sauvage’, v. 8534.

⁶⁴ ‘Leu’, in both the subject and the oblique case, is used in the following verses: v. 86; v. 105; v. 112; v. 113; v. 132; v. 167; v. 228; v. 250; v. 306; v. 319; v. 3240; v. 3245; v. 3261; v. 3331; v. 3339; v. 3393; v. 3398; v. 3769; v. 4094; v. 4109; v. 4122; v. 4301; v. 4345; v. 4363; v. 4380; v. 4558; v. 4731; v. 4815; v. 4843; v. 5877; v. 7221; v. 7229; v. 7260; v. 7331; v. 7377; v. 7503; v. 7515; v. 7609; v. 7642; v. 7672; v. 7696; v. 7746; v. 8102; v. 8534.

‘werewolf’ (Queen Felise; the ‘vilain’; the King of Spain; Alphonse; messengers to Nathaniel; Emperor Nathaniel) and four use ‘beast’ (Queen Felise; Guillaume; the King of Spain; messengers to Nathaniel). Although ‘beste’ is employed by characters on fourteen occasions, the poet suggests that the animal is most clearly identifiable as a wolf, as more figures refer to Alphonse as a ‘leu’.

Of the six figures that refer to Alphonse as ‘werewolf’, only two do so independently of others’ descriptions of the animal as a hybrid or without the wolf indicating its transformed state. Although Felise first notes that the animal who kidnapped her son is a ‘leu’ and a ‘beste’ (v. 132), she then refers to the creature as a ‘leu garoul’ (v. 151). However, the animal appears fleetingly in the ‘vergiere’ before running away with Guillaume (vv. 86-96), and behaves in an entirely animal manner. The wolf leaps into the ‘vergiere’, jaws gaping, and carries off the young prince into the forest. There seems to be nothing in this passage that would prompt the Queen to see the animal and conclude that he is a werewolf, rather than simply a wolf.

The other character to refer to Alphonse as a werewolf without acquired knowledge of the beast’s hybridity is the peasant from whom he steals food (vv. 3250-3295). The poet describes the werewolf’s ambush of the hapless ‘vilain’:

Li vilains vint, et li *leus* saut;
Cil voit la *beste* et crie en haut:
‘Aidiés, biau peres glorious!
Hui me deffent, que cis *garous*
De moi ocire n’ait poissance.’
Et li *garous* vers lui s’avance,
As dens l’aert et saut d’encoste.
Tres bien le tient par le hargote (vv. 3261-68) (my italics)

All three terms used to refer to Alphonse are employed in this passage, and the peasant’s use of ‘garous’ appears not to be prompted by the wolf’s actions. His utterance occurs before the wolf attacks him, and can therefore only be a response to the beast’s physical appearance, which the poet describes elsewhere as ‘uns grans leus’ (v. 86). Indeed,

Sconduto notes that the poet insists on the animal rather than human behaviour of Alphonse in this passage. The beast acts like a savage wolf and attacks the peasant, even though he bites his clothing rather than flesh (v. 3268).⁶⁵ Although the audience is aware of Alphonse's intentions to procure human food by mugging the peasant, his actions in no way indicate a human nature to the 'vilain', who prays for protection from the beast (vv. 3263-65). The peasant's use of 'garou', a term suggesting apparent recognition of the creature as a human/animal hybrid, is therefore as surprising as Felise's earlier utterance. Both passages suggest ambiguity regarding the distinction between 'werewolf' and the other terms used to denote Alphonse. They raise questions regarding whether 'garou' and 'leu garou' in fact indicate recognition of Alphonse as a metamorphosed man, rather than just an animal, causing the audience to ask whether the semantic value of these referents is truly understood by those who employ them.

The terms 'leu garoul' and 'garoul' are defined by Tobler as 'Werwolf', and both remain in modern French.⁶⁶ 'Garou' is a 'personnage maléfique, mythique, mi-homme mi-loup', and 'loup-garou' is defined as 'homme transformé en loup'.⁶⁷ Both terms are translated in English by the single term 'werewolf', indicating that they are synonymous.⁶⁸ Definitions of the Old French and modern French forms of these referents emphasise the hybridity of this figure, suggesting that a 'leu garoul' or a 'garoul' was understood by the poet and his audience to be more than a savage wolf. The variants of 'leu garoul' (nominative: 'leus garous', 'leus warox'; oblique: 'leu garoul') and 'garoul' (nominative: 'garoul', 'garox'; oblique 'garoul') occur a total number of thirty-four times

⁶⁵ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 104.

⁶⁶ 'Lou-garou', in Tobler, V, p. 696; 'Garou', in Tober, IV, p. 197. See also 'Garol', in Frédéric Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue Française*, 10 vols (Paris: F. Vieweg, 1889) IV, p. 236; 'Loup-garou', in Godefroy, X, p. 96; 'Garol', in Alan Hindley, Frederick W. Langley, Brian J. Levy, *Old French-English Dictionary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 341; 'Lou-garou', in Hindley, Langley, and Levy, p. 400.

⁶⁷ '1. Garou', in *Le Petit Robert*, p. 1133; 'Loup-garou', in *Le Petit Robert*, p. 1484.

⁶⁸ 'Garou', in *Collins-Robert French-English English-French Dictionary*, ed. by Beryl T Atkins (Glasgow: Harper Collins, 1993), p. 375; 'Loup-garou', in *Collins-Robert*, p. 477.

in the romance.⁶⁹ Close analysis of the use of these terms indicates that both Alphonse's human and animal natures are emphasised when the creature is referred to as a 'werewolf'. For example, the initial image of Alphonse as a wolf with gaping jaws (v. 86) is later signalled by the description of 'Le garoul la goule bace' (v. 4081). The poet stresses the werewolf's animal form and features, further emphasised by the closeness in sound between 'garoul' and 'goule'. In contrast, other passages emphasise the werewolf's overtly human behaviour, such as when he delivers the lovers' food: 'Ce qu'il porte molt humlement / A li garox devant aus mis' (vv. 3294-95). However, above all it is the beast's human nature that is most strongly foregrounded in association with 'werewolf'. The poet repeatedly notes that it is the 'garoul' who guides and protects the lovers (vv. 3765-66; vv. 3818-20; vv. 3871-72; v. 4258), manipulating this term alongside the homonyms 'garandir' and 'garir', as explored in Chapter Three.⁷⁰

The use of 'garoul' and 'leu garoul' to refer to a beast that is both human and animal suggests that the peasant and Felise employ these terms because they recognise Alphonse as more than just a wolf. What is more, the depiction of Felise in *Guillaume* as an inscribed reader indicates that she is cognisant of the wolf's true form, and that her use of 'werewolf' is a result of her correct interpretation of the state of the beast that kidnaps her child. However, the poet does not explain what prompts this apparent recognition, and it thus appears to be impossible to state whether Alphonse's true form is understood by either Felise or the peasant. What is more, even though Guillaume comes close to recognising the hidden human nature of Alphonse, 'reading' the hybrid correctly by perceiving its 'raison et sens' (v. 4378), the eponymous hero does not refer to this figure

⁶⁹ 'Leu garoul' and variants occurs nine times in the text, and 'garoul' and variants occur twenty-five times. The instances of 'leu-garoul' are as follows: v. 151; v. 182; v. 274; v. 307; v. 4185; v. 7252; v. 7315; v. 8781; v. 8960. 'Garous' is used in the following verses: v. 197; v. 261; v. 408; v. 415; v. 3264; v. 3266; v. 3290; v. 3295; v. 3345; v. 3765; v. 3818; v. 3871; v. 4081; v. 4258; v. 4746; v. 5839; v. 6375; v. 7207; v. 7880; v. 8491; v. 8518; v. 8519; v. 8536; v. 8744; v. 8759.

⁷⁰ See discussion in Chapter Three, p. 188.

as a ‘werewolf’. The poet thus suggests that use of the term is not the privilege of those who recognise Alphonse’s hybrid form.

The lack of clarity regarding characters’ use of ‘werewolf’ also highlights the effect of transformation on recognition. There is ambiguity surrounding the reasons why characters use ‘leu garoul’ and ‘garoul’, and the extent to which they recognise Alphonse as a hybrid remains unclear. This ambiguity is strengthened by the three apparently synonymous signifiers which are varied according to the poet’s needs in a seemingly arbitrary manner. The poet hints at characters’ recognition of Alphonse as either an animal or a human/animal hybrid, yet he does not state outright that certain figures see the beast as a transformed human rather than a wolf. The use of these terms thus creates an ambiguous representation of characters ‘reading’ Alphonse in the narrative, as the text does not clearly indicate which characters successfully interpret the secondary hero.

This ambiguity is not only emphasised by the referent ‘werewolf’, it is also stressed by the term most used to refer to Alphonse, ‘beste’, which becomes the most semantically ambiguous in *Guillaume*. Alphonse is referred to as ‘beste’ (nominative and oblique) a total of sixty-one times.⁷¹ As noted earlier, four characters signify Alphonse as ‘beste’ fourteen times. It could be argued that ‘beste’ is the most inherently ambiguous signifier, as Tobler defines it simply as ‘Tier’ (‘animal’).⁷² The lack of physical description of the *Guillaume* ‘beste’ means that it is only the presence of ‘leu’ in the narrative that gives a definite form to this figure as a wolf. Nevertheless, ‘beste’ separates Alphonse from human characters in the narrative, as Godefroy notes that it denotes ‘tout animal *excepté* l’homme’ (my emphasis).⁷³ By excluding the possibility of employing

⁷¹ ‘Beste’ is used to refer to Alphonse in the following verses: v. 88; v. 120; v. 128; v. 132; v. 154; v. 175; v. 186; v. 235; v. 245; v. 275; v. 306; v. 3262; v. 3273; v. 3280; v. 3286; v. 3310; v. 3352; v. 3402; v. 3777; v. 4014; v. 4088; v. 4099; v. 4102; v. 4107; v. 4108; v. 4117; v. 4128; v. 4152; v. 4156; v. 4194; v. 4201; v. 4213; v. 4228; v. 4269; v. 4354; v. 4370; v. 4550; v. 4569; v. 4572; v. 4602; v. 4608; v. 4628; v. 4640; v. 4686; v. 4919; v. 5842; v. 5849; v. 5854; v. 5858; v. 6379; v. 6382; v. 6387; v. 6396; v. 7234; v. 7240; v. 7270; v. 7336; v. 7677; v. 8521; v. 8781; v. 9227.

⁷² ‘Beste’, in Tobler, I, p. 948.

⁷³ ‘Beste’, in Godefroy, VIII, p. 320.

‘beste’ to denote a human, use of ‘beste’ in *Guillaume* suggests that those who use it do not recognise Alphonse as a human/animal hybrid. This creates contradictions in the text, as Felise refers to the creature as ‘beste’ and ‘leus’ (v. 132) before she employs the term ‘leu garoul’ (v. 151), counteracting the suggestion that her use of the latter referent implies recognition of this figure as a metamorphosed man.

The difference between Alphonse as an animal and his double, Guillaume, as a human is stressed through the depiction of the ‘beast’ belonging to the eponymous hero. The poet places the possessive adjectives ‘sa’ (v. 4269), ‘nostre’ (v. 4014; v. 4354), and ‘lor’ (v. 4550; v. 4628; v. 4640; v. 4686; v. 4919) alongside ‘beste’ to show Guillaume and Melior holding power over the animal. This image aligns with *Bisclavret*, in which the wolf is only referred to by characters as ‘beste’, and which emphasises the closeness between the werewolf and the King: ‘Cil le garderent volentiers / tuz jurs entre les chevaliers / e pres del rei s’alout culchier’ (vv. 175-77). Although Marie does not use possessive adjectives to explicitly state the relationship between *Bisclavret* and the King as one of possession, the image she paints of this bond is evoked in the depiction of Alphonse as ‘Guillaume’s beast’. What is more, the closeness found in both works between the werewolves and their human companions suggests that although the animals are seen as ‘bestes’, a term which by definition separates them from humans, they are recognised as more than savage wolves.

The closeness between Guillaume and Alphonse is emphasised during their time in the wild together, in which the poet highlights the werewolf’s attempts to use his behaviour to gain recognition of his hidden human form. By adopting Alphonse as his own, Guillaume aligns with the King in *Bisclavret*, who takes the ‘beast’ into his household after realising that the creature is more than an animal. Even though neither the King nor Guillaume recognise that the ‘beasts’ they adopt are transformed humans, the

protection they provide brings the lycanthropes closer to achieving recognition by allowing them to make contact with the human world that they wish to rejoin.

Bisclavret and Alphonse become more human when in the company of those who take possession of them, and the ‘beasts’ appear to be like faithful human servants, rather than hunting animals. Noacco states that Bisclavret ‘se comporte en chien fidèle et dévoué, *mimêsis* du chevalier au service du seigneur’.⁷⁴ Bacou similarly observes that ‘la domestication du loup’ in *Bisclavret* allows the animal to recover his human role in the King’s service as ‘homme meilleur parmi les hommes’.⁷⁵ The same effect is achieved in *Guillaume*, as Alphonse is depicted sharing Guillaume’s bedchamber while they await the arrival of Brande to retransform the werewolf:

Devant Guillaume estoit ses lis
Ens en la chambre, o le baron.
Si sont et per et compaignon
Ne s’entr’eslongent nuit et jor (vv. 7620-23)

The inseparability of Alphonse and Guillaume is stressed in a manner that evokes *Bisclavret*, yet this intertextual model is rewritten. At this point in the romance Guillaume is aware of Alphonse’s human identity, and the image of them as ‘per et compaignon’ (v. 7622) is thus one of human partners, rather than animal and master. Nevertheless, the poet manipulates and develops the closeness found in *Bisclavret* between the werewolf and its positive double, stressing that Alphonse’s human nature is further emphasised by his relationship with Guillaume.

Four adjectives qualify ‘beste’ in relation to Alphonse: ‘sauvage’ (v. 154), ‘fiere’ (v. 120; v. 3280; v. 4102; v. 5842), ‘franche’ (v. 175; v. 3352; v. 4152; v. 4370; v. 6396), and ‘mue’ (v. 306; v. 3310; v. 4128; v. 5854). ‘Sauvage’ and ‘fiere’, defined as ‘wild’ and ‘powerful’, emphasise the beast’s savage nature, as signalled by the initial image of Alphonse as a terrifying wolf (v. 86).⁷⁶ However, although these adjectives stress the

⁷⁴ Noacco, p. 41.

⁷⁵ Bacou, p. 44.

⁷⁶ ‘Fier’, in Tobler, III, pp. 1822-24.

figure's animal nature, aligning with the definition of 'beste' as denoting any being other than a human, the other two adjectives emphasise its human qualities. Translated into modern French as 'noble', 'franc' refers to courtly personae in texts contemporary to *Guillaume*, yet it is also used to emphasise the noble and human nature of animals.⁷⁷ In *Bisclavret*, Marie describes the werewolf as 'frans et de bon'aire' (v. 179). Chrétien evokes this description by referring to Yvain's lion as 'frans et de bon'eire' (v. 3393), and Dubuis notes that in *Yvain* 'ce sont là les termes mêmes qui définissaient et caractérisaient le chevalier', highlighting the human-like qualities that these adjectives signal.⁷⁸

In *Guillaume*, the description of Alphonse as 'beste franche' aligns with these texts and 'alludes to the wolf's noble conduct, as well as his noble origins'.⁷⁹ Guillaume twice addresses Alphonse as 'franche beste' (v. 3352; v. 4370), and uses the term to refer to the werewolf after the animal's second 'vergier' appearance (v. 6396). The use of 'franc' in other texts to denote chivalrous qualities is seen by Sconduto as evidence that Guillaume employs the term because he sees the 'beast' as a transformed human, and she notes that 'it is obvious that he has recognized Alphonse's inherent nobility'.⁸⁰ However, it is unclear whether or not Guillaume really does recognise the 'beste' as a human/animal hybrid, rather than as an animal with noble qualities, like Yvain's lion.

The fourth term to qualify Alphonse as a 'beste' in *Guillaume*, the adjective 'mue', highlights further manipulation of characters' recognition of Alphonse as a transformed human/animal hybrid.⁸¹ Alphonse is described as a 'beste mue' first by the poet (v. 306), twice by Guillaume (v. 3310; v. 4128), and once by Queen Felise

⁷⁷ 'Franc', in Tobler, III, pp. 2198-2203. Tobler cites examples in which the term is used to stress the chivalrous qualities of a character, such as the following from the *Chanson de Roland*: 'Franc chevalier, dist l'empere Carles'.

⁷⁸ Dubuis, p. 22.

⁷⁹ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 94.

⁸⁰ Sconduto, *Metamorphosis of the werewolf*, p. 106.

⁸¹ The noun 'mue' is used twice in the romance (v. 5604; v. 7669). Although it is translated by Tobler as 'prison', when used in Brande's speech to Alphonse it can also be translated as 'transformation': "Ci sui por toi garir venue / Et toi geter de ceste mue / Qui tant longement t'a covert" (vv. 7687-89). 'Müe' in Tobler, VI, pp. 398-99. See comments in McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', pp. 373-74.

(v. 5854).⁸² The adjective ‘mu’ is the antecedent of the modern French ‘muet’ (‘dumb’), yet although McCracken translates ‘beste mue’ as ‘mute beast’, and Ferlampin-Acher as ‘une bête privée de parole’, Sconduto interprets the term as ‘transformed beast’.⁸³ This interpretation is a result of Sconduto perceiving ‘mue’ as the past participle of the verb ‘muer’ (to transform), a verb employed by the poet to describe transformation elsewhere in *Guillaume* (v. 305; v. 3994; v. 4718; vv. 7870). In particular, the poet uses the third-person present indicative of ‘muer’ in the description of Brande’s metamorphosis of Alphonse into a werewolf (v. 305), after which it is directly contrasted with the adjective ‘mu’ (with feminine agreement) to describe the transformed figure as a mute beast: ‘Son estre et sa samblance *mue* / Que leus devint et beste *mue*’ (vv. 305-06) (my emphasis).

Although Sconduto translates both occurrences of ‘mue’ in these verses as ‘transformed’, this homophonic rhyme pair in fact emphasises the image of Alphonse as transformed into a dumb animal that must communicate through gesture.⁸⁴ Indeed, Ferlampin-Acher notes that ‘l’homophonie de *mue* à la rime signale de fait que ce qui différencie essentiellement l’homme de l’animal est l’usage de la parole’.⁸⁵ Similarly, Tobler notes the formulaic use in Old French of ‘beste mue’ to denote any dumb animal, defining ‘mu’ as ‘stumm; der Sprache nicht fähig oder beraubt; les bestes mues (im Gegensatz zu den sprachbegabten Menschen)’.⁸⁶

The occurrences of ‘beste mue’ to refer to Alphonse in *Guillaume* cannot be read as ‘transformed beast’, as the poet would have needed a ninth syllable in each line to create the past participle of ‘muer’ (‘mué’). Nevertheless, Sconduto’s interpretation of Guillaume’s use of this phrase raises questions surrounding his recognition of Alphonse

⁸² ‘Muer’, in Tobler, VI, pp. 405-12 (p. 405); ‘Mu’, in Tobler, VI, pp. 386-40 (p. 386). See also comments on the verb ‘muer’ in Pairet, pp. 21-22.

⁸³ McCracken, ‘Skin and Sovereignty’, pp. 363-64; Guillaume de Palerne, trans. by Ferlampin-Acher, p. 122; Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 98.

⁸⁴ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 98. McCracken states that Sconduto’s interpretation is ‘wrong’. McCracken, ‘Skin and Sovereignty’, pp. 363-64.

⁸⁵ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, p. 54.

⁸⁶ ‘Dumb; not able to speak or bereft of speech; les bestes mues (in contrast to speaking humans)’ (my translation). ‘Mu’, in Tobler, VI, p. 386.

as a human/animal hybrid. Guillaume refers to Alphonse on two occasions with the term ‘beste mue’:

‘Fu mais tex merveille veüe,
Quant Diex par une beste mue
No soustenance nos envoie?’ (vv. 3309-11)

‘Fu ainc mais tel chose veüe,
Quant Diex par une beste mue
Nos a fait tel besoing secours?’ (vv. 4127-29)

Sconduto’s interpretation of ‘beste mue’ leads her to conclude that ‘like his mother Queen Felise, and like the peasant whose food was stolen, Guillaume also recognizes that Alphonse is a werewolf: *une beste mue*’.⁸⁷ However, I have demonstrated that the use of the term ‘werewolf’ by Felise and the peasant is not sufficient evidence to confirm these characters’ correct recognition of the beast as a man transformed into lupine form, and McCracken stresses that Sconduto’s translation of ‘beste mue’ as ‘transformed beast’ is erroneous.⁸⁸ Guillaume’s use of ‘beste mue’ cannot thus support Sconduto’s claim that Guillaume recognises Alphonse as a man transformed into a wolf.

However, Guillaume’s use of ‘beste mue’ could be read as a tongue-in-cheek allusion to Alphonse’s human nature that is trapped and rendered mute within his transformed state, suggesting that Guillaume does indeed recognise that there is more to the animal than meets the eye. ‘Mu’ (‘dumb’) is not an adjective used to describe the beasts in *Bisclavret* and *Yvain*, and its presence in *Guillaume* is stressed by the homophonic rhyme pair used in the description of Alphonse’s metamorphosis (vv. 305-06), suggesting that it holds significance in the romance. The ideas of transformation on the one hand, and of animals lacking language on the other, are brought together in the two meanings of ‘mu’, as emphasised in vv. 305-06. Use of ‘beste mue’ later in *Guillaume* recalls this poetic wordplay, suggesting that although characters see Alphonse as a ‘mute beast’, they nevertheless may also recognise that his dumbness is caused by

⁸⁷ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 104.

⁸⁸ McCracken, ‘Skin and Sovereignty’, pp. 363-64.

transformation from human to animal form. As Guillaume repeatedly wonders how a 'mute beast' could have the inclination to bring the couple food and help them, there is a suggestion that his wonderment at the animal's human-like actions indicates that he begins to recognise the wolf's human nature. It could be argued that Guillaume's later statement regarding his observation of the wolf's 'raison et sens' (v. 4378) is prompted by his earlier observation of the animal's behaviour, and the use of 'beste mue' in vv. 3309-11 and vv. 4127-9 could therefore indicate the start of the hero's process of recognising that there is something more to the beast than meets the eye. However, the poet does not suggest whether the interpretation of 'beste mue' as a mute beast that has been transformed is implied in Guillaume's use of this phrase to denote Alphonse, creating ambiguity regarding Guillaume's recognition of this figure as a transformed man.

Use of 'beste mue' in *Guillaume* further adds to the ambiguous representation of characters successfully recognising, or 'reading', the transformed nature of Alphonse, aligning with the overall ambiguity surrounding the referents for this figure in *Guillaume*. Although certain signifiers appear to indicate recognition of the wolf's zoomorphic transformation ('garoul' and 'leu garoul'), the context in which these terms are placed complicates understanding of whether or not those who employ these expressions perceive Alphonse as a hybrid being. The poet suggests that recognition of Alphonse as a transformed beast is not clear-cut. Although certain passages indicate that figures such as Guillaume see the noble and human qualities of the animal, no one states that Alphonse is a man transformed into a wolf until he appears before the King of Spain. The ambiguous use of 'wolf', 'werewolf' and 'beast' highlights the way in which recognition of this human/animal hybrid is complicated by the metamorphosis he has experienced. Those who encounter Alphonse do not clearly define him as human, animal, or hybrid, and the poet emphasises the correspondence between transformation and recognition by stressing

the impact that the former has on characters' ability to recognise this metamorphosed figure.

The ambiguity surrounding these terms also links to the representation of Felise and Guillaume as inscribed readers. Their interpretation of Alphonse, indicated by the referents they employ to denote him, suggests their ability (or inability) to 'read' the beast. Recognition is equated to reading in the text through the suggestion that only the King of Spain is able to correctly read the animal, as he alone explicitly recognises Alphonse as a transformed man. Although Felise's use of 'werewolf' indicates that she successfully interprets the animal, the poet does not explicitly state that she understands the semantic implications of the term she employs, as no explanation is given for her use of this referent. Similarly, Guillaume does not call Alphonse 'werewolf', even though he sees the wolf's human qualities, as communicated in the beast's actions caring for the couple. The poet suggests that Guillaume is unable to 'read' the beast, and indicates that these terms do not reliably signal characters' interpretation of this figure.

The representation of Felise and Guillaume as inscribed readers is stressed in the scenes at the Palermo palace. This chapter will now explore the way in which the ability of these characters to recognise, and therefore 'read', transformed figures is questioned in the romance. By examining scenes of recognition and lack of recognition between Guillaume and Felise in Palermo, this study will continue to highlight links between transformation and recognition in *Guillaume*, arguing that the importance of the latter is stressed within both the intra- and extra-diegetic frames of this work.

Animal-skin disguises and recognition at the Palermo palace

The depiction of the Queen as an inscribed reader is stressed in the representation of this figure observing the disguised lovers in the Palermo 'vergier':

Et voit qu'ensemble s'esbanient;
Mais ne set pas ce que il dient.
[...] Et de ce molt s'esmerveilloit
Que tel samblant d'amor i voit.

Sovent a soi meïsmes a dit
 C'onques mais .II. bestes ne vit
 Qui l'une l'autre eüst si chiere
 Com a cil cers et cele chiere.
 'Ne ne furent .II. bestes mues,
 Ki se geüssent estendues
 Comme ele font, bien le puis dire.
 [...] Il samble bien et je le cuit
 C'andoi aient sens et raison.' (vv. 4947-61; vv. 4966-67)

Felise's wonderment at the couple's behaviour ('s'esmerveillot', v. 4953) signals parallels with the King's reaction to the werewolf in *Bisclavret* (v. 152). Yet it also aligns with her later response to Alphonse's actions in the 'vergiere' (v. 5848), linking her observation of the lovers with her later attempt to 'read' Alphonse's gestures. The closeness between these scenes stresses the representation of the Queen as an inscribed reader, who actively tries to interpret the behaviour of the animals she observes (vv. 4953-67).

The portrayal of Felise observing the lovers further stresses the effect of transformation on characters' ability to recognise metamorphosed individuals, highlighting similarities between the recognition of the disguised lovers and of the hybrid werewolf. This link is made explicit by the phrase 'beste mue' which is employed by Felise to denote the quasi-metamorphosed couple (v. 4959), recalling Guillaume's use of the term to refer to Alphonse (v. 3310; v. 4128). Felise's use of 'beste mue' stresses that she sees the figures as 'mute beasts', marvelling at the communication she perceives between the animals: 'Et voit qu'ensemble *s'esbanient* / Mais ne set pas ce qui il *dient*' (vv. 4949-50) (emphasis mine). The emphasis placed on the image of the beasts talking suggests that Felise questions how two 'mute beasts' are able to communicate, yet other elements of her monologue suggest the use of 'mue' as a pun that indicates an awareness of the lovers' transformed state. Felise notes the 'sens et raison' of the animals (v. 4967), echoing Guillaume's speech to Alphonse in which he states that the beast has 'raison et sens' (v. 4378). Scoduto has argued that Guillaume's comments to Alphonse provide

evidence of his recognition of the animal as a werewolf.⁸⁹ Thus, the close parallels between Felise's observation of the couple's human qualities and Guillaume's words to Alphonse suggest that the Queen sees through the lovers' attempts to transform and conceal their human form. This closeness indicates that, like the werewolf, although these figures are also seen to mute, characters may also perceive their transformed state, as suggested in the wordplay created by the term 'mue'. However, although the poet implies that Felise recognises the animals as more than deer, it is not stated outright that she perceives them to be transformed humans, suggesting that she is unable to 'read' the 'deer' successfully. Like Guillaume's understanding of Alphonse and the King's perception of Bisclavret in Marie's *lai*, the Queen identifies that there is more to the 'beasts' than meets the eye, yet her recognition is limited. Felise does not see the correspondence between the lovers' behaviour and the metamorphoses they have experienced, and as an inscribed reader fails to make further steps towards successfully interpreting their behaviour as a signals of their transformed state.

Felise's lack of recognition of the lovers' true form is stressed to comic effect when she observes them for a second time. On this occasion, and as noted in the previous chapter, the poet observes that the clothing under the disguises is showing through the seams of the skins, which have stretched in the sun (vv. 5094-99).⁹⁰ However, in spite of this telling indication of their transformed state, Felise continues to marvel at these creatures. Like the King in *Bisclavret*, Felise depends upon her advisor, Moises, to successfully recognise and 'read' the 'bestes' (vv. 5100-05), and his quick recognition of the lovers is contrasted with her inability to identify them as humans in disguise. The poet foregrounds the notion of recognition and stresses links with interpretation, showing Moises not only recognising that the animals are humans wearing deerskins, but more importantly identifying them as Melior and her young lover (vv. 5111-53). Moises reads

⁸⁹ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 114.

⁹⁰ See discussion in Chapter Three, p. 192.

the layers of the couple's disguised form, and interprets them according to his knowledge of a young couple who have eloped from Rome dressed as animals (vv. 5112-40).

Felise and Moises's contrasting abilities to recognise the 'beasts' align with the opposing interpretations of Alphonse by Guillaume and by the King of Spain, further highlighting the ambiguous portrayal of the ease with which transformed characters are 'read' and identified. The poet suggests that some characters perceive the real form of the hybrids instantly, whilst others cannot see beyond these creatures' outer appearance to the hidden figures underneath. The ambiguous depiction of identification in *Guillaume* emphasises the correspondence between transformation and recognition, yet it also stresses the links between recognition and interpretation. Moises and Felise each function as contrasting inscribed readers, one successfully and one unsuccessfully interpreting the 'deer'. Parallels are signalled between these readers and the *Guillaume* audience, emphasising the importance of the audience's recognition of intertextual allusions in their interpretation of this work.

The notion of inscribed readers is developed in the Palermo section of the romance, stressing links between reading and recognition of transformation in the narrative. In particular, the depiction of characters' ability to recognise transformed figures is pushed to a comic extreme when the Queen is portrayed donning a deerskin to meet the lovers in the 'vergier'. Lacunae in the manuscript have removed any explanation of the motivation for Felise's disguise, and critics have thus seen the episode as a 'grotesque' overemphasis of the 'recours aux déguisements' found in the narrative.⁹¹ The image of Felise as a quasi-animal is foregrounded in the text, as she is described moving 'A .III. piés comme autre beste' (v. 5172), before the poet notes that the lovers perceive Felise as a beast (v. 5196).

⁹¹ Micha, p. 31. See also comments in Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 69-70; and McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', p. 367.

The depiction of Guillaume reacting to Felise's arrival in the 'vergier' manipulates the representation of the eponymous hero as an inscribed reader.⁹² Upon seeing Felise, Guillaume tells Melior why the 'beste' is not afraid of the lovers: "Ne nos cuide autres qu'ele voit: / S'ele savoit nostre convaigne, / Ne seroit pas notre compaignee" (vv. 5200-02). Guillaume's naive faith in the Queen's ignorance suggests that he immediately 'misreads' the figure before him. Comic irony is created in Guillaume's belief that the Queen thinks the lovers are exactly what they appear to be, as the audience knows that Felise is aware of the couple's hidden identity as humans. The poet exploits Guillaume's comments by portraying the unafraid 'beste' responding to the eponymous hero: "Et si vos di que je sai bien / Vos erremens tos et vos estres." (vv. 5208-09). This response shocks the lovers, who believed that their disguises had concealed their true form, and the animal's use of speech surprises the couple. The lovers' interpretation of a disguised human/animal hybrid is aligned with the Queen's earlier attempts to 'read' the beasts she saw in the 'vergier', as they take Felise's appearance at face-value and think that she is a 'beast'. Guillaume and Melior do not read beyond the surface appearance of the 'deer', and react to her words by crossing themselves and shaking with fear (vv. 5210-13) before Guillaume interrogates the creature:

'Beste, de par le roi du mont,
 Se de par lui paroles dont,
 Ne ce c'est autres esperites,
 Ne que ce est que vos me dites,
 Ne se par toi i arons mal.' (vv. 5215-19)

This scene stresses the comical image of the terrified lovers unable to recognise that Felise is mirroring their own quasi-hybrid state. Guillaume's speech highlights his lack of recognition of Felise's true form and emphasises his misreading of the 'animal' that he persists in calling 'beste'. Guillaume interrogates Felise's use of verbal communication,

⁹² That Felise enters the 'vergier' in a deerskin and mimics the lovers, also suggests that she enters the narrative that has been created by their disguises.

indicating that he does not consider the possibility of the creature being like himself, a human dressed in a deerskin.

It appears that even though Felise mirrors exactly the lovers' quasi-transformed state, the lovers are unable to recognise her as a metamorphosed human, and they instead jump to the extreme conclusion that she must be possessed by a divine or malevolent force (vv. 5215-17). Felise's transformed appearance prevents Guillaume from successfully interpreting the figure before him. Just as Felise struggles to read the 'bestes mues' she observes in the 'vergier' as disguised humans, Guillaume's recognition of the Queen is affected by her animalised form. However, unlike the lovers, whose disguises are worn to conceal their identity, Felise does not attempt to hide her human nature. The Queen only mimics the lovers' disguised state in order to join them in the 'vergier', and once there her actions shatter the pretence of an animal identity, as she immediately speaks to them.

The *Guillaume* poet insists upon an ambiguous depiction of the success with which characters recognise the quasi-hybrids in the text, and thus emphasises the correspondence between transformation and recognition. The image of one talking deer baffled by the presence of another stresses the incongruous lack of recognition in this scene, showing that characters struggle to perceive others' transformed states, even in moments that appear to indicate a figure's true form. As the scenes at the Palermo palace develop, the notion of recognition continues to be emphasised in the text, as the romance highlights particular the portrayal of Guillaume and Felise as inscribed readers. The positive denouement of the romance rests upon the ability of Felise to 'read' the unknown knight she welcomes into her household as her son and heir, yet the poet presents several scenes in which mother and son fail to recognise one another and to identify their familial bond. Although the Queen facilitates Guillaume's retransformation to fully human form

by taking him into the Palermo palace, the poet notes that she and the eponymous hero remain ignorant of his identity as Felise's son (vv. 5285-89).⁹³

As the narrative progresses in Palermo, the poet insists upon the importance of recognition of Guillaume as Sicilian heir, in particular by juxtaposing scenes of unbelievable recognition with moments of far-fetched lack of recognition. For example, King Embron's horse, Brunsaudebruel, instantly recognises Guillaume as the late King's son and heir, and therefore as his new master (vv. 5405-20).⁹⁴ In contrast, although the Queen and her people marvel at the horse's unquestioning acceptance of Guillaume as its master (vv. 5421-22), they do not follow the animal's example and recognise Guillaume's identity, failing to read the significance of the horse's behaviour. The poet emphasises the lack of recognition of Guillaume in this scene by aligning the onlookers' amazement with the wonderment of Felise at the disguised lovers and at the werewolf's gestures in the Palermo 'vergier'. Just as Felise 'molt s'esmerveilleoit' (v. 4953) at Alphonse's behaviour, the poet notes that those who care for the horse 'Molt se present a merveillier' (v. 5421). The verb 'merveillier' suggests a lack of recognition of the meaning behind Brunsaudebruel's actions towards Guillaume, aligning with the lack of recognition of the significance of Alphonse's behaviour. When Felise hears of the horse's actions, the poet once again emphasises characters' inability to recognise Guillaume as Embron's heir. Queen believes that Brunsaudebruel's gestures signify 'Honor qui par tans li vendra' (v. 5427), mirroring Guillaume's interpretation of Alphonse's behaviour in the 'vergier' as a good omen (vv. 5858-59). Like Guillaume, who is unable to read the meaning in the werewolf's gestures, Felise does not correctly interpret the significance of this event.

The horse's immediate recognition of Embron's heir is juxtaposed with Felise and others' inability to recognise the young knight. The narrative continues to emphasise the lack of recognition of Guillaume through moments at which characters come tantalisingly

⁹³ McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', p. 368.

⁹⁴ See comments on this scene in McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', p. 371; and Miller, p. 358.

close to identifying the eponymous hero. For example, Guillaume's likeness to Embron is observed by the Queen's people:

Cil qui virent le roi Embron
Endemetiers que il vivoit
Dient que bien li resambloit:
Ensi disoient mult de gent (vv. 7604-07)

However, the poet does not state that those who perceive this likeness make the connection between Guillaume and Embron and recognise the eponymous hero's true identity, thus thwarting the audience's expectations for recognition.

Once Guillaume enters Felise's household, the depiction of the interaction between the Queen and the knight repeatedly builds dramatic tension leading to an expected recognition scene between mother and long-lost son. For example, Felise recounts the kidnapping of her child to Guillaume, and tension mounts as Guillaume reacts to her words and pieces together memories from his childhood:

Quant Guillaumes la merveille oit
A poi de lui ne se mescroit,
Car bien li membre del vachier
Qui le norri et ot si chier,
De ce qu'il dist l'empereor
Qu'en riches dras, en noble ator
L'avoit trové petit el bois (vv. 5907-13)

However, Felise believes that the child was drowned (vv. 5901-06), and this belief prevents Guillaume from recognising his mother:

Por voir ses fix estre cuidast,
Se la roïne dit n'eüst
Qu'en la mer ses fix noiés fust;
Por ce en laisse le penser. (vv. 5916-19)

The use of the conditional perfect stresses Guillaume's near-recognition of his true identity by emphasising what could have been. The poet continues to highlight the notion of the 'could have been' in this section, noting how the situation in Palermo would have been different, had Florence and Felise been aware of Guillaume's identity (vv. 5285-89; vv. 5555-62). However, it is clear that the eponymous hero does not dwell on such

thoughts (v. 5919), and above all emphasis is placed on the lack of recognition between Felise and Guillaume.

Although expectations for a recognition scene between mother and son are thwarted in this passage, recognition of the eponymous hero's transformed identity is soon returned to in the text. After observing Guillaume in battle, Felise explains to the young knight how much he reminds her of King Embron and her lost child (vv. 6337-46). The audience expects Guillaume to conclude that he must be Felise's son, yet he instead attempts to move her thoughts away from the matter by observing that people often look alike, even without a familial bond (vv. 6357-59). He further undermines the possibility of a recognition scene by stating that although he would like to resemble King Embron and the lost prince, it would be impossible for him to be her son, "Puisqu'il est mors" (v. 6365).

However, in spite of this dismissal, Felise nevertheless has faith in her suspicions regarding the knight's true identity:

La roïne n'est mie bel
De ce qu'ot dire au damoiseil,
Por ce que mort tenoit son fil,
Car de lui *croit que ce soit il*:
Ses *cuers* li dist tos et enorte
Et ses *corages* li aporte. (vv. 6367-72) (emphasis mine)

Even though the knight ignores the bond between himself and the Queen, the passage implies that Felise instinctively identifies Guillaume, in spite of his logical argument against the possibility of this identity. Vuagnoux-Uhlig notes that Felise's observation of the resemblance between the knight and her late husband lead her to 'reconnaître Guillaume comme son propre fils', adding that they facilitate the 'épisode des retrouvailles entre la reine et son fils'.⁹⁵ However, contrary to these comments, there are no 'retrouvailles' between mother and son at this moment in *Guillaume*. In fact, both characters depend upon the later intervention of the retransformed Alphonse to confirm

⁹⁵ Vuagnoux-Uhlig, p. 180; p. 174. See also comments in: Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', p. 79; and Miller, p. 358.

the identity of the unknown knight for a moment of recognition to take place between them (vv. 8077-8128).

The scenes throughout the Palermo palace episode create an ambiguous representation of the extent to which Felise recognises Guillaume as her lost child, questioning the ability of these inscribed readers to successfully interpret the events that occur in the narrative. The representation of Felise and Guillaume as inscribed readers creates parallels between these figures and the *Guillaume* audience, in particular through the manipulation of their expectations for a recognition scene between mother and son. Just as Guillaume immediately misreads the form of Felise as a ‘beste’ in the ‘vergier’ and Felise misinterprets the actions of Embron’s horse towards the unknown knight, it appears that the audience could also be inclined to misread the text that unfolds before them. As will be explored in the final section of this chapter, the role of the audience in romance reception is emphasised throughout *Guillaume*, as the text encourages their active engagement in reception. By insisting upon the depiction of inscribed readers misreading in the narrative, the poet stresses that the audience should not presume the course of the text, but should instead engage with their reception of the work in order to successfully interpret it.

The notion of recognition is further stressed in Palermo through an unbelievable moment of recognition between the Queen and another transformed figure. As I have noted, when Alphonse gestures from the ‘vergier’ Felise senses that the wolf’s behaviour carries meaning and tries to read its significance. Although she does not understand that the wolf is a transformed man (vv. 5852-55), she nevertheless recognises the beast:

‘Certes, se je l’osoie dire’
Fait la dame, ‘sire, c’est cil
Qui me ravi .I. mien chier fil
Que j’ai perdu molt a lonc tans’ (vv. 5862-65)

The Queen’s identification of Alphonse as the wolf that kidnapped Guillaume is instant and unquestioning, and dramatic irony is created by the contrast between Felise’s

recognition of the wolf and the lack of recognition between mother and son. Yet this scene also raises unanswered questions regarding the Queen's ability to recognise Alphonse as the beast that kidnapped her child. Just as ambiguity surrounds Felise's identification of Alphonse as a 'leu garoul' in the opening scene of the romance, there is no explanation of how she is able to recognise the wolf as her child's kidnapper. In so doing, the poet highlights additional ambiguity surrounding recognition of transformed characters, and manipulates familial recognition scenes by depicting Felise recognising not her child, but the animal that kidnapped him. This unbelievable moment of recognition adds to the depiction of Felise as an inscribed reader. This successful reading is contrasted with passages in which Felise misreads narrative events, emphasising the links between recognition and interpretation in the narrative and suggesting parallels between inscribed reading and the extra-diegetic interpretation of *Guillaume*.

Yet more moments of non-recognition are contrasted with remarkable recognition during the scene in which Alphonse is recognised by the King of Spain as his long-lost son (vv. 7207-7340). Although they share knowledge of the knight's name, status as noble foundling, and resemblance to the Queen's late husband, these signals of his identity are not enough for Felise and Guillaume to fully acknowledge their relationship as mother and child. In contrast, King Alphonse of Spain is able to not only perceive that the wolf which appears before him is a transformed human, he also recognises the hybrid beast as his son. The notion of parent-child recognition is manipulated in the passage, as although the King had not believed the stories he had heard about his son's disappearance, nor seen the beast before (vv. 7313-24), he is the first to perceive the significance of the beast's behaviour and recognise the werewolf. For the King, the wolf's gestures are enough evidence to prove his transformed state and human identity:

'Cil leus qui or fu ci a nous,
Qui tel semblant fist moi et vous
Devant trestoute nostre gent,
Nel vit nus hom n'ait essiënt,

Ne nus oster ne me porroit
Que ce nule autre beste soit
Que mes fix Alphons, li perdus.
Or est a moi ci revenus
Por merci querre et por proier
Que le venge de ma moillier. ' (vv. 7331-40)

The King not only recognises the beast, he also understands the intention of the animal's actions, sharply contrasting with other characters' inability to perceive the true meaning of the wolf's humanised behaviour. The King is portrayed as the only inscribed reader to successfully interpret the transformed figure before him. The King looks beyond the surface meaning of the beast's appearance and interprets the significance of his gestures as indicative of its human form and identity.

The identification of Alphonse by the King of Spain contrasts with the lack of recognition between Felise and Guillaume. Although it is suggested that the Queen acknowledges Guillaume's identity before it is revealed to her, she does not proclaim this belief to others, contrasting with the King's immediate declaration of Alphonse's identity. The notion of recognition is emphasised by the disparity between scenes of parent-child identification, further stressing the ambiguity surrounding characters' ability to perceive and successfully 'read' the true form of the transformed beings in the narrative.

Guillaume has been dubbed by McCracken as a 'story about making known', signalling the importance of recognition in the text.⁹⁶ However, the emphasis placed on identifying characters by perceiving their original form in spite of their transformed appearance indicates that the text is in fact about making re-known. The poet foregrounds 're-cognition', as exemplified in the identification of Alphonse by his father, who acknowledges the animal before him as the child he once knew and lost. The poet stresses recognition between characters who have been separated and whose identities have been transformed, such as Felise's recognition of the unknown Guillaume as her son and heir.

⁹⁶ McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', p. 375.

The emphasis placed recognition as a process of perceiving something already known but which has been transformed poet signals the role of the audience who receive this romance. Bruckner notes that the manipulation of the notion of recognition in many twelfth-century texts highlights the role of the audience of Old French romance: ‘it is not surprising that scenes of recognition are a favorite topos of romance fictions [...], inasmuch as they dramatize the process of cognition itself as it functions in the medieval context’.⁹⁷ This process of re-cognition has been explored by Varvaro, who states that in medieval texts ‘on ne pousse pas le public à connaître ce qu’il ignore, mais à *re*-connaître ce dont il sait déjà quelque chose’.⁹⁸ Intertextual rewriting relied on the transformation of known material, and the audience was therefore encouraged to not only perceive allusions to works they knew, but to recognise the way in which this material had been reconfigured.

This understanding of the process of recognition adopted by the audience is aligned with the stress placed in *Guillaume* on the effect that transformation has on recognition. In particular, the correspondence between transformation and recognition is emphasised by the ambiguity surrounding recognition of Alphonse. Identification of this figure is seen to be a two-part process, as characters must first realise that the beast is more than an animal before perceiving that it is a transformed man with a human identity. This two-part process mirrors the role of the audience, who must perceive intertextual allusions, yet also recognise the manipulation of existing material in the romance. The poet thus further emphasises the self-reflexive nature of this text which mirrors its production and reception within its narrative.

The parallels between recognition in *Guillaume* and the audience’s role in romance reception are also emphasised by the presence of inscribed readers in the narrative. In particular, the actions of Felise and Guillaume in ‘reading’ others by

⁹⁷ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 220.

⁹⁸ Alberto Varvaro, ‘Elaboration des textes et modalités du récit dans la littérature française médiévale’, *Romania*, 119 (2001), 1-75 (p. 62).

attempting to interpret their appearance or behaviour are equated with their attempts to recognise transformed figures such as Alphonse. The poet highlights links between reading and recognition within the narrative, indicating that these notions mirror the closeness between the audience reading (or orally receiving) the text and their recognition of intertextual rewriting in their interpretation of the romance.

Krueger's work on inscribed readers in medieval romance suggests that depictions of characters receiving texts or events in the narrative reflect the audience's relationship with these works. In her analysis of Chrétien's *Yvain* and *Le Chevalier de la Charrete*, she notes that these romances 'inscribe the demand of a courtly public for a chivalric tale into the text', all the while mirroring 'an audience's reception of courtly romance [...] in the configuration of the public groups who await the outcome of the hero's exploits'.⁹⁹ Krueger focuses on these self-reflexive elements as indicative of the poet's understanding of the demands and reception of his audience. Her work highlights the relevance of the present analysis of *Guillaume* as a work which similarly reflects in its narrative the role of its audience. However, rather than exploring the reflection of an audience's evaluation of or demands on the poet and his work within a narrative, this thesis seeks to explore the way in which *Guillaume* mirrors the audience's role in reading and interpreting the text through their recognition of intertextual rewriting. Thus, this chapter will now turn in its final section to an exploration of the role of a medieval romance audience in receiving a text composed through intertextual rewriting, in order to determine the extent to which *Guillaume* mirrors its processes of composition and reception.

⁹⁹ Roberta Krueger, 'Reading the *Yvain/Charrete*: Chrétien's Inscribed Audiences at Nouaz and Pesme Aventure', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 19 (1983), 172-187 (p. 172; p. 176). See also comments in Krueger, *Women Readers and the Ideology of Gender*, pp. 28-29.

Recognition, reception, and the audience of *Guillaume de Palerne*

Recognition of rewritten material forms part of the ‘intertextual game of romance’ played between audience and poet in texts contemporary to *Guillaume*.¹⁰⁰ As explored in the Introduction to this study, this ‘game’ relied on re-cognition of material known to the audience.¹⁰¹ Poets reworked intertextual material and presented it in a different form and context, testing ‘the connoisseurship of the audience’ and thus engaging them in the reception of the new work.¹⁰² Yet, in some instances, this recognition was also essential for the audience to understand the text. For example, Varvaro notes that the *Folie Tristan de Berne* relies on the audience’s knowledge of ‘les principaux épisodes de l’histoire des deux amants’ which they must recognise in the disguised Tristan’s speech in order to follow the narrative.¹⁰³ However, even in texts for which recognition of rewriting was not essential to understanding the unfolding plot, audiences were nevertheless invited to participate in the intertextual game. Indeed, critics note that enjoyment of the text was enhanced by recognition of ‘generic conventions and intertextual allusions, whether explicit or implicit’, as audiences would evaluate poets’ treatment of ‘the model or models on which they drew’.¹⁰⁴

Zumthor states that in medieval texts ‘le courant intertextuel passe partout’, as works presented ‘l’écho de tous les autres textes du même genre’.¹⁰⁵ Kelly notes that the audience would hear ‘echoes’ of other texts during the reception of a work, and scholars stress that audiences would be aware of poets’ rewriting and the existence of a ‘network of texts’.¹⁰⁶ Critics highlight the medieval audience’s ability to perceive different layers of

¹⁰⁰ Bruckner, ‘Intertextuality’, p. 230; and Zumthor, ‘Le Texte-fragment’, p. 81.

¹⁰¹ See discussion in the Introduction to this thesis, pp. 32-33.

¹⁰² Bruckner, ‘Intertextuality’, p. 230; Simon Gaunt, *Retelling the Tale: An Introduction to Medieval French Literature* (London: Duckworth, 2001), pp. 117-18.

¹⁰³ Varvaro, p. 50.

¹⁰⁴ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 212; Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, p. 9.

¹⁰⁵ Zumthor, *La Poésie et la voix*, p. 112.

¹⁰⁶ Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion*, p. 180; Virginie Greene, ‘Introduction’, in *The Medieval Author in Medieval French Literature*, ed. by Virginie Greene (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 1-11 (p. 2). See also comments in Hans Robert Jauss, ‘The Alterity and Modernity of Medieval Literature’, trans. by Timothy Bahti, *New Literary History*, 10 (1979), 181-229 (pp. 185-89).

a work, such as references to symbolic meanings within the narrative, suggesting that they were thus able to identify allusions to reconfigured works.¹⁰⁷ Above all, recognition of intertextual rewriting depended on ‘an attentive public’ who could use their knowledge of other texts to identify ‘different narrative nuclei’ fused together in order to create ‘a new element in the expanding chemistry of romance’.¹⁰⁸

Poets were aware of the importance of the audience’s recognition of transformed material, which could in fact go unnoticed. For example, Kelly notes that the audience could be ignorant of the material reworked by the poet, such as Latin texts rewritten for a vernacular audience, or that a work could present such original rewriting that it would be difficult to recognise the transformed ‘*materia*’.¹⁰⁹ Different techniques were therefore employed by poets to enable recognition of rewriting, such as explicit references to their intertextual models. This approach is exemplified in Chrétien’s overt allusion to the *Tristan* legend in *Cligès* (vv. 3127-42; vv. 5243-49), yet it is also found in the *Guillaume* poet’s use of the name ‘Melior’ to signal *Partonopeus de Blois*. Other methods included using ‘comic effects and irony’ to signal ‘reuse of common matter’, as explored in Ferlampin-Acher’s study of ‘marqueurs de parodie’ in *Guillaume*.¹¹⁰

Another technique used by poets to facilitate recognition of intertextual rewriting is their creation of what Eley has dubbed ‘faultlines’, as explored in her study of *Partonopeus*.¹¹¹ These ‘faultlines’ are moments at which ambiguity or contradictions in the narrative highlight the fusion of different intertextual models that cannot be blended seamlessly.¹¹² For example, Eley cites the emphasis placed in *Partonopeus* on the age of the eponymous hero as a ‘faultline’, as the poet opposes the model found in the *romans*

¹⁰⁷ Guiette, *Questions de Littérature*, pp. 39-41; Jauss, p. 185. See also discussion in Chapter Three, pp. 177-83.

¹⁰⁸ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 212; Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, p. 211.

¹⁰⁹ Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion*, pp. 108-09 and p. 63.

¹¹⁰ Bruckner, ‘Intertextuality’, p. 231; Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?*’, p. 64. Her work develops that of Hamon on signals of irony. See Hamon, pp. 79-80.

¹¹¹ Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, pp. 82-84; p. 148; p. 201.

¹¹² Eley, ‘*Partonopeus de Blois*’, p. 8.

d'antiquité of a hero of a specified age with the model of the fairy-mistress stories in which the hero is taken 'outside human time' and appears to be ageless.¹¹³

Guillaume also features 'faultlines' that signal rewriting, such as the ambiguity surrounding the depiction of women's consent to marry. As explored in Chapter One, the poet contradicts passages emphasising women's consent by suggesting that Alixandrine and Florence are betrothed without prior consultation (vv. 8290-8307; vv. 8772-76).¹¹⁴ This contradiction is caused by rewriting of the *Partonopeus* triple wedding, and the 'faultline' created draws attention to this intertextual allusion. A similar 'faultline' is noted by Dunn, who suggests that contradictory comments regarding whether or not Guillaume ever knew his father (compare v. 8135 with vv. 61-124) indicate that the poet was imitating the Romulus-model 'but confused his plot by introducing alien features' from different material.¹¹⁵ It could be argued that these 'faultlines' are the unintentional result of intertextual rewriting. However, Eley states that in *Partonopeus* some 'faultlines' are 'deliberately left uncamouflaged in order to draw attention to the mechanics of rewriting', indicating that the *Guillaume* poet similarly foregrounds rewriting by producing contradictions in the text.¹¹⁶

I have thus far explored how the the theme of transformation is used in *Guillaume* to further signal intertextual rewriting, whilst the notions of doubling and correspondence draw attention to the intertextual layer that parallels the narrative of this text. This chapter argues that the poet similarly reflects the audience's reception of the text through his manipulation of the theme of recognition. However, the poet does not only stress recognition in order to invite recognition of intertextual allusions. Rather, by placing emphasis in the narrative on the audience's process of romance reception through their recognition of rewriting, he also encourages the audience to perceive the importance of

¹¹³ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', p. 29.

¹¹⁴ See discussion of faultlines in Chapter One, pp. 103-04, and comments in Chapter Two, pp. 123-24.

¹¹⁵ Dunn, pp. 113-14.

¹¹⁶ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', p. 208.

the role they play in the creation of romance. Whilst the themes of transformation and recognition foreground the processes of composition and reception, the narrative also highlights the link between the poet and audience, emphasising the active participation of both parties in the ‘game of romance’.

The correspondence between poet and audience in the extra-diegetic frame of the work is stressed by the parallels that link the poet’s intertextual rewriting and the audience’s recognition of reconfigured material. Scholars note that medieval poets transformed the material they rewrote through *mutuatio* and *mutatio*.¹¹⁷ The notion of the *integumentum* emphasises the process of transformation employed by poets rewriting existing material.¹¹⁸ This term, which aligns with *involucrum* (‘envelope’), highlights the image of an outer layer of text that is peeled back to reveal a kernel of truth inside: ‘Integumentum est genus demonstrationis sub fabulosa narratione veritatis involvens intellectum, unde etiam dicitur involucrum’.¹¹⁹ Although *integumentum* suggests the expression of a hidden message, as noted by Alain de Lille in his *De Planctu Naturae*, it also indicates the process adopted by medieval poets of removing the external layer of a work in order to reveal the core of the text that they then redressed within their own work.¹²⁰ This process is mirrored and reversed in the role required of the audience in their recognition of intertextual allusions. The audience is encouraged to strip back the new clothing given by poets to transformed material in order to reveal the kernel of the

¹¹⁷ Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion*, pp. xi-xiii, pp. 9-10, and p. 60.

¹¹⁸ Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion*, p. 90; Roberta Krueger, ‘*Philomena*: Brutal Transitions and Courtly Transformations in Chrétien’s Old French Translation’, in *A Companion to Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy and Joan Tasker Grimbert (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2005), pp. 87-102 (p. 90); Edouard Jeuneau, ‘L’Usage de la notion d’*integumentum* à travers les gloses de Guillaume de Conches’, *Archives d’Histoire Doctrinale et Littérature du Moyen Age*, 24 (1957), 35-100 (p. 37); Francine Mora-Lebrun, *L’‘Eneide’ médiévale et la naissance du roman* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994), pp. 97-108.

¹¹⁹ ‘*Integumentum* is a kind of demonstration hidden under a fabulous narrative that shrouds understanding of the truth, which is why it is also called *involucrum* [envelope]’ (translation my own). Bernardus Silvestris, *Commentum quod dicitur Bernardi Silvestris super sex libros Eneidos Virgillii*, ed. by Julian Ward Jones and Elizabeth Frances Jones (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1977), p. 3.

¹²⁰ Alan states that ‘the poetic lyre gives a false note on the outer bark of the composition but within tells the listeners a secret of deeper significance so that when the outer shell of falsehood has been discarded the reader finds the sweeter kernel of truth hidden within’. Alan of Lille, *The Complaint of Nature*, trans. by Sheridan, p. 140.

original text, allowing them to recognise the rewritten work and to understand the transformations it has undergone.

The close similarities between poetic transformation and audience recognition of material emphasise the correspondence between the processes of composition and reception, all the while highlighting the link between the two active agents in romance creation. Hutcheon observes that self-reflexive works foreground the closeness between the processes of reading and writing, noting that ‘the act of reading [...] is itself, like the act of writing, the creative function to which the text draws attention’.¹²¹ The stress placed on both recognition and transformation in the narrative of *Guillaume* highlights reflection of the roles of both audience and poet in the work. Rather than emphasising his role alone, the poet signals the importance of author and audience in romance creation, a notion that aligns with observations regarding the key part played by the reader in the creation of literature.

Literary theorists in the mid-to-late twentieth century brought critical focus on the role played by the reader (or audience), whose function in producing the text through their ‘realization’ of the work is perceived to be as important as that of the author or poet.¹²² Link argues that a text is not only written ‘über etwas (einen bestimmten Gegenstand), sondern auch für jemand (einen bestimmten Leser)’.¹²³ Texts are thus ‘not only about speaking and writing [...] but also about reading’, and scholars insist that in literary works ‘reading and writing join hands [...] [and] become distinguishable only as two names for the same activity’.¹²⁴ Theories of reader-response and reception can help to inform understanding of the role of the medieval audience, as foregrounded in *Guillaume* through

¹²¹ Hutcheon, *Narcissistic Narrative*, p. 39.

¹²² Suleiman, p. 22.

¹²³ ‘About something (a real subject), but also for someone (a real reader)’ (own translation). Hannelore Link, *Rezeptionsforschung: Eine Einführung in Methoden und Probleme* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1976), p. 11.

¹²⁴ Naomi Schor, ‘Fiction as Interpretation / Interpretation as Fiction’, in *The Reader in the Text*, ed. by Suleiman and Crosman, pp. 165-82 (p. 168); Jane P. Tompkins, ‘An Introduction to Reader-Response Criticism’, in *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, ed. by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. ix-xxvi (pp. ix-x).

the manipulation of recognition. What is more, when viewed in the context of medieval romance reception, these critical tools can not only explain the part played by the audience, they can also shed light on the importance of this agent in romance creation.

Reader-response theory is primarily expounded by Wolfgang Iser, whose work foregrounds the ‘dialectic relationship between text, reader, and their interaction’.¹²⁵ The reader’s active role is emphasised by Iser, for whom Holub notes that ‘the artwork is constituted by and in the act of reading’.¹²⁶ Iser states that the reader must ‘participate in bringing out the meaning’, adding that this participation is ‘essential [...] for communication between the author and the reader’.¹²⁷ The focus of Iser’s work lies in the process of reading adopted by the reader, rather than the final meaning produced by textual interpretation.¹²⁸ Iser examines the signals given in a work that ‘activate the individual reader’s faculties of perceiving’ and guide the reader’s process of reading, all the while enhancing the text’s illocutionary force by inviting a response.¹²⁹ The example Iser gives of such a signal is that of a deliberately ‘unclear’ statement, comparing the effect of the statement ‘is there any salt’ with the ‘directly clear’ statement ‘may you pass me the salt’ in order to illustrate how a text can elicit a reader response for interpretation.¹³⁰

Scholars have adopted reader-response theory in medieval literary studies, employing this critical tool in their examination of the role played by the audience of

¹²⁵ Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), p. x. Elsewhere, Iser notes the fundamental importance of the reader’s active participation in composing the meaning of a text (in his study, a novel).

¹²⁶ Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), p. xii; Wolfgang Iser, ‘Interaction between Text and Reader’, in *The Reader in the Text*, ed. by Suleiman and Crosman, pp. 106-19; Robert C. Holub, *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1984), p. 149.

¹²⁷ Iser, *The Implied Reader*, p. 30.

¹²⁸ Iser, *The Act of Reading*, p. 18. See also Holub, pp. 155-56.

¹²⁹ Iser, *The Act of Reading*, p. 107; pp. 61-62. See also Wolfgang Iser, ‘The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach’, in *Reader-Response Criticism*, ed. by Tompkins, pp. 50-69. Stanley Fish also explored the process of reading, although he focused on ‘the reader’s moment-to-moment reactions to the language’, an approach that cannot be aligned with this study of *Guillaume*, as this thesis does not closely analyse the language used by the poet. See comments in Tompkins, p. xvi.

¹³⁰ Iser, *The Act of Reading*, pp. 61-62.

works such as *Guillaume*. For example, Allen observes that the focus this theory brings on the ‘processes of reading and understanding’ aligns with the demands on the medieval audience to ‘engage in a complex process of decoding, revising, misunderstanding, and interpreting in order to make meaning in and with the text’.¹³¹ Notions explored in reader-response criticism are also discussed in studies of medieval biblical exegesis, a practice that encouraged the reader to engage in ‘the discovery of inherent meanings’ through a ‘recherche active d’un sens’.¹³²

The *Guillaume* poet uses signals in his work to guide the reader’s interpretation of the romance. His manipulation of narrative themes highlights intertextual transformation, and in particular the emphasis placed on recognition foregrounds the process of reception adopted by the audience. Yet the poet also stresses the presence of figures in the narrative that function as inscribed readers and mirror the audience’s role. In particular, the representations of Felise and Guillaume emphasise the way in which these characters attempt to ‘read’ and interpret the actions and appearances of transformed figures in the narrative. Their ability (or inability) to successfully ‘read’ and recognise those around them aligns with the audience’s role in receiving (or reading) the text by recognising rewriting, as they interpret the text as a work composed through intertextual transformation.

Above all, theories of reader-response emphasise the important role played by both author and audience in literary creation, as ‘the convergence of text and reader brings the literary work into existence’.¹³³ The focus this criticism places on the reader is echoed and explored in reception theory, as developed by Hans Jauss, which reflects and builds upon a ‘general shift in concern from the author and the work to the text and the

¹³¹ Peter L. Allen, ‘A Frame for the Text? History, Literary Theory, Subjectivity, and the Study of Medieval Literature’, *Exemplaria*, 3 (1991), 1-25 (p. 17).

¹³² Duncan Robertson, *Lectio Divina: The Medieval Experience of Reading* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011), p. 42; Benoît, p. 310.

¹³³ Iser, *The Implied Reader*, p. 275.

reader'.¹³⁴ Rather than exploring the way in which the reader decodes the meaning of a text, reception theory examines readers' reactions to a work within a historical context.¹³⁵ Jauss was concerned with the relationship between literature and history, and his work analyses the way in which the changing historical reception of a text has an impact upon the work itself, examining a work's 'chain of receptions from generation to generation'.¹³⁶ Jauss also explored the concept of 'alterity', a term used to analyse the modern aesthetic experience of historical literary texts.¹³⁷ Scholars note that his work encourages critics to 'rethink constantly the works in the canon in light of how they have affected and are affected by current conditions and events', and like reader-response theory, reception theory has been applied in the work of medievalists.¹³⁸

Reception theory also stresses the existence of an 'interaction of author and public' by emphasising the 'dialectical process of production *and* reception' in literary texts.¹³⁹ Jauss highlighted the active role played by the reader or audience, noting that 'the historical life of a literary work is unthinkable without the active participation of its addressees'.¹⁴⁰ This active participation relies on readers' knowledge of existing works alongside which a new text is received, dubbed by Jauss the audience's 'horizon of expectations'.¹⁴¹ Individual readers bring a 'system of references' to a text that affect their reception of a new text through 'the disparity between the given horizon of expectations and the appearance of a new work'.¹⁴² A similar observation is found in Iser's reader-response theory, as he notes how a reader's process of understanding relies on their interaction with a 'repertoire' of 'familiar territory within a text', which can include their

¹³⁴ Holub, p. xii.

¹³⁵ Link, pp. 44-45; Henry J. Schmidt, "'Text-Adequate Concretizations" and Real Readers: Reception Theory and its Applications', *New German Critique*, 17 (1979), 157-69 (p. 160); Holub, p. 83.

¹³⁶ Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. by Timothy Bathi (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982), p. 20.

¹³⁷ Hans Robert Jauss 'Littérature médiévale et expérience esthétique', *Poétique*, 31 (1977), 322-36.

¹³⁸ Holub, p. 58. See also comments in Allen, 'A frame for the text?', p. 5; and Gumbrecht, pp. 5-12.

¹³⁹ Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, p. 15; Holub, p. 57.

¹⁴⁰ Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, p. 19.

¹⁴¹ Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, p. 22.

¹⁴² Holub, p. 59; Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, p. 25. See comments in Paul de Man, 'Introduction', in Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, pp. vii-xxv (pp. xi-xii).

knowledge of earlier works as well as social, historical, or cultural norms and phenomena.¹⁴³

The emphasis placed in the work of Iser and Jauss on readers' awareness of pre-existing material during their reception of a text foregrounds the notion of intertextual rewriting. Jauss's exploration of genre in medieval literature evokes the notion of intertextual dialogue, and Iser alludes to recognition of rewriting by suggesting that signals to the 'repertoire' in a text highlight authors' manipulation of existing works.¹⁴⁴ Comments from both theorists align with medievalists' understanding of the intertextual game of romance played by poet and audience. Kelly notes the medieval audience's 'storehouse of memory' which facilitated their interaction in romance reception by allowing them to recognise intertextual allusions.¹⁴⁵ Like Jauss's 'horizon of expectations', poets manipulated the audience's knowledge of existing texts when they used them to compose a new work, thwarting the expectations that would be created by allusions to particular texts through their transformation of known material from the 'repertoire' shared by poet and audience.

Theories of reader-response and reception foreground the interaction of author and audience that is central to medievalists' understanding of the game of romance. Critics observe a reciprocal partnership in the creation and actualisation of a text, and this is mirrored in the emphasis placed on both the processes of composition and reception in *Guillaume*. However, much of the critical discourse related to the partnership between reader and author highlights the existence of different author and reader figures at the varying levels of a text, and which must be taken into consideration in this examination of the audience of medieval romance. Scholars acknowledge the existence of a 'real' author

¹⁴³ Iser, *The Implied Reader*, p. 34; Iser, *The Act of Reading*, p. 69.

¹⁴⁴ Jauss, 'Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature', in *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, pp. 76-109 (p. 88); Iser, *The Act of Reading*, p. 69. See also comments in Peter J. Rabinowitz, "'What's Hecuba to Us?'" The Audience's Experience of Literary Borrowing', in *The Reader in the Text*, ed. by Suleiman and Crosman, pp. 241-63 (pp. 246-47); and Suleiman, p. 36.

¹⁴⁵ Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion*, pp. 117-18.

and a 'real' reader, the two 'flesh and blood' individuals who create and receive a text, and similarly turn their attention to inscribed authors and readers which mirror these figures in the narrative.¹⁴⁶ However, reader-response theory focuses in particular on the figure of the 'implied' reader, a term coined by Booth.¹⁴⁷ The notion of the 'implied' reader was developed by Iser, who used it to describe the reader who 'embodies all those predispositions necessary for a literary work to exercise its effect – predispositions laid down, not by an empirical outside reality, but by the text itself'.¹⁴⁸ As a 'construct' of the text that is 'in no way to be identified with any real reader', the implied reader aligns with the hypothetical or 'authorial' audience.¹⁴⁹ This public is that which is held in the author's mind during the composition of a work, as it is able to receive and understand the text that he produces.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, Rabinowitz notes that an author bases his/her 'artistic choices' in any given work upon assumptions relating to their implied reader or hypothetical audience.¹⁵¹

Guillaume de Palerne was composed for the poet's implied audience, the ideal public who were able to perceive the current of intertextual allusions underneath the narrative, and whose knowledge of existing works would facilitate their recognition of the transformative rewriting signalled by the work. Krueger notes that romance poets had an 'authorial audience' in mind when composing their texts, and Marnette states that a written text 's'adresse non à un lecteur réel mais à un lecteur 'supposé', personnage

¹⁴⁶ See comments in the following: Gerald Prince, 'Introduction à l'étude du narrataire', *Poétique*, 14 (1973), 178-96 (pp. 187-88); Gerald Prince, 'Reader', in *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, ed. by Peter Hühn et al. (Hamburg: Hamburg University Press, [n.d.]), <hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/index.php?title=Reader&oldid=1465> [accessed 15 June 2015] (para. 7 and 21 of 29); and Suleiman, p. 14.

¹⁴⁷ Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987), pp. 428-31; Link, p. 12 and p. 26; Walker Gibson, 'Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers', in *Reader-Response Criticism*, ed. by Tompkins, pp. 1-6 (p. 2); Rabinowitz, "'What's Hecuba to Us?'" p. 243.

¹⁴⁸ Iser, *The Act of Reading*, p. 34. For further detail on this concept, see Iser, *The Implied Reader*.

¹⁴⁹ Iser, *The Act of Reading*, p. 34; Peter J. Rabinowitz, *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998), p. 22; Peter J. Rabinowitz, 'Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences', *Critical Inquiry*, 4 (1977), 121-41 (p. 126).

¹⁵⁰ Link, p. 28; Booth, pp. 29-30.

¹⁵¹ Rabinowitz, *Before Reading*, p. 22.

hypothétique qui partage avec le narrateur [...] certaines connaissances de base'.¹⁵² However, the game of romance was not limited to poet and implied audience. Rather, it was a phenomenon that was actualised in the performance of a work in an oral sphere which engaged a real audience that was 'indispensable' to the reception of a text.¹⁵³

In spite of the growth of the literate population in the latter part of the twelfth century, *Guillaume* was composed within the context of predominantly oral diffusion and reception of literary texts.¹⁵⁴ Crosby states that 'in the Middle Ages the masses of the people read by means of the ear rather than the eye', and observes that medieval poets 'indicate again and again that they intend their works to be heard' by appealing to the ear of the listener, rather than the eye of the reader.¹⁵⁵ Scholars note that texts were destined for both readers and listeners, as highlighted by Marnette's use of the term 'auditeur/lecteur'.¹⁵⁶ However, the primary mode of romance reception was through performances to an audience or by reading aloud within a small group.¹⁵⁷ Evidence of this oral delivery is found in direct addresses to 'those listeners who are present at the recitation' which highlight poets' attempts to engage their audience at different moments during a work.¹⁵⁸ Indeed, Marnette observes that 'il est impossible de dissocier les textes

¹⁵² Krueger, *Women Readers and the Ideology of Gender*, p. 26; Sophie Marnette, *Narrateur et points de vue dans la littérature française médiévale: Une approche linguistique* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1998), pp. 29-30.

¹⁵³ Francis Gingras, 'Le Miel et l'amertume: *Partonopeus de Blois* et l'art du roman', in *Partonopeus in Europe*, ed. by Hanley, Longtin, and Eley, pp. 131-45 (p. 141). See also Kelly, *The Conspiracy of Allusion*, p. 56; and Varvaro, p. 45.

¹⁵⁴ Franz H. Bäuml, 'Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy', *Speculum*, 55 (1980), 237-65 (p. 244); Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), p. 26; Zumthor, *La Lettre et la Voix*, p. 19.

¹⁵⁵ Ruth Crosby, 'Oral Delivery in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 11 (1936), 88-110 (p. 88 and p. 94).

¹⁵⁶ Gaunt, *Retelling the Tale*, p. 23; Marnette, p. 31. See also Brian Stock, 'History, Literature, and Medieval Textuality', *Yale French Studies*, 70 (1986), 7-15 (p. 10); and Paul Zumthor, 'L'Intertexte performantiel', *Texte*, 2 (1983), 49-59 (p. 56)

¹⁵⁷ Bäuml, p. 245; Sophie Marnette and Helen Swift, 'Introduction: Que veut dire 'voix narrative'?', *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes*, 22 (2011), 1-7 (p. 4); Joyce Coleman, *Public Reading and the Reading Public in Late Medieval England and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 28.

¹⁵⁸ Crosby, p. 100; John L. Grigsby, 'Narrative Voices in Chrétien de Troyes: A Prolegomenon to Dissection', *Romance Philology*, 32 (1979), 261-73 (p. 266); Roberta Krueger, 'The Author's Voice', in *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Lacy, Kelly, and Busby, I, pp. 115-40 (p. 120).

médiévaux de leur contexte oral de communication et de réception'.¹⁵⁹ This 'contexte' suggests that the poet considered both his implied and real audience during the process of composition, and that he encouraged interaction with the latter in performance, as noted by Doane who states that the 'intended/actual audience' in an oral milieu are in fact 'coterminous'.¹⁶⁰

Scholars have explored the way in which medieval works encourage both the implied audience and the 'real' audience present at oral performances to participate in the creation of their texts. For example, Marnette observes that the second-person 'vous' of narratorial interjections in the *chansons de geste* encourages the audience to witness the events that are described, and to thus become 'les sujets créateurs du récit, participant non seulement à sa re-présentation mais aussi à sa re-création'.¹⁶¹ However, Marnette states that in contrast the interaction between poet and audience in vernacular romance was greatly reduced. Narratorial interjections in these texts have an increased use of the first-person 'je', indicating the author controlling the narrative and the audience's response.¹⁶² These texts are seen to exclude the first-hand participation of the audience, who are thus accorded 'une position plutôt secondaire' in what Eley describes as a relationship of 'master and pupil'.¹⁶³

According to Marnette, the real and implied audiences of texts such as *Guillaume* are not encouraged to actively participate in the narrative as witnesses of the events that unfold, and instead become passive listeners of the texts that they receive.¹⁶⁴ However, analyses of the intertextual game of romance played between poet and audience contradict Marnette's argument, instead highlighting the active role of an audience invited to

¹⁵⁹ Marnette, p. 212.

¹⁶⁰ A. N. Doane, 'Oral Texts, Intertexts, and Intratexts: Editing Old English', in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, ed. by Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 75-113 (p. 81).

¹⁶¹ Marnette, p. 59; pp. 66-67; p. 162.

¹⁶² Marnette, pp. 34-38.

¹⁶³ Marnette, p. 57 and p. 96; Penny Eley, 'Author and Audience in the *Roman de Troie*', in *Courtly Literature: culture and context*, ed. by Keith Busby and Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1990), pp. 179-90 (p. 185).

¹⁶⁴ Marnette, p. 85.

recognise allusions to and rewriting of works that they knew, receiving the work ‘not just aurally, but critically’.¹⁶⁵ This critical reception is explored by Bruckner, who notes the progressive development of the interaction of the audience of Old French romance ‘from passive listening to active recognitions and interpretations’.¹⁶⁶ In particular, Hanning has examined the ‘inextricably linked phenomena’ in romance creation of ‘the virtuoso poet and the virtuoso audience’.¹⁶⁷ He defines the interaction between these figures through romance composition and reception thus:

The audience [...] is presented [...] with the important task of co-operating in turn in the full creation of the romance itself. The chivalric romance [...] requires its audience to work hard, defining its own attitude towards the many constituent parts and levels of the fiction. [...] Our answers to the text’s unanswered questions, our interpretations of its mysteries, make us creators as well as audience. Our attempts to *discover* the meaning, of a text as riddled with ambiguities as the chivalric romance habitually is, inevitably *endow* the text with meanings drawn from our own experience of other romances, and indeed of the world outside the fiction.¹⁶⁸

Hanning highlights the ‘important task’ that is given to the audience in romance reception, and insists that their interaction with the text is an active one that creates meaning, rather than just receiving it passively. Although he does not explicitly refer to the intertextual game of romance, Hanning suggests a similar type of participative involvement between audience and poet through his observation of the way in which audiences interpret a text by comparing it with their knowledge of other works and the real world.

Above all, Hanning stresses the notion of collaboration between an audience ‘ready, willing, and able to provide interpretative responses’ to the romance produced by the poet, stating that the text is the result of the ‘shared labours’ of both parties.¹⁶⁹ Romance is thus produced through the interaction between poet and audience, particularly in the sphere of oral performance and reception in which poets explicitly sought ‘direct,

¹⁶⁵ Doane, p. 81.

¹⁶⁶ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 10.

¹⁶⁷ Hanning, ‘The Audience as Co-Creator’, p. 9.

¹⁶⁸ Hanning, ‘The Audience as Co-Creator’, p. 16. See also Marie-Louise Ollier, ‘The Author in the Text: The Prologues of Chrétien de Troyes’, *Yale French Studies*, 51 (1974), 26-41 (p. 33).

¹⁶⁹ Hanning, ‘The Audience as Co-Creator’, p. 16.

unmediated interaction with the listening consumers of literature'.¹⁷⁰ Poets who invited their audience to recognise intertextual rewriting thus engaged them in a collaborative approach to romance creation. The audience's actualisation and comprehension of a text depended on a successful collaboration with the poet so that they were able to perceive 'relationships [...] between texts'.¹⁷¹

The emphasis placed in the *Guillaume* narrative on ambiguous recognition foregrounds the notion of the audience activating the work through their reception of romance. Reader-response theory highlights the way in which ambiguity and gaps in a text encourage the reader to engage in interpretation and actively make meaning.¹⁷² Indeed, Iser notes that 'what is concealed [in a text] spurs the reader into action'.¹⁷³ In *Guillaume*, the poet presents an ambiguous depiction of characters' ability to recognise transformed individuals, emphasising the effect of transformation on recognition, and foregrounding the importance of the latter for the narrative's denouement. However, his ambiguous use of phrases such as 'leu garoul', and the unclear representation of characters' understanding of the semantic value of terms that they employ to denote Alphonse, in particular 'werewolf', leaves gaps in the text that the audience must actively interpret. The ambiguity surrounding inscribed readers' interpretation of figures in the narrative mirrors the interpretative challenges he presents to his audience, and the representation of figures attempting to actively read the events before them invites his audience to engage similarly with his romance.

The interaction between the poet and audience of medieval romance has been referred to by scholars as a 'contract' established between the two agents involved in

¹⁷⁰ Eley, *Partonopeus de Blois*, p. 10.

¹⁷¹ Freeman, *The Poetics of 'Translatio Studii' and 'Conjointure'*, p. 55.

¹⁷² See comments in the following: Iser, *The Act of Reading*, pp. 107-08 and p. 167; Iser, *The Implied Reader*, p. 30, p. 55, and p. 275; Tompkins, p. xv.

¹⁷³ Iser, 'Interaction between Text and Reader', p. 111.

romance production and reception.¹⁷⁴ The notion of a ‘contract’ implies that the audience was aware of the function they fulfilled in the text’s extra-diegetic frame, and indicates that they understood the importance of their participation. Hanning has observed that the continuous interaction between poet and audience ‘fostered a reciprocal self-consciousness’ of their participation in ‘an act of *mutual creation* by artist and audience’, suggesting their awareness of the function they were expected to fulfil ‘in the overall success of the work’.¹⁷⁵ Although Hanning’s comments indicate that the audience of a text such as *Guillaume* would have known what was expected of them in romance creation, the poet nevertheless emphasises their role by stressing and manipulating recognition, foregrounding their reception of intertextual rewriting.

The *Guillaume* poet explicitly highlights his audience’s role in romance reception alongside his part in the composition of this self-reflexive work, emphasising the inextricable link between poet and audience in romance creation. The poet invites recognition of his inventive rewriting, manipulating the horizon of expectations of his implied audience whilst soliciting the interaction of the real audience present at the expected oral performances of his text.

The focus placed on the audience’s active participation in romances such as *Guillaume* resonates with the Barthesian concept of the ‘writerly’ (‘scriptible’) rather than the ‘readerly’ (‘lisible’) text, first propounded in *S/Z*.¹⁷⁶ The notion of a ‘writerly’ text minimises the role of the author and focuses on works that actively encourage readers to make meaning in a manner that closely mirrors the role of the author, rather than to passively receive the work they read.¹⁷⁷ Barthes argues that this type of work does not

¹⁷⁴ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 10; Gingras, ‘Le Miel et l’amertume’, p. 132; Krueger, ‘Reading the *Yvain/Charrete*’, p. 172.

¹⁷⁵ Hanning, ‘The Audience as Co-Creator’, p. 9 and p. 15.

¹⁷⁶ Roland Barthes, *S/Z* (Paris: Seuil, 1970), p. 10. See also comments in Roland Barthes, ‘Ecrire la lecture’, in *Essais critiques IV: Le Bruissement de la langue* (Paris: Seuil, 1984), pp. 33-36 (pp. 33-35); and Roland Barthes, ‘De l’œuvre au texte’, in *Essais critiques IV*, pp. 69-77 (pp. 75-76).

¹⁷⁷ Barthes, *S/Z*, pp. 16-17.

exist in 'classical' texts, and focuses his analysis on Balzac's *Sarrasine*.¹⁷⁸ However, close analysis of the way in which *Guillaume* foregrounds the role of its audience suggests that Barthes's notion is not alien to medieval literature. Indeed, this study indicates that poets such as the anonymous *Guillaume* author were acutely aware of the importance of their audience's active engagement, implied and real, and that at times they explicitly highlighted the involvement of the audience in receiving and thereby assisting in the creation of original works of transformative rewriting.

Conclusion

Analysis of recognition in *Guillaume de Palerne* has revealed the way in which the manipulation of this notion in the narrative reflects the role of the audience of this romance. The representation of the recognition of Alphonse emphasises the beast's use of behaviour and gestures to solicit recognition, alluding to and rewriting the intertextual model of Marie de France's *Bisclavret*. However, the animal's use of overtly human actions to encourage identification of his hidden human form also aligns with the poet's manipulation of elements of his narrative, such as the notion of transformation, to signal intertextual rewriting to the audience. What is more, the representation of figures attempting to 'read' the werewolf and interpret his gestures and appearance also suggest ways in which the poet inscribes his audience's role into the narrative.

Other aspects of the recognition of Alphonse parallel elements of the romance's extra-diegetic sphere. Recognition of the werewolf and the quasi-animal form of the eponymous hero depends on a two-part process that is stressed in the narrative. These figures must first be seen to be more than the animals that they appear to be before characters can then identify them as transformed men with an individual human identity. This two-part recognition mirrors the audience's perception of intertextual rewriting in

¹⁷⁸ Barthes, *S/Z*, p. 10.

Guillaume, as they must acknowledge allusions to known works before they can then recognise the poet's transformation of intertextual material.

Finally, lexical analysis of the terms used to refer to Alphonse has shed light on the ambiguity surrounding recognition in *Guillaume*. Although certain figures indicate their awareness of Alphonse's hybridity through the referents with which they denote him, there is no clear-cut distinction between the semantic implications of 'werewolf', 'wolf', and 'beast' in the text. It is unclear whether or not characters recognise Alphonse as a human/animal hybrid, as even though Felise calls him a 'werewolf' and Guillaume explicitly states that the animal has sense and reasoning, only the King of Spain declares outright that the beast is a transformed man and identifies him as his son. This ambiguity of recognition is further emphasised by the repeated lack of recognition between Felise and Guillaume and moments of unbelievable recognition that raise unanswered questions regarding how figures are able (or unable) to identify other characters. By inserting ambiguity surrounding recognition in the narrative, the poet creates ambiguity in the text which must be actively interpreted by the audience. Just as figures must 'read', interpret, and identify the characters they encounter, so the audience must engage with the text they receive and decide for themselves whether Felise immediately perceives Alphonse as a werewolf, or whether Guillaume sees the beast as a transformed human. The links between recognition and reading in this romance are thus stressed in *Guillaume*, as the work mirrors its external frame of reception within its narrative.

Above all, the poet underlines the importance of recognition, stressing the impact that transformation has on recognition and foregrounding the close correspondence between these notions. The poet uses the emphasis placed on recognition to reflect the audience's recognition of intertextual rewriting in their reception of the work. By highlighting the way in which recognition is central to the denouement of the *Guillaume* plot, and by stressing the way in which it is affected by transformation, the poet points to

the importance of this notion in the extra-diegetic frame of the romance. Examination of the oral context in which *Guillaume* was produced and received foregrounds the existence of a reciprocal relationship between poet and audience, as poets depended on their audience to assist in the creation of the text through participation in the intertextual game of romance.

Analysing the role of the *Guillaume* audience has brought this study into contact with modern theories that explore the integral part played by the reader in the creation of a text, and which address the privilege traditionally accorded to authors rather than readers in literary criticism. This chapter has discussed the way in which theories of reader-response and reception can complement our existing understanding of the reciprocal relationship between poet and audience in romance creation. However, close examination of *Guillaume* has also provided a lens with which to explore these critical tools that purport to be modern, but which in fact align with practices common to the literary sphere of the late twelfth century. By looking at the parallels between these concepts and the importance of the romance audience, as stressed by *Guillaume*, this study suggests that scholars are able to expand their understanding of 'modern' notions by examining them through the lens of texts which highlight their core principles, rather than solely by imposing their critical discourse on interpretation of a selected text.

The conclusions drawn in this chapter can help us to understand the state of reading and reception of romance at the end of the twelfth century, emphasising the audience's awareness of the active role they played in creating a text through reception. The explicit stress placed on the role of the reader in *Guillaume* suggests a development in poets' approach to engaging the audience of their text in romance reception and production, as found in later texts such as *Joufroi de Poitiers* and *Le Bel Inconnu*. Scholars note that the poets of these works seek the active engagement of the extra-diegetic figures involved in the creation of these works by using narratorial interjections

to ask their opinion regarding the plot and its continuation.¹⁷⁹ Although the *Guillaume* poet does not pause his text in order to involve the audience at the narrative level of the text's progression, the stress he places on their important role nevertheless signals a developing awareness of strategies with which poets could engage their audience during the reception of their romance. In a similar vein, Eley notes that in the *Roman de Troie* the poet highlights the presence of the audience through narratorial interventions that direct their interpretation of the text.¹⁸⁰ Indeed, Eley states that the poet foregrounds 'the relationship between author and audience [...] to a degree which is unusual – possibly unique – in French literature of this period'.¹⁸¹

However, this analysis of *Guillaume* provides another example of ways in which poets emphasised the relationship between the figures of romance production and reception. It suggests that the *Troie* example is not unique, but rather that it indicates the presence of a model that was developed by poets such as the anonymous author of *Guillaume de Palerne*, whose self-reflexive work highlights the production and reception of late twelfth-century romance.

¹⁷⁹ See comments in the following: Grigsby, 'The Narrator in *Partonopeu de Blois*, *Le Bel Inconnu*, and *Jouffroi de Poitiers*', pp. 563-43; Jeri S. Guthrie, 'The *Je(u)* in *Le Bel Inconnu*: Auto-referentiality and Pseudo-autobiography', *Romanic Review*, 75 (1984), 147-61; Norris J. Lacy, 'The Margins of Romance: Art and Artifice in *Jouffroi de Poitiers*', *Symposium*, 44 (1990), 264-71; and Penny Simons, 'The 'Bel Sanblant': Reading in *Le Bel Inconnu*', *French Studies*, 50 (1996), 257-74.

¹⁸⁰ Eley, 'Author and Audience in the *Roman de Troie*', pp. 180-87.

¹⁸¹ Eley, 'Author and Audience in the *Roman de Troie*', p. 183.

Conclusion

The main aim of this thesis has been to explore *Guillaume de Palerne* as a self-reflexive romance. It responds to the recent trend that argues for *Guillaume* to be integrated into mainstream medieval scholarship alongside texts that shed light on the developing genre of French romance. Although *Guillaume* has been primarily analysed for its representation of the werewolf Alphonse, scholars have recently observed the way in which the poet foregrounds his compositional process within the narrative. The comments of Ferlampin-Acher and Simons suggest that the poet mirrors the form of his work within its content, predominantly through his manipulation of transformation.¹ This study has revealed, in more extensive terms, the self-reflexive nature of *Guillaume* by exploring how the narrative themes of transformation and recognition drive the composition and reception of this text. It has also analysed the relationship between these creative processes and their respective agents, as stressed in *Guillaume* by the notions of doubling and correspondence.

The methodological approach of this analysis has been shaped by a critical framework suited to the study of a medieval text. It has combined close reading of *Guillaume* with an examination of the key narrative themes, all the while drawing on elements of literary theory that have been acknowledged as pertinent to informing our understanding of romance. The predominant focus has been on exploring a diverse range of intertextual allusions signalled within the *Guillaume* narrative in order to question the ways in which the ‘intertextual game of romance’ is reflected and emphasised in this text.² The first two chapters engaged in discussion of the role of the poet, whose transformation of intertextual material through *mutatio* is highlighted by his use of abstract and concrete ‘catalysts of transformation’ in the narrative. The second half of the thesis explored the

¹ Ferlampin-Acher, ‘Introduction’, pp. 80-81 and p. 80; Simons, ‘The Significance of Rural Space’, p. 431.

² Bruckner, ‘Intertextuality’, p. 230.

poet's manipulation of doubling and correspondence to signal the romance's intertextual layer and to foreground the partnership between himself and his audience, before interrogating in its final chapter the way in which the role of the latter participant in the 'game of romance' is reflected in the narrative. The analysis presented in the four chapters argues in defence of my hypothesis that *Guillaume de Palerne* is a self-reflexive work that comments on its processes of production and reception, aligning with Hutcheon's definition of self-reflexive literature.³

This study has begun to address several lacunae in *Guillaume* criticism by building upon the recent work that has engaged with this romance. In particular, I have underlined the value of broadening the horizons of *Guillaume* scholarship to encompass elements that are unrelated to the werewolf and eponymous hero. Analysis of the key women in *Guillaume* presented in Chapter One highlights and expands scholars' observations regarding the existence of intertextual parallels between female figures, shedding light on the *mutatio* of material through division, replication, and fusion of figures such as *Partonopeus* Melior within the *Guillaume* narrative. Its conclusions regarding the poet's compositional techniques are echoed in Chapter Two, in which the study of three demarcated spaces in *Guillaume* presents additional examples of intertextual rewriting, such as the fusion of two contrasting story models in the depiction of the wolf crossing the straits of Messina with Guillaume. The parallels observed in these chapters between transformation in the narrative and intertextual rewriting provide illustrative examples of medieval compositional practices explored by critics such as Guyer and Bruckner, shedding light on the poet's use of *mutatio* to reconfigure pre-existing material.⁴ Above all, the conclusions drawn from these examinations of 'catalysts

³ Hutcheon, *Narcissistic Narrative*, p. xii.

⁴ Bruckner, *Shaping Romance*, p. 7 and p. 122-23; Guyer, pp. 128-29. See also comments in Eley and Simons, '*Partonopeus de Blois* and Chrétien de Troyes', p. 333; Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', pp. 5-6.

of transformation' demonstrate that analysis of *Guillaume* can complement existing knowledge of romance composition.

The methodological approach of this thesis, which has been grounded in close reading of intertextual allusions in *Guillaume*, has produced a number of significant contributions to scholarship on this romance. First, I have drawn new conclusions regarding the portrayal of Alphonse. In Chapter Three, analysis of the partnership between Guillaume and the werewolf has led to the discovery of intertextual links with non-lycanthropic models that inform the depiction of Alphonse, but which had been overlooked by critics. In so doing, this study underlines the validity of expanding *Guillaume* scholarship beyond the corpus of werewolf narratives, and foregrounds the potential for discovering new examples of the poet's inventive approach to rewriting.

Yet more intertextual allusions that had been hitherto ignored have also been discovered between *Guillaume* and the *romans d'antiquité*. Links with the *Roman de Thèbes* have been uncovered in the opening 'vergier' episode, and analysis of the two Melior figures ('dream' and 'real' Melior) has highlighted rewriting of the conflicting personalities of the *Narcisus et Dané* heroine. These allusions are particularly noteworthy as they confirm Warren's observation of links between *Guillaume* and the 'older romantic' school (1150-1180).⁵ Discussion of these intertextual parallels foregrounds the implications of this study on broader issues relating to *Guillaume*, facilitating an engagement with the debate regarding the date of its composition. By exploring allusions to 'first generation' *romans d'antiquité* alongside analysis of 'second generation' texts that are rewritten in *Guillaume*, such as *Partonopeus de Blois*, the *Tristan* tradition, and the works of Chrétien de Troyes, it is possible to suggest a date of composition concurrent with this web of intertexts. The conclusions drawn in this thesis thus support the dating

⁵ Warren, 'The Works of Jean Renart', p. 97.

put forward by Dunn, Fourrier, and Micha, who argue that *Guillaume* was composed at the end of the twelfth century, rather than in the 1280s, as suggested by Ferlampin-Acher.⁶

Analysis of intertextual rewriting in *Guillaume* has also shed light on the conscious manipulation of texts that exist in intertextual dialogue with one another. As well as rewriting the *romans d'antiquité* (works that overtly stress their manipulation of material through 'translation') the poet engages in existing conversations between works of 'second generation' romance. For example, the representation of Alixandrine is informed by the models of both Lunete and Urraque, and simultaneous use of these figures foregrounds the poet's awareness of links between *Yvain* and *Partonopeus*. Similarly, the portrayal of the lovers in the Palermo 'vergier' rewrites allusions to the *locus amoenus* scenes in both Bérout's *Tristan* and Chrétien's *Cligès*, the latter of which rewrites the former. By drawing on and transforming a range of material that also reworks other texts, the *Guillaume* poet highlights the prevalence of rewriting in late twelfth-century romance, delineating the position of his text within an intertextual network.

Examination of rewriting has also shed light on the presence of mismatches or 'faultlines' in the *Guillaume* narrative that are created by the fusion of intertextual material into this romance.⁷ Examples of such 'faultlines' include the issue of consent in the scenes depicting Alixandrine and Florence's respective betrothals, in which contradictions in the narrative result from the rewriting of the *Partonopeus* triple wedding. Analysis of *Guillaume* stresses the fruitful nature of examining such disjunctures in medieval texts, indicating one way in which poets expose the mechanics of their compositional approach which can then be examined in contemporary studies of romance that seek to explore the production of these works.

A key finding of this study is the identification of significant ambiguity in the *Guillaume* narrative. Some of this ambiguity is a result of rewriting, as the 'faultlines'

⁶ Dunn, p. 3 and p. 141; Fourrier, 'La "Contesse Yolent" de *Guillaume de Palerne*', pp. 115-23; Micha, 'Introduction', p. 23; Ferlampin-Acher, 'Introduction', pp. 32-48.

⁷ Eley, '*Partonopeus de Blois*', pp. 7-9

created by intertextual fusion provoke unanswered questions in the text. For example, the poet is ambiguous in his representation of Alixandrine using magic to assist the lovers in a manner that aligns with Thessala from *Cligès*, and insists on similar ambiguity in his portrayal of the confidante echoing Brengain from Thomas's *Tristan* and quarrelling with her mistress. The depiction of Alixandrine blurs the distinction between this figure and her intertextual models and triggers questions regarding her behaviour that are not explicitly addressed in the text. Like other disjunctures in the narrative caused by rewriting, the resulting ambiguity engages the audience and provokes a response. However, only those who recognise the allusions to the *Tristan* model are in some way able to interpret the actions of this figure, and the poet thus emphasises the importance of recognition in the extra-diegetic sphere of the romance.

This study has discussed multiple examples of ambiguity in *Guillaume* that had been overlooked by scholars. In particular, I have explored the ambiguous representation of Guillaume as a non-identical double of the werewolf when wearing animal-skin disguises. Analysis indicates that although Guillaume does not undergo the same type of zoomorphic transformation as the werewolf, the distinction between these two figures as human/animal hybrids is not as clear cut as previous scholarship has suggested. Critics note that Guillaume 'mimics' the werewolf by donning animal skins, observing that the permanence of Alphonse's imposed metamorphosis is stressed by the voluntary and reversible nature of the eponymous hero's disguises.⁸ However, close study of Guillaume as a quasi-animal in bear- and deerskins suggests that his transformation may not be so easily reversed, nor as voluntarily undertaken, and above all raises unanswered questions regarding the parallels between the heroes.

Further examples of ambiguity have been highlighted by in-depth discussion of the werewolf in *Guillaume*. In particular, this study calls into question existing comments regarding recognition in the narrative of Alphonse as a human/animal hybrid. Scoduto

⁸ Miller, p. 355; McCracken, 'Skin and sovereignty', p. 362.

claims that Guillaume recognises Alphonse's hybrid state, and Ferlampin-Acher similarly notes that Felise's use of the term 'werewolf' denotes her identification of the beast as a man transformed into a wolf.⁹ However, by engaging in careful lexical analysis of the referents employed to denote Alphonse, this study suggests that the only clear-cut recognition of this figure is found in the identification of the werewolf by the King of Spain. In so doing, this thesis not only emphasises the ambiguity surrounding recognition in the *Guillaume* narrative, it also addresses inaccuracies in existing scholarship, such as Sconduto's interpretation of terms such as 'beste mue'. Critics have overlooked the presence of semantically ambiguous phrases in *Guillaume* that must be interpreted by the audience, and have ignored echoes of this ambiguity in characters' use of terms to denote Alphonse and to indicate their recognition of this figure as a transformed human.¹⁰ In neglecting to acknowledge the ambiguity surrounding identification of Alphonse, scholars have ignored the relationship between ambiguity and recognition in the text. Ambiguity in *Guillaume* emphasises recognition in the romance, and the notions of reading and interpretation are linked in the intra- and extra-diegetic frames of the romance through gaps in the text that must be interpreted by the characters and audience alike.

The analysis of recognition with which this study culminates is motivated primarily by an absence of critical discussion of this theme, yet it also facilitates examination of the romance as a self-reflexive text. Recognition in the narrative mirrors the audience's role perceiving intertextual rewriting during their reception of romance. The ambiguity that surrounds recognition in the narrative emphasises the importance of actively engaging in interpretation, and the presence of inscribed readers further stresses links between recognition, reading, and interpretative practice. For example, Felise's use of the term 'werewolf' at the start of the romance implies that she 'reads' Alphonse as a

⁹ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 114; Ferlampin-Acher, 'Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?', p. 66.

¹⁰ Sconduto, *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf*, p. 98; McCracken, 'Skin and Sovereignty', pp. 363-64; *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Ferlampin-Acher, p. 122.

hybrid figure, and she later attempts to ‘read’ the meaning of his behaviour in the ‘vergièr’. However, the depictions of Felise ‘reading’ the transformed appearances of Alphonse and Guillaume at different moments of the text suggest that she is not always a cognisant and successful reader. The creation of inscribed readers presents another way in which the external level of text production and reception is mirrored within the content of *Guillaume*. Characters such as Felise are aligned with the readers of this text, who may or may not be able to correctly perceive the poet’s intertextual rewriting, and their interpretative efforts foreground the audience’s active participation in receiving this text.

One of the central contributions of this thesis is its discussion of reflections in the *Guillaume* narrative of audience participation in romance reception. The poet foregrounds audience recognition of rewriting by mirroring his efforts to signal intertextual transformation in Alphonse’s endeavours to gain recognition of his hybrid state. Similarly, the two-part process of recognition required to identify Alphonse as a transformed man with an individual identity reflects the process of recognition demanded of the audience, who must first perceive references to pre-existing works before then recognising the way in which these texts have been transformed. The intertextual current from which *Guillaume* is composed is seen as a hidden layer of the text that doubles its surface meaning, and analysis of doubling and correspondence has shed light on the way in which the poet stresses the presence of this hidden layer. Just as characters in the text must perceive and interrogate the doubling and correspondence between the appearance and identity of hybrid creatures such as Alphonse, the poet indicates that the audience must similarly acknowledge the presence of *Guillaume*’s intertextual sphere and question the correspondence between the romance and the works it rewrites.

This study has argued that the notions of doubling and correspondence are manipulated by the poet to stress the concept of partnership at three different levels of his work. In the narrative, the poet highlights the partnership between Guillaume and

Alphonse, and a new avenue in *Guillaume* criticism has been explored through examination of the interaction between these double heroes. The emphasis placed on partnership in the narrative signals the meta-level of the text, foregrounding the relationship between the audience and poet in the ‘intertextual game of romance’. This partnership is further emphasised by the doubling and correspondence between transformation and recognition, the themes that reflect the roles and processes adopted by the agents of romance creation. Finally, the notion of partnership is embodied in the work as a whole through the inextricable links underlined between its content and form. By mapping the key themes of *Guillaume* onto the processes of composition and reception, this study has highlighted links between content and form in this self-reflexive work. These comments echo those of Krueger regarding ‘self-reflective’ elements of other romances, as she notes that audience reception is ‘reflected in theme and structure’ of *Yvain* and *Le Chevalier de la Charrette*.¹¹

Close examination of the doubling and correspondence between the micro and macro levels of *Guillaume* has informed this analysis of the romance as a self-reflexive text, providing new evidence with which to argue for its incorporation into the main corpus of texts explored in medieval scholarship. I have developed critical paradigms for exploring medieval self-reflexive romances, drawing together Ferlampin-Acher and Huchet’s work on reflections of rewriting in the *Roman de Thèbes* and the *Roman d’Eneas* with Krueger’s analysis of audience reception in the work of Chrétien de Troyes.¹² However, unlike previous studies, this study has highlighted the fruitful nature of simultaneously examining reflections of production and reception within a text. This approach links both creative practices, and thus acknowledges the emphasis placed in romance on the correspondence and partnership between these processes and between poet and audience.

¹¹ Krueger, ‘Reading the *Yvain/Charrete*’, p. 172.

¹² Ferlampin-Acher, ‘*Le Roman de Thèbes*, Geste de deus frères’, p. 309; Huchet, ‘L’Enéas: un roman spéculaire’, pp. 66-71; Krueger, ‘Reading the *Yvain/Charrete*’, pp. 172-87.

This study presents a holistic approach to examining medieval texts, as it interrogates romance production and reception by engaging in close analysis of *Guillaume*. Yet it also argues that, whilst greater understanding of medieval romance practices can be achieved by exploring reflections of a text's extra-diegetic frame within its narrative, interpretation of these self-reflexive works must be informed by existing knowledge regarding romance production and reception. This thesis presents an example of such research in practice, and its methodological approach advocates building bridges between close literary analysis of romance and the application of critical concepts found both in medieval studies and in the wider discipline of literary theory. It has combined elements of intertextual theory with scholars' understanding of medieval rewriting practices, and has used theories of reader-response and reception to further elucidate existing scholarship regarding the reception of romance. In engaging with these theories through its reading of *Guillaume*, rather than by interpreting the romance through a theoretical lens, the conclusions drawn in this study highlight parallels between medieval romance practices and notions believed to be 'modern'. This analysis also suggests that the lines between alterity and modernity are blurred when medieval literature is analysed alongside 'modern' theories, thus underlining the implications that such an approach has on our understanding of 'modern' theoretical concepts.¹³

In particular, I have argued that the trend developed in the latter part of the twentieth century for outlining the important role of the reader is in fact an integral part of medieval romance practices, and one of which both poet and audience were aware. Poets created intertextual dialogues between texts by rewriting pre-existing material, and romance reception relied on audiences recognising these conversations through active interpretation of works such as *Guillaume*. The concept of the 'game of romance', as explored throughout this study, in fact contradicts the comments of Marnette, who states

¹³ See similar comments made by Guthrie regarding the analysis of the 'poetic invention' in *Le Bel Inconnu*. Guthrie, p. 147.

that romances solicit less audience interaction than genres such as the *chanson de geste*.¹⁴ I have demonstrated that by inviting recognition of intertextual rewriting, romance poets encouraged their audience to acknowledge the processes of composition and reception, and to recognise the role they played in the creation of these texts.

Analysis of *Guillaume de Palerne* as a self-reflexive work has highlighted the contribution that this text can make to our understanding of romance. However, this study has not produced an exhaustive analysis of every part of this romance, choosing not to focus on scenes such as the battles in Palermo, which are still to be analysed in *Guillaume* scholarship. It has also suggested new lines of enquiry informed by the preliminary research it has produced. The findings of Chapter One indicate the importance of female figures, and the relationships explored between women in the inter- and extra-textual spheres of *Guillaume* suggest that greater in-depth study of these characters will provide a valuable contribution to *Guillaume* scholarship. Similarly, analysis of space has stressed the importance of geographical locations and settings in the narrative and intertextual spheres of the romance, yet the focus on three demarcated spaces leaves other spatial elements of the text as yet underexplored. What is more, the new intertextual parallels I have highlighted indicate that further analysis of rewriting in *Guillaume* will continue to develop the contributions of this study towards situating this text within the ‘second generation’ of French romance. Finally, this analysis has not extended its gaze forward from the estimated date of composition of *Guillaume*, and thus leaves scope for an examination of the influence this work held over later narratives, and over other texts which similarly function as self-reflexive romances, including the work with which it is preserved, Jean Renart’s *L’Escoufle*.

This study of *Guillaume de Palerne* as a self-reflexive romance has underlined the importance of placing this anonymous text within mainstream scholarship of Old French literature. Whilst the poet’s literary skill does not match that of figures such as Chrétien

¹⁴ Marnette, p. 59.

de Troyes, I have demonstrated that the work nevertheless provides an underexplored example of poets' approaches to developing romance at the end of the twelfth century. Although *Guillaume* was overlooked in much medieval scholarship until the late 1990s, this thesis complements the recent revival of interest in the romance, exploring reflections of composition and reception within the narrative and analysing the correspondence it stresses between its poet and audience. Above all, I have highlighted the important contribution that *Guillaume* can make to our understanding of writing, rewriting, and reading in French romance.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Alan of Lille, *The Complaint of Nature*, trans. by James J. Sheridan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980)
- Aristotle, *Art of Poetry: A Greek View of Poetry and Drama*, ed. by W. Hamilton Fyfe and trans. by Ingram Bywater (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940)
- , *Poetics*, trans. by Malcolm Heath (London: Penguin, 1996)
- Arthur and Gorlagon*, ed. by George Lyman Kittredge (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1903)
- Augustine, Saint, *On Christian Doctrine*, trans. by D. W. Robertson Jr. (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1958)
- , *The City of God Against the Pagans*, trans. by Eva Matthews Sanford and William McAllen Green, 7 Vols. (London: William Heinemann, 1965)
- Bernardus Silvestris, *Commentum quod dicitur Bernardi Silvestris super sex libros Eneidos Virgilii*, ed. by Julian Ward Jones and Elizabeth Frances Jones (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1977)
- Bérout, 'Le Roman de Tristan', in *Tristan et Yseut. Les poèmes français. La saga norroise*, ed. and trans. by Daniel Lacroix and Philippe Walter (Paris: Livre de Poche—Lettres Gothiques, 1989), pp. 22-281
- Chrétien, *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, ed. by A. J. Holden (Geneva: Droz, 1988)
- Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain, ou le chevalier au lion*, ed. and trans. by Michel Rousse (Paris: Flammarion, 1990)
- , 'Erec et Enide', ed. and trans. by Jean-Marie Fritz, in Chrétien de Troyes, *Romans, suivis de Chansons, avec, en appendice, Philomena* (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1994), pp. 61-283
- , 'Le Chevalier de la Charrette', ed. and trans. by Charles Méla, in Chrétien de Troyes, *Romans, suivis de Chansons, avec, en appendice, Philomena* (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1994), pp. 501-704
- , *Perceval, ou le Conte du Graal*, ed. and trans. by Jean Dufournet (Paris: GF Flammarion, 1997)
- , *Cligès*, ed. and trans. by Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006)
- Cicero, *De inventione; De optimo genere oratum; topica*, trans. by H. M. Hubbell (London: William Heinemann, 1949)
- Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova*, trans. by Margaret F. Nims (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1967)

- Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Volume 5: Topographica Hibernica, et Expugnatio Hibernica*, ed. by J. S. Brewer, James F. Dimock, and George F. Warner (London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer 1867)
- , *The History and Topography of Ireland*, trans. by John J. O'Meara (London: Penguin Books, 1982)
- Giraldus Cambrensis, *The Topography of Ireland*, trans. by Thomas Forester and ed. by Thomas Wright (Cambridge, ON: Medieval Latin Series, 2000), pp. 11-92 <http://www.yorku.ca/inpar/topography_ireland.pdf> [accessed 1 October 2014]
- Guillaume de Palerne: Roman du XIII^e siècle*, ed. by Alexandre Micha (Geneva: Droz, 1990)
- Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. by H. Michelant (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1876)
- Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Christine Ferlampin-Acher (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2012)
- Guillaume de Palerne: An English Translation of the 12th-Century French Verse Romance*, trans. by Leslie A. Sconduto (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2004)
- La Chanson de Roland*, ed. and trans. by Jean Dufournet (Paris: Flammarion, 1993)
- 'La Folie Tristan de Berne', in *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, suivi de La Folie Tristan de Berne et La Folie Tristan d'Oxford*, trans. by Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Ian Short and ed. by Félix Lecoy (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003), pp. 300-37
- 'La Folie Tristan d'Oxford', *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, suivi de La Folie Tristan de Berne et La Folie Tristan d'Oxford*, trans. by Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Ian Short and ed. by Félix Lecoy (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003), pp. 350-415
- La Vie de Saint Eustache: Poème français du XIII^e siècle*, ed. by Holger Petersen (Paris: Champion, 1928)
- Le Roman d'Eneas: Texte Critique*, ed. by Jacques Salverda de Grave (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1891)
- Le Roman de Partonopeu de Blois*, ed. and trans. by Olivier Collet and Pierre-Marie Joris (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 2005)
- Le Roman de Thèbes*, ed. by Guy Raynaud de Lage, 2 vols (Paris: Champion, 1966)
- Marie de France, *Lais de Marie de France*, trans. by Laurence Harf-Lancner and ed. by Karl Warnke (Paris: Livre de Poche, 1990)
- Matthew of Vendôme, *The Art of Versification*, trans. by Aubrey E. Galyon (Ames, IA: The Iowa State University Press, 1980)
- 'Melion', in *'Melion' and 'Biclarel': Two Old French Werwolf Lays*, ed. and trans. by Amanda Hopkins (Liverpool: Liverpool Online Series Critical Editions of French Texts, 2005), pp. 51-82

- Narcisus et Dané*, ed. and trans. by Penny Eley (Liverpool: Liverpool Online Series Critical Editions of French Texts, 2002)
- Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. by Frank Justus Miller, 2 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1941)
- Robert D'Orbigny, *Le Conte de Floire et Blanchefleur*, ed. and trans. by Jean-Luc Leclanche (Paris: Champion, 2003)
- Thomas, *Le Roman de Tristan: poème du XII^e siècle*, ed. by Joseph Bédier, 2 vols (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1902), I, pp. 141-55
- , 'Le Roman de Tristan', in *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, suivi de La Folie Tristan de Berne et La Folie Tristan d'Oxford*, trans. by Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Ian Short and ed. by Félix Lecoy (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003), pp. 41-245

Secondary Sources

- Le Petit Robert* (Paris: Le Robert, 2012)
- Adams, Tracy, 'Crossing Generic Boundaries: The Clever Courtly Lady', *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 21 (2004), 81-96
- Allen, Graham, *Intertextuality* (London: Routledge, 2000)
- Allen, Peter L., 'A Frame for the Text? History, Literary Theory, Subjectivity, and the Study of Medieval Literature', *Exemplaria*, 3 (1991), 1-25
- Allen, Renée, 'The Roles of Women and Their Homosocial Context in the *Chevalier au Lion*', *Romance Quarterly*, 46 (1999), 141-54
- Anderson, Sybol Cook, *Hegel's Theory of Recognition: From Oppression to Ethical Liberal Modernity* (London: Continuum, 2009)
- Armstrong, Grace M., 'Women of Power: Chrétien de Troyes's Female Clerks', in *Women in French literature: a collection of essays*, ed. by Michel Guggenheim (Saratoga CA: Anna Libri, 1988), pp. 29-46
- Atkins, Beryl T., ed., *Collins-Robert French-English English-French Dictionary*, (Glasgow: Harper Collins, 1993)
- Azzam, Wagih, 'Le Printemps de la littérature: La 'translation' dans 'Philomena' de Crestiens li Gois', *Littérature*, 74 (1989), 47-62
- Bachelard, Gaston, *La Poétique de l'espace* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967)
- Bacou, M., 'De quelques loups-garous', in *Métamorphose et bestiaire fantastique au Moyen Age*, ed. by Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Ecole normale supérieure de jeunes filles, 1985), pp. 29-50

- Barteau, Françoise, *Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut: Introduction à une lecture plurielle* (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1972)
- Barthes, Roland, *S/Z* (Paris: Seuil, 1970)
- , 'Théorie du texte', in *Encyclopedia universalis* (Paris: Encyclopedia Universalis France, 1973), pp. 370-74
- , 'Ecrire la lecture', in *Essais critiques IV: Le Bruissement de la langue* (Paris: Seuil, 1984), pp. 33-36
- , 'De l'œuvre au texte', in *Essais critiques IV: Le Bruissement de la langue* (Paris: Seuil, 1984), pp. 69-77
- , 'La Mort de l'auteur', in *Œuvres complètes*, ed. by Eric Marty, 3 vols (Paris: Seuil, 2002), III, pp. 40-45
- Baswell, Christopher, 'Marvels of Translation and Crises of Transition in the Romances of Antiquity', in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 29-44
- Bateman, J. Chimène, 'Problems of Recognition: the Fallible Narrator and the Female Addressee in *Partonopeu de Blois*', in *Partonopeus in Europe: An Old French Romance and its Adaptations*, ed. by Catherine Hanley, Mario Longtin, and Penny Eley (New York: Global Academic Publishing, 2004), pp. 163-79
- Baumgartner, Emmanuèle, *Tristan et Iseut: De la légende aux récits en vers* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1987)
- , *Le Récit médiéval: XII^e-XIII^e siècles* (Paris: Hachette, 1995)
- , 'Benoît de Sainte-Maure et l'œuvre de Troie', in *The Medieval 'Opus': Imitation, Rewriting, and Transmission in the French Tradition*, ed. by Douglas Kelly (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 15-28
- Baumgartner, Emmanuèle, and Ian Short, 'La Folie Tristan de Berne et La Folie Tristan d'Oxford: Introduction', in *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, suivi de La Folie Tristan de Berne et La Folie Tristan d'Oxford*, trans. by Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Ian Short and ed. by Félix Lecoy (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003), pp. 285-98
- , 'Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas: Introduction', in *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, suivi de La Folie Tristan de Berne et La Folie Tristan d'Oxford*, trans. by Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Ian Short and ed. by Félix Lecoy (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003), pp. 9-40
- Bäumli, Franz H., 'Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy', *Speculum*, 55 (1980), 237-65
- Behrmann, Bridget, "'Quel beste ceste piax acuevre': Idyll and the Animal in *Guillaume de Palerne*'s Family Romance', *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 24 (2012), 331-46
- Benkov, Edith Joyce, 'The Naked Beast: Clothing and Humanity in *Bisclavret*', *Chimères*, 19 (1988), 27-43

- Benoît, Jean-Louis, 'Clef du texte, clef du royaume. La Lecture de la bible au Moyen Age comme paradigme de la littérature', in *Les Clefs des textes médiévaux: Pouvoir, savoir et interprétation*, ed. by Fabienne Pomel (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2006), pp. 303-19
- Berkvam, Doris Desclais, *Enfance et maternité dans la littérature française des XII^e et XIII^e siècles* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1981)
- Berquist, Jon L., 'Introduction: Critical Spatiality and the Uses of Theory', in *Constructions of Space I: Theory, Geography, and Narrative*, ed. by Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), pp. 1-12
- Berthelot, Anne, *Histoire de la littérature française du Moyen Age* (Paris: Nathan, 1989)
- Bibolet, Jean-Claude, 'Jardins et vergers dans l'œuvre de Chrétien de Troyes', in *Vergers et jardins dans l'univers médiéval* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications du CUER MA, 1990), pp. 31-40
- Bibring, Tovi, 'Sexualité douteuse et bestialité trompeuse dans *Bisclavret* de Marie de France', *French Studies*, 63 (2009), 1-13
- Bichon, Jean, *L'Animal dans la littérature française au XII^{ème} et au XIII^{ème} siècles*, 2 Vols (Lille: Service de reproduction des thèses, Université de Lille, 1976)
- Blamires, Alcuin, *The Case for Women in Medieval Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Blanchot, Maurice, *L'Espace littéraire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1955)
- Blumenfield-Kosinski, Renate, 'Chrétien de Troyes as a Reader of the *Romans Antiques*', *Philological Quarterly*, 64 (1985), 398-405
- Bobbé, Sophie, *L'Ours et le loup: Essai d'anthropologie symbolique* (Paris: Editions de la Maison de sciences de l'homme, 2002)
- Bodistean, Florica, 'Tristan and Isolde, or On the Conventions and Liberties of Medieval Eros', *Journal of Humanistic and Social Studies*, 1 (2010), 7-28
- Boehmer, E., 'Abfassungszeit des *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Romanische Studien*, 3 (1878), 131
- Boivin, Jeanne-Marie, 'Le Prêtre et les loups-garous: un épisode de la *Topographia Hibernica* de Giraud de Barri', in *Métamorphose et bestiaire fantastique au Moyen Age*, ed. by Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Ecole normale supérieure de jeunes filles, 1985), pp. 51-69
- Booth, Wayne C., *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987)
- Borodine, Myrrha, *La Femme et l'amour au XII^e siècle auprès les poèmes de Chrétien de Troyes* (Paris: Picard, 1909)
- Bouillot, Carine, 'Quand l'homme se fait animal, deux cas de métamorphose chez Marie de France: *Yonec* et *Bisclavret*', in *Magie et Illusion au Moyen Age* (Aix-en-Provence: CUER MA Université de Provence, 1999), pp. 67-78

- , ‘La Chevelure: la tirer ou l’arracher, étude d’un motif pathétique dans l’épique médiéval’, in *La Chevelure dans la littérature et l’art du Moyen Age*, ed. by Chantal Connochie-Bourgne (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l’Université de Provence, 2004), pp. 35-46
- , ‘Existe-t-il une isotopie de l’enfance chez Chrétien de Troyes?’, in *Enfances Arthuriennes*, ed. by Denis Hüe and Christine Ferlampin-Acher (Orléans: Paradigme, 2006), pp. 145-160
- Boutet, Dominique, *Formes littéraires et conscience historique aux origines de la littérature française (1100-1250)* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999)
- Bouvier, Jean-Claude, ‘Ort et jardin dans la littérature médiévale d’Oc’, in *Vergers et jardins dans l’univers médiéval* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications du CUER MA, 1990), pp. 41-51
- Braut, Gerald J., *Early Blazon: Heraldic Terminology in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries With Special Reference to Arthurian Heraldry* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997)
- Brewer, J. S., James F. Dimock, and George F. Warner, ‘Preface’ in Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Volume 5: Topographica Hibernica, et Expugnatio Hibernica*, ed. by J. S. Brewer, James F. Dimock, and George F. Warner (London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer 1867), pp. vii-xc
- Brown-Grant, Rosalind, *French Romance of the Later Middle Ages: Gender, Morality, and Desire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Bruce, James Douglas, *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance From the Beginnings Down to the Year 1300* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928)
- Bruckner, Matilda Tomaryn, *Narrative Invention in Twelfth-Century French Romance: The Convention of Hospitality (1160-1200)* (Lexington, KY: French Forum Publishers, 1980)
- , ‘Repetition and Variation in Twelfth-Century French Romance’, in *The Expansion and Transformations of Courtly Culture*, ed. by Nathaniel B. Smith and Joseph T. Snow (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1980), pp. 95-114
- , ‘En guise de conclusion’, *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 104-08
- , ‘Intertextuality’, in *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes* ed. by Norris J. Lacy, Douglas Kelly, and Keith Busby, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987), I, pp. 223-65
- , ‘Of Men and Beasts in *Bisclavret*’, *Romanic Review*, 82 (1991), 251-69
- , ‘From Genealogy to Romance and Continuation in the Fabulous History of *Partonopeu de Blois*’, *L’Esprit Créateur*, 33 (1993), 27-39
- , ‘Rewriting Chrétien’s *Conte du graal* – Mothers and Sons: Questions, Contradictions, and Connections’, in *The Medieval ‘Opus’: Imitation, Rewriting, and Transmission in the French Tradition*, ed. by Douglas Kelly (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 213-44

- , *Shaping Romance: Interpretation, Truth, and Closure in Twelfth-Century French Fictions* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993)
- , ‘The Shape of Romance in Medieval France’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 13-28
- Brumlik, Joan, ‘Chrétien’s Enide: Wife, Mistress and Metaphor’, *Romance Quarterly*, 35 (1988), 404-14
- Burns, E. Jane, *Bodytalk: When Women Speak in Old French Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993)
- Burns, E. Jane, and Roberta Krueger, ‘Introduction: Courtly Ideology and Woman’s Place in Medieval French Literature’, *Romance Notes*, 25 (1985), 205-19
- Butor, Michel, *Répertoire II* (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1964)
- Bynum, Caroline Walker, *Metamorphosis and Identity* (New York: Zone Books, 2001)
- , ‘Metamorphosis, or Gerald and the Werewolf’, *Speculum*, 73 (1998), 987-1013
- Cadot, A. M., ‘Du récit mythique au roman: étude sur *Piramus et Tisbé*’, *Romania*, 97 (1976), 433-61
- Caldarini, Ernesta, ‘Un lieu du roman médiéval: le verger’, *Cahiers de l’Association internationale des études françaises*, 34 (1982), 7-23
- Cameron, Margaret, ‘Meaning: Foundational and Semantic Theories’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by John Marenbon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 342-62
- Cartlidge, Neil, *Medieval Marriage: Literary Approaches, 1100-1300* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997)
- Cavagna, Mattia, ‘Le Désert-forêt dans le roman de *Partonopeus de Blois*’, in *Partonopeus in Europe: An Old French Romance and its Adaptations*, ed. by Catherine Hanley, Mario Longtin, and Penny Eley (New York: Global Academic Publishing, 2004), pp. 209-24
- Cave, Terence, *Recognitions: A Study in Poetics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988)
- Chase, Carol J., ‘Double Bound: Secret Sharers in *Cligés* and the *Lancelot-Graal*’ in *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy, Douglas Kelly, and Keith Busby, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987), I, pp. 169-85
- Chenu, M.-D, *La Théologie au douzième siècle* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1957)
- Classen, Albrecht, ‘Introduction’, in *The Power of a Woman’s Voice in Medieval and Early Modern Literatures: New Approaches to German and European Women Writers and to Violence Against Women in Premodern Times* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), pp. 1-36

- , 'Introduction', in *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: The Spatial Turn in Premodern Studies*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 1-191
- Clayton, Jay, and Eric Rothstein, 'Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality', in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, ed. by Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 3-36
- Clements, Pamela, 'Shape-Shifting and Gender-Bending: Merlin's Last Laugh at Silence', in *The Future of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Problems, Trends, and Opportunities for Research*, ed. by Roger Dahood (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 43-51
- Cobby, Anne Elizabeth, *Ambivalent Conventions: Formula and Parody in Old French* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995)
- Coghlan, Maura, 'The Flaw in Enide's Character: A Study of Chrétien de Troyes' *Erec*', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 5 (1979), 21-37
- Coleman, Joyce, *Public Reading and the Reading Public in Late Medieval England and France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Collet, Olivier, and Pierre-Marie Joris, 'Introduction', in *Le Roman de Partonopeu de Blois*, ed. and trans. by Olivier Collet and Pierre-Marie Joris (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 2005), pp. 9-49
- Corbellari, Alain, 'Onirisme et bestialité: Le Roman de *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Neophilologus*, 86 (2002), 353-62
- Cormier, Raymond J., *One Heart One Mind: The Rebirth of Virgil's Hero in Medieval French Romance* (University, MS: Romance Monographs, 1973)
- Crisp, Frank, *Mediaeval Gardens* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1966)
- Crosby, Ruth, 'Oral Delivery in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 11 (1936), 88-110
- Crouzet, Michel, 'Introduction', in *Espaces Romanesques*, ed. by Michel Crouzet (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982), pp. 1-2
- Culler, Jonathan, 'Presupposition and Intertextuality', *Modern Language Notes*, 91 (1976), 1380-1396
- Curtius, Ernst Robert, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. by Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1953)
- Dällenbach, Lucien, *The Mirror in the Text*, trans. by Jeremy Whiteley with Emma Hughes (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989)
- De Certeau, Michel, *L'Invention du quotidien: Arts de faire*, 2nd edn., 2 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1990)
- De Man, Paul, 'Introduction', in Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. by Timothy Bathi (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982), pp. vii-xxv

- De Vries, Ad, 'Apple', in *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1976), pp. 17-19
- Delp, Wilhelmine E., *Etude sur la langue de Guillaume de Palerne, suivie d'un glossaire* (Paris: Protat, 1907)
- Deluz, Christiane, 'Le Jardin médiéval, lieu d'intimité', in *Vergers et jardins dans l'univers médiéval* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications du CUER MA, 1990), pp. 97-107
- Dembowski, Peter, 'Intertextualité et critique des textes', in *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 17-29
- Doane, A. N., 'Oral Texts, Intertexts, and Intratexts: Editing Old English', in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, ed. by Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 75-113
- Doggett, Laine E., 'On Artifice and Realism: Thessala in Chrétien de Troyes's *Cligès*', *Exemplaria*, 16 (2004), 43-72
- Donagher, Colleen P., 'Socializing the Sorceress: The Fairy Mistress in *Lanval*, *Le Bel Inconnu*, and *Partonopeu de Blois*', *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 4 (1997), 69-88
- Douglas, Adam, *The Beast Within: Man, Myths and Werewolves* (London: Orion, 1993)
- Dubost, Francis, *Aspects fantastiques de la littérature narrative médiévale (XII^{ème} - XIII^{ème} siècles): L'Autre, l'Ailleurs, l'Autrefois* (Geneva: Editions Slatkine, 1991)
- Dubuis, Roger, 'Du bon usage du "double" et du "dédoublement" dans *Le Chevalier au lion* de Chrétien de Troyes', in *Doubles et dédoublement en littérature*, ed. by Gabriel A. Pérouse (St Etienne: Publications de l'Université de St Etienne, 1995), pp. 15-25
- Duby, Georges, *L'Économie rurale et la vie des campagnes dans l'Occident médiéval*, 2 vols. (Paris: Aubier, 1962)
- , *Hommes et structures du Moyen Âge* (Paris: Mouton, 1973)
- , *Le Chevalier, la femme et le prêtre: Le Mariage dans la France féodale* (Paris: Hachette, 1981)
- , *A History of Private Life: II. Revelations of the Medieval World*, trans. by Arthur Goldhammer (London: Belknap Press, 1988)
- , *Medieval Marriage: Two Models From Twelfth-Century France*, trans. by Elborg Foster (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991)
- Dunn, Charles W., *The Foundling and the Werwolf: A literary-historical study of 'Guillaume de Palerne'* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960)
- Dupont-Roc, Roselyne, and Jean Lallot, 'Notes chapitre 11', in Aristotle, *La poétique*, trans. by Roselyne Dupont-Roc and Jean Lallot (Paris: Seuil, 1980), pp. 231-34
- Eco, Umberto, 'Denotation', in *On the Medieval Theory of Signs*, ed. by Umberto Eco and Costantino Marmo (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1989), pp. 43-77

- Eco, U., R. Lambertini, C. Marmo and A. Tabarroni, 'On Animal Language in the Medieval Classification of Signs', in *On the Medieval Theory of Signs*, ed. by Umberto Eco and Costantino Marmo (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1989), pp. 3-41
- Eley, Penny, 'Author and Audience in the *Roman de Troie*', in *Courtly Literature: culture and context*, ed. by Keith Busby and Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1990), pp. 179-90
- , 'Introduction', in *Narcisus et Dané*, ed. and trans. by Penny Eley (Liverpool: Liverpool Online Series Critical Editions of French Texts, 2002), pp. 7-30
- , *'Partonopeus de Blois': Romance in the Making* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2011)
- Eley, Penny, et. al., ed., *'Partonopeus de Blois': An Electronic Edition*, (Sheffield: HriOnline, 2005) <www.hrionline.ac.uk/partonopeus> [accessed 10 February 2015]
- Eley, Penny, and Penny Simons, 'The Prologue to *Partonopeus de Blois*: Text, Context and Subtext', *French Studies*, 49 (1995), 1-16
- , '*Partonopeus de Blois* and Chrétien de Troyes: A Re-assessment', *Romania*, 117 (1999), 316-41
- , 'Poets, Birds and Readers in *Partonopeus de Blois*', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 36 (2000), 1-15
- , 'A Subtext and its Subversion: The Variant Endings to *Partonopeus de Blois*', *Neophilologus*, 82 (1998), 181-97
- Faral, Edmond, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1913)
- , *Les Arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle: Recherches et documents sur la technique littéraire du moyen âge* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1924)
- Faure, M., 'Le *Bisclavret* de Marie de France: une histoire suspecte de loup-garou', *Revue des langues romanes*, 83 (1978), 345-56
- Fenster, Thelma S., 'Introduction', in *Arthurian Women* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. xvii-lxxvii
- Ferber, Michael, 'Apple', in *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 12-13
- Ferlampin-Acher, Christine, '*Merveilles*' et topique merveilleuse dans les romans médiévaux (Paris: Champion, 2003)
- , 'Perceforest et ses miroirs aux alouettes', in *Miroirs et jeux de miroirs dans la littérature médiévale*, ed. by Fabienne Pomel (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003), pp. 323-38
- , 'Introduction', in Chrétien de Troyes [?], *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, trans. and ed. by Christine Ferlampin-Acher (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2007), pp. 7-68

- , ‘*Le Roman de Thèbes, Geste de deux frères*’, in *Romans d’antiquité et littérature du Nord. Mélanges offerts à Aimé Petit*, ed. by S. Baudelle, M. M. Castellani, Ph. Logié, and E. Poulain-Gautret (Paris: Champion, 2007), pp. 309-318
- , ‘*Guillaume de Palerne: une parodie?*’, *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes*, 15 (2008), 59-71
- , ‘Les Métamorphoses du *versipellis* romanesque (*Guillaume de Palerne, Guillaume d’Angleterre, Perceforest*)’, in *Littérature et folklore dans le récit médiéval*, ed. by Emese Egedi-Kovács (Budapest: Collège-Eötvös ELTE, 2011), pp. 119-34
- , ‘Introduction’, in *Guillaume de Palerne*, trans. by Christine Ferlampin-Acher (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2012), pp. 7-112
- Ferrante, Joan M., *Woman as Image in Medieval Literature: From the Twelfth Century to Dante* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975)
- Fisher, John, ‘*La Vie de Saint Eustache* par Pierre de Beauvais’, *The Romanic Review*, 8 (1917), 1-67
- Fitz, Brewster E., ‘The Prologue to the *Lais* of Marie de France and the Parable of the Talents: Gloss and Monetary Metaphor’, *Modern Language Notes*, 90 (1975), 558-64
- Flutre, Louis-Fernand, *Table des noms propres avec toutes leurs variantes figurant dans les romans du moyen âge écrits en français ou en provençal et actuellement publiés ou analysés* (Poitiers: Centre d’Etudes supérieures de civilisation médiévale, 1962)
- Foehr-Janssens, Yasmina, ‘Le Chien et l’anneau: parcours de la reconnaissance dans les *Folies Tristan*’, in *Des Tristan en Vers au Tristan en prose: hommage à Emmanuèle Baumgartner*, ed. by Laurence Harf-Lancner et al (Paris: Champion, 2009), pp. 273-91
- Fossier, Robert, ‘La Femme dans les sociétés occidentales’, *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 20 (1977), 93-104
- Foulet, Alfred, and Uitti, K. D., ‘The Prologue to the *Lais* of Marie de France: A Reconsideration’, *Romance Philology*, 35 (1981), 242-49
- Fourrier, Anthime, *Le Courant réaliste dans le roman courtois en France au moyen âge*, 2 vols (Paris: Nizet, 1960)
- , ‘La “Contesse Yolent” de *Guillaume de Palerne*’, in *Etudes de langue et de littérature du Moyen Age offertes à Felix Lecoy par ses collègues, ses élèves et ses amis* (Paris: Champion, 1973), pp. 115-23
- Frappier, Jean, ‘Structure et sens du *Tristan*: version commune, version courtoise’, *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 23 (1963), 255-80
- , ‘La Peinture de la vie et des héros antiques dans la littérature française du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle’, in *Histoire, mythes et symboles: Etudes de littérature française* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1976), pp. 21-54

- , 'Remarques sur la structure du lai. Essai de définition et de classement', in Jean Frappier, *Du Moyen Age à la Renaissance: études d'histoire et de critique littéraire* (Paris: Champion, 1976), pp. 15-35
- Freeman, Michelle A., *The Poetics of 'Translatio Studii' and 'Conjointure': Chrétien de Troyes's 'Cligès'* (Lexington, KY: French Forum, 1979)
- , 'Dual Natures and Subverted Glosses: Marie de France's *Bisclavret*', *Romance Notes*, 25 (1985), 288-301
- Frye, Northrop, 'Levels of Meaning in Literature', *The Kenyon Review*, 12 (1950), 246-62
- Galand, Perrine, 'Les "Beaux" Signes: Un "locus amoenus" d'Alain de Lille', *Littérature*, 74 (1989), 27-46
- Gallo, Ernest, 'The *Poetria nova* of Geoffrey of Vinsauf', in *Medieval Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric* ed. by James J. Murphy (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), pp. 68-84
- Galloni, Paolo, 'Lo specchio di Tristano: Il Doppio, il desiderio e il disordine', *Quaderni medievali*, 45 (1998), 6-36
- Galyon, Aubrey E., 'Introduction' in Matthew of Vendôme, *The Art of Versification*, trans. by Aubrey E. Galyon (Ames, IA: The Iowa State University Press, 1980), p. 3-22
- Garrus, Annie-France, 'Pierre Durand, lecteur de *Guillaume de Palerne*', in *Le goût du lecteur à la fin du Moyen Age*, ed. by Danielle Bohler (Paris: Léopard d'or, 2006), pp. 307-12
- Gaunt, Simon, 'From Epic to Romance: Gender and Sexuality in the *Roman d'Eneas*', *Romanic Review*, 83 (1992), 1-27
- , *Gender and Genre in Medieval French Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)
- , *Retelling the Tale: An Introduction to Medieval French Literature* (London: Duckworth, 2001)
- Genette, Gérard, *Figures II* (Paris: Seuil, 1969)
- , *Palimpsestes: la Littérature au second degré* (Paris: Seuil, 1982)
- Germain, Ellen, 'Lunete, Women, and Power in Chrétien's *Yvain*', *Romance Quarterly*, 38 (1991), 15-25
- Gerould, Gordon Hall, 'Forerunners, Congeners and Derivatives of the Eustace Legend', *PMLA*, 19 (1904), 335-448
- Gibson, Walker, 'Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers', in *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, ed. by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 1-6
- Gide, André, *Journal, 1889-1939* (Paris: Gallimard, Pléiade, 1948)

- Gier, Albert, 'L'Amour, les monologues: le *Lai de Narcisse*', in *Conjunctures: Medieval Studies in Honor of Douglas Kelly*, ed. by Keith Busby and Norris J. Lacy (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994), pp. 129-37
- Gignoux, Anne-Claire, *Initiation à l'intertextualité* (Paris: Ellipses, 2005)
- , 'De l'intertextualité à l'écriture', *Cahiers de Narratologie*, 13 (2006), <<http://narratologie.revues.org/329>> [accessed 14 January 2015]
- Gingras, Francis, *Erotisme et merveilles dans le récit français des XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002)
- , 'Le Miel et l'amertume: *Partonopeus de Blois* et l'art du roman', in *Partonopeus in Europe: An Old French Romance and its Adaptations*, ed. by Catherine Hanley, Mario Longtin, and Penny Eley (New York: Global Academic Publishing, 2004), pp. 131-45
- Glasser, Marc, 'Marriage and the Use of Force in *Yvain*', *Romania*, 108 (1987), 484-502
- Godefroy, Frédéric, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue Française*, 10 vols (Paris: F. Vieweg, 1889)
- Gold, Penny Schine, *The Lady & the Virgin: Image, Attitude, and Experience in Twelfth-Century France* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985)
- Gravdal, Kathryn, *Vilain and Courtois: Transgressive Parody in French Literature of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1989)
- Greene, Virginie, 'Le Deuil, mode d'emploi, dans deux romans de Chrétien de Troyes', *French Studies*, 52 (1998), 257-78
- , 'Introduction', in *The Medieval Author in Medieval French Literature*, ed. by Virginie Greene (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 1-11
- Griffin, Miranda, "'Dont me revient ceste parole?'" Echo, Voice and Citation in *Le Lai de Narcisse* and *Cristal et Clarie*', *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 22 (2011), 59-74
- Grigsby, John L., 'The Narrator in *Partonopeu de Blois*, *Le Bel Inconnu*, and *Joufroi de Poitiers*', *Romance Philology*, 21 (1968), 536-43
- , 'Narrative Voices in Chrétien de Troyes: A Prolegomenon to Dissection', *Romance Philology*, 32 (1979), 261-73
- Grimbert, Joan, *Yvain dans le miroir: une poétique de la réflexion dans le 'Chevalier du Lion' de Chrétien de Troyes* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1988)
- , 'On Fenice's Vain Attempts to Revise a Romantic Archetype and Chrétien's Fabled Hostility to the Tristan Legend', in *Reassessing the Heroine in Medieval French Literature*, ed. by Kathy M. Krause (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2001), pp. 87-106
- Grinnell, Natalie, 'The Other Woman in Chrétien de Troyes's *Yvain*', *Critical Matrix*, 10 (1996), 36-57

- Guðmundsdóttir, Aðalheiður, 'The Werewolf in Medieval Icelandic Literature', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 106 (2007), 277-303
- Guiette, Robert, *Questions de Littérature* (Gent: Romanica Gardensia, 1960)
- , 'Symbolisme et "senefiance" au Moyen Age', in Robert Guiette, *Forme et senefiance* ed. by J. Dufournet, M. de Grève, and H. Braet (Geneva: Droz, 1978), pp. 33-60
- Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich, 'Strangeness as a Requirement for Topicality: Medieval Literature and Reception Theory', *L'Esprit Créateur*, 21 (1981), 5-12
- Guthrie, Jeri S., 'The *Je(u)* in *Le Bel Inconnu*: Auto-referentiality and Pseudo-autobiography', *Romanic Review*, 75 (1984), 147-61
- Guyer, Foster E., *Romance in the Making: Chrétien de Troyes and the Earliest French Romances* (New York: Vanni, 1954)
- Guynn, Noah D., 'Hybridity, Ethics, and Gender in Two Old French Werewolf Tales', in *From Beasts to Souls: Gender and Embodiment in Medieval Europe*, ed. by E. Jane Burns and Peggy McCracken (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013), pp. 157-84
- Haidu, Peter, *Aesthetic Distance in Chrétien de Troyes: Irony and Comedy in 'Cligès' and 'Perceval'* (Geneva: Droz, 1968)
- , 'Narrativity and Language in Some XIIIth Century Romances', *Yale French Studies*, 51 (1974), 133-46
- Halliwell, Stephen, *Aristotle's Poetics* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998)
- Hamon, Philippe, *L'Ironie littéraire: Essai sur les formes de l'écriture oblique* (Paris: Hachette, 1996)
- Hanning, R. W., *The Individual in Twelfth-century Romance* (London: Yale University Press, 1977)
- , 'The Audience as Co-Creator of the First Chivalric Romances', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 11 (1981), 1-28
- , 'Love and Power in the Twelfth Century, with Special Reference to Chrétien de Troyes and Marie de France', in *The Olde Daunce: Love, Friendship, Sex, and Marriage in the Medieval World*, ed. by Robert R. Edwards and Stephen Spector (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), pp. 87-103
- Hannoosh, Michele, 'The Reflexive Function of Parody', *Comparative Literature*, 41 (1989), 113-27
- Harf-Lancner, Laurence, *Les Fées au Moyen Age: Morgane et Mélusine: La Naissance des fées* (Paris: Champion, 1984)
- , 'De la métamorphose au Moyen Age', in *Métamorphose et bestiaire fantastique au Moyen Age*, ed. by Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Ecole normale supérieure de jeunes filles, 1985), pp. 3-25

- , ‘La Métamorphose illusoire: des théories chrétiennes de la métamorphose aux images médiévales du loup-garou’, *Annales Economies Sociétés Civilisations*, 40 (1985), 208-26
- , ‘Introduction’, in *Lais de Marie de France*, trans. by Laurence Harf-Lancner and ed. by Karl Warnke (Paris: Le Livre de Poche, 1990), pp. 7-19
- , ‘Introduction’, in Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès*, ed. and trans. by Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006), pp. 9-52
- Harvey, John, *Medieval Gardens* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1981)
- Heath, Malcolm, ‘Introduction’, in Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. by Malcolm Heath (London: Penguin, 1996), pp. vii-lxvii
- Hegel, G. W. F., *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. by A. V. Miller (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977)
- Hibbard, Laura, *Mediaeval Romance in England: A Study of the Sources and Analogues of the Non-Cyclic Metrical Romances* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1924)
- Hindley, Alan, Frederick W. Langley, Brian J. Levy, *Old French-English Dictionary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Hoepffner, Ernst, ‘Die Berner und die Oxforder *Folie Tristan*. (Schluß)’, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 39 (1919), 672-99
- Holden, A. J., ‘Introduction’, in *Guillaume d’Angleterre*, ed. by A. J. Holden (Geneva: Droz, 1988), pp. 9-37
- Holmes, Urban T., *A History of Old French Literature* (New York: F. S. Crofts, 1937)
- Holten, Kathryn, ‘Metamorphosis and Language in the Lay of *Bisclavret*’, in *In Quest of Marie de France: A Twelfth-Century Poet*, ed. by Chantal A. Marechal (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), pp. 193-211
- Holub, Robert C., *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1984)
- Holzbacher, Ana-María, ‘La Mère dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes’, in *La mère au Moyen Age*, ed. by Aimé Petit (Lille: Université Charles de Gaulle, 1998), pp. 159-69
- Hopkins, Amanda, ‘Introduction’ in ‘*Melion*’ and ‘*Biclarel*’: *Two Old French Werwolf Lays*, ed. and trans. by Amanda Hopkins (Liverpool: The Liverpool Online Series Critical Editions of French Texts, 2005), pp. 7-50
- Houlgate, Stephen, *Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013)
- House, Humphrey, *Aristotle’s Poetics: A Course of Eight Lectures* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1967)
- Houwen, L. A. J. R., ‘“Breme Beres” and “Hende Hertes”: Appearance and Reality in *William of Palerne*’, in *Loyal Letters: Studies on Mediaeval Alliterative Poetry & Prose* (Groningen: E. Forsten, 1994), pp. 223-38

- Huber, Werner, Martin Middeke, and Hubert Zapf, 'Introduction', in *Self-Reflexivity in Literature*, ed. by Werner Huber, Martin Middeke, and Hubert Zapf (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005), pp. 7-10
- Huchet, Jean-Charles, *Le Roman médiéval* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1984)
- , 'L'Enéas: un roman spéculaire', in *Relire le "Roman d'Eneas"*, ed. by Jean Dufournet (Paris: Champion, 1985), pp. 63-81
- Hüe, Denis, 'De quelques transformations animales', in *Magie et Illusion au Moyen Age* (Aix-en-Provence: CUER MA Université de Provence, 1999), pp. 235-53
- , 'Faire d'armes, parler d'amour: les stratégies du récit dans *Parthonopeu de Blois*', in *Rémanences: Mémoire de la forme dans la littérature médiévale* (Paris: Champion, 2010), pp. 289-302
- , 'Relecture, clôture, culture: le contenu des jardins', in *Rémanences: Mémoire de la forme dans la littérature médiévale* (Paris: Champion, 2010), pp. 81-100
- Hunt, Tony, 'Tradition and Originality in the Prologues of Chrestien de Troyes', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 8 (1972), 320-44
- Hutcheon, Linda, 'Ironie et parodie: stratégie et structure', *Poétique*, 36 (1978), 467-77
- , *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox* (London: Methuen, 1980)
- , 'Introduction', in *L'Autoreprésentation: Le Texte et ses miroirs* (Toronto: Trinity College, 1982), pp. 7-14
- , *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000)
- , *A Theory of Adaptation* (London: Routledge, 2006)
- Iser, Wolfgang, *The Implied Reader* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1974)
- , *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1978)
- , 'Interaction between Text and Reader', in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 106-19
- , 'The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach', in *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, ed. by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 50-69
- James-Raoul, Danièle, 'Les Discours des mères aperçus dans les romans et lais du XII^e et XIII^e siècles' in *La Mère au Moyen Age*, ed. by Aimé Petit (Lille: Université Charles de Gaulle, 1998), pp. 145-57
- Jappé, Françoise, 'Adaptation et création dans le conte de *Narcisse*', *Bien dire et bien apprendre*, 14 (1996), 155-67

- Jauss, Hans Robert, 'Littérature médiévale et expérience esthétique', *Poétique*, 31 (1977), 322-36
- , 'The Alterity and Modernity of Medieval Literature', trans. by Timothy Bahti, *New Literary History*, 10 (1979), 181-229
- , *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. by Timothy Bathi (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982)
- Javelet, Robert, *Image et Ressemblance au douzième siècle: De Saint Anselme à Alain de Lille. Tome 1, Texte* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1967)
- Jeuneau, Edouard, 'L'Usage de la notion d'*integumentum* à travers les gloses de Guillaume de Conches', *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littérature du Moyen Age*, 24 (1957), 35-100
- Jenny, Laurent, 'La Stratégie et la forme', *Poétique*, 27 (1976), 257-81
- Jobes, Gertrude, 'Apple' and 'Apple Tree', in *Dictionary of Mythology Folklore and Symbols* (New York: The Scarecrow Press, 1961), pp. 112-14
- Jodogne, Omer, 'Le Caractère des œuvres "antiques" dans la littérature française du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle', in *L'Humanisme médiéval dans les littératures romances du XII^e au XIV^e siècle*, ed. by Anthime Fourier (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1964), pp. 55-85
- Johnson, E. Joe, *Once there were two true friends: Idealized Male Friendship in French Narrative from the Middle Ages through the Enlightenment* (Birmingham, AL: Summa, 2003), pp. 34-47
- Jones, Rosemarie, *The Theme of Love in the 'Romans d'antiquité'* (London: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 1972)
- Jonin, Pierre, *Les Personnages féminins dans les romans français de Tristan au XII^e siècle* (Gap: Ophrys, 1958)
- Joris, Pierre-Marie, "'Thèbes avec Troie": Partonopeu de Blois ou le sens d'un retour', in *Partonopeus in Europe: An Old French Romance and its Adaptations*, ed. by Catherine Hanley, Mario Longtin, and Penny Eley (New York: Global Academic Publishing, 2004), pp. 63-78
- Kaufmann, Alexander, *Der Gartenbau im Mittelalter* (Berlin: B. Grundmann, 1892)
- Kay, Sarah, 'Courts, Clerks, and Courtly Love', in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 81-96
- Kay, Sarah, and Peggy McCracken, 'Introduction: Animal Studies and *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 24 (2012), 323-30
- Kelly, Douglas, *Sens and Conjointure in the 'Chevalier de la charrette'* (The Hague: Mouton, 1966)
- , 'Theory of Composition in Medieval Narrative Poetry and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria Nova*', *Medieval Studies*, 31 (1969), 117-48

- , 'Topical Invention in Medieval French Literature', in *Medieval Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric*, ed. by James J. Murphy (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), pp. 231-51
- , 'Les Inventions ovidiennes de Froissart: réflexions intertextuelles comme imagination', *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 82-92
- , *The Arts of Poetry and Prose* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1991)
- , *The Art of Medieval French Romance* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992)
- , 'Introduction', in *The Medieval 'Opus': Imitation, Rewriting, and Transmission in the French Tradition*, ed. by Douglas Kelly (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 1-11
- , *The Conspiracy of Allusion: Description, Rewriting, and Authorship from Macrobius to Medieval Romance* (Leiden: Brill, 1999)
- , '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
- Kinoshita, Sharon, *Medieval Boundaries: Rethinking Difference in Old French Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006)
- Koenig, V. Frederic, 'New Studies on Jean Renart: The Date of the *Escoufle*', *Modern Philology*, 32 (1934-5), 343-52
- Knust, Hermann, 'Introducción a la leyenda de San Eustaquio', in *Dos obras didácticas y dos leyendas: sacadas de manuscritos de la Biblioteca del Escorial* (Madrid: M. Ginesta, 1878), pp. 107-121
- Kristeva, Julia, 'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman', *Critique*, 239 (1967), 438-65
- , *Semeiotikè: recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris: Seuil, 1969)
- Krueger, Roberta, 'Loyalty and Betrayal: Iseut and Brangien in the Tristan Romances of Bérout and Thomas', in *Sisterhood Surveyed*, ed. by Anne Dzamba Sess (West Chester, PA: West Chester University, 1983), pp. 72-78
- , 'Reading the *Yvain/Charrete*: Chrétien's Inscribed Audiences at Nouaz and Pesme Aventure', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 19 (1983), 172-187
- , 'Love, Honor, and the Exchange of Women in *Yvain*: Some Remarks on the Female Reader', *Romance Notes*, 25 (1985), 302-17
- , 'The Author's Voice', in *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy, Douglas Kelly, and Keith Busby, 2 Vols (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987), I, pp. 115-40
- , *Women Readers and the Ideology of Gender in Old French Romance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- , 'Introduction', in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 1-10

- , ‘Questions of Gender in Old French Courtly Romance’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Romance*, ed. by Roberta L. Krueger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 132-49
- , ‘*Philomena*: Brutal Transitions and Courtly Transformations in Chrétien’s Old French Translation’, in *A Companion to Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy and Joan Tasker Grimbert (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2005), pp. 87-102
- Lacy, Norris J., ‘The Margins of Romance: Art and Artifice in *Joufroi de Poitiers*’, *Symposium*, 44 (1990), 264-71
- , ‘Introduction’, in *Text and Intertext in Medieval Arthurian Literature*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy (New York: Garland, 1996), pp. vii-ix
- , ‘Motif Transfer in Arthurian Romance’, in *The Medieval ‘Opus’: Imitation, Rewriting, and Transmission in the French Tradition*, ed. by Douglas Kelly (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 157-68
- , ‘On Armor and Identity: Chrétien and Beyond’, in “*De sens rassis*”: *Essays in Honor of Rupert T. Pickens*, ed. by Keith Busby, Bernard Guidot, and Logan E. Whalen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), pp. 365-74
- Landsberg, Sylvia, *The Medieval Garden* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003)
- Landy, Francis, ‘The Song of Songs and the Garden of Eden’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 98 (1979), 513-28
- Lasry, Anita Benaim, ‘The Ideal Heroine in Medieval Romances: A Quest for a Paradigm’, *Kentucky Romance Quarterly*, 32 (1985), 227-43
- Laurie, Helen C. R., ‘*Piramus et Tisbé*’, *The Modern Language Review*, 55 (1960), 24-32
- , ‘*Eneas* and the Doctrine of Courtly Love’, *The Modern Language Review*, 64 (1969), 283-94
- Le Gentil, P., ‘L’Épisode du Morois et la signification du *Tristan* de Béroul’, in *Studia philologica et litteraria in honorem L. Spitzer*, ed. by A. G. Hatcher and K. L. Selig (Bern: Francke, 1958), pp. 264-74
- Le Goff, Jacques, *L’Imaginaire Médiéval* (Paris: Gallimard, 1985)
- Lecouteux, Claude, *Fées, sorcières et loups-garous au Moyen Age: Histoire du double* (Paris: Editions Imago, 1992)
- , *Fées, sorcières et loups-garous au Moyen Age: Histoire du double*, 2nd edn (Paris: Editions Imago, 2012)
- Lefay-Toury, Marie-Noëlle, ‘Roman breton et mythes courtois: L’évolution du personnage féminin dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes (à suivre)’, *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 15 (1972), 193-204
- , ‘Roman breton et mythes courtois: L’évolution du personnage féminin dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes (suite et fin)’, *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 15 (1972), 283-93

- Lefebvre, Henri, *La Production de l'espace* (Paris: Anthropos, 1974)
- Lefèvre, S., 'Polymorphisme et métamorphose dans les mythes de la naissance dans les bestiaires', in *Métamorphose et bestiaire fantastique au Moyen Age*, ed. by Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Ecole normale supérieure de jeunes filles, 1985), pp. 215-44
- Legros, Huguette, 'Du verger royal au jardin d'amour: mort et transfiguration du *locus amoenus* (d'après *Tristan* de Béroul et *Cligès*)', in *Vergers et jardins dans l'univers médiéval* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications du CUER MA, 1990), pp. 215-33
- Lejeune, Rita, 'La Femme dans les littératures française et occitane du XI^e au XIII^e siècle', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 20 (1977), 201-17
- Lepage, Yvan G., 'Bestiaire des songes médiévaux', in *Le Récit de rêve: Fonctions, thèmes et symboles*, ed. by Christian Vandendorpe (Québec: Nota bene, 2005), pp. 75-95
- Leshock, David B., 'The Knight of the Werewolf: *Bisclavret* and the Shape-Shifting Metaphor', *Romance Quarterly*, 46 (1999), 155-65
- Link, Hannelore, *Rezeptionsforschung: Eine Einführung in Methoden und Probleme* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1976)
- Logan, Marie-Rose, 'L'Intertextualité au carrefour de la philologie et de la poétique', *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 47-49
- Lot-Borodine, Myrrha, *Le Roman idyllique au moyen âge* (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1913)
- Maddox, Donald, 'Trois sur deux: théories de bipartition et de tripartition des œuvres de Chrétien de Troyes', *Œuvres et critiques*, 5 (1980-81), 91-102
- , 'Generic Intertextuality in Arthurian Literature: The Specular Encounter', in *Text and Intertext in Medieval Arthurian Literature*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy (New York: Garland, 1996), pp. 3-24
- , 'Inventing the Unknown: Rewriting in *Le Bel Inconnu*', in *The Medieval 'Opus': Imitation, Rewriting, and Transmission in the French Tradition*, ed. by Douglas Kelly (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 101-23
- , *Fictions of Identity in Medieval France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- , 'Intratextual Rewriting in the *Roman de Tristan* of Beroul', in "*De sens rassis*": *Essays in Honor of Rupert T. Pickens*, ed. by Keith Busby, Bernard Guidot, and Logan E. Whalen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), pp. 389-402
- Marnette, Sophie, *Narrateur et points de vue dans la littérature française médiévale: Une approche linguistique* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1998)
- Marnette, Sophie, and Helen Swift, 'Introduction: Que veut dire 'voix narrative'?', *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes*, 22 (2011), 1-7

- McCash, June Hall, 'Melion and Bisclavret: The Presence and Absence of Arthur', in *"Moult a sans et vallour": Studies in Medieval French Literature in Honor of William W. Kibler*, ed. by Monica L. Wright, Norris J. Lacy, and Rupert T. Pickens (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2012), pp. 233-49
- McCracken, Peggy, 'The Body Politic and the Queen's Adulterous Body in French Romance', in *Feminist Approaches to the Body in Medieval Literature*, ed. by Linda Momperis and Sarah Stanbury (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), pp. 38-64
- , *The Romance of Adultery: Queenship and Sexual Transgression in Old French Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998)
- , 'Skin and Sovereignty in *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 24 (2012), 361-75
- , 'Nursing Animals and Cross-Species Intimacy', in *From Beasts to Souls: Gender and Embodiment in Medieval Europe*, ed. by E. Jane Burns and Peggy McCracken (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013), pp. 39-64
- McGuire, J. R., 'L'Onguent et l'initiative féminine dans *Yvain*', *Romania*, 112 (1991), 65-82
- McKeehan, Irene Pettit, '*Guillaume de Palerne*: A Medieval "Best Seller"', *PMLA*, 41 (1926), 785-809
- Melchior-Bonnet, Sabine, 'Préface', in *Miroirs et jeux de miroirs dans la littérature médiévale*, ed. by Fabienne Pomel (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003), pp. 15-16
- Ménard, Philippe, 'Les Histoires de loup-garou au moyen âge', in *Symposium in honorem prof. M. de Riquer* (Barcelona: Edicions del Quaderns Crema, 1984), pp. 209-38
- , 'Jardins et vergers dans la littérature médiévale', in *Jardins et vergers en Europe occidentale, VIII^e-XVIII^e siècles* (Paris: Auch, 1989), pp. 41-69
- Menegaldo, Silvère, 'Quand le narrateur est amoureux: prologues et épilogues "lyriques" dans le roman de chevalerie en vers aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles', in *Prologues et épilogues dans la littérature du Moyen Âge*, ed. by Aimé Petit (Villeneuve d'Ascq: Centre d'Etudes Médiévales et Dialectales de Lille III, 2001), pp. 149-65
- Meyer, Paul, 'Notice: Du ms. F 149 de la bibliothèque nationale de Madrid', *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, 4 (1878), 38-59
- Micha, Alexandre, '*Eneas et Cligès*', in *Mélanges de philologie romance et de littérature médiévale offerts à Ernest Hoepffner* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949), pp. 237-43
- , 'Tristan et Cligès', *Neophilologus*, 36 (1952), 1-10
- , 'III. Romans d'aventure et d'amour: 1. La survivance du merveilleux', in *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, ed. by Jean Frappier and Reinhold R. Grimm, 11 vols (Heidelberg: Winter, 1978), IV, pp. 454-57

- , ‘Chrétien de Troyes’, in *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, ed. by Jean Frappier and Reinhold R. Grimm, 11 vols (Heidelberg: Winter, 1978), IV, pp. 231-64
- , ‘Introduction’, in *Guillaume de Palerne: Roman du XIII^e siècle*, ed. by Alexandre Micha (Geneva: Droz, 1990), pp. 7-38
- Michel, Lise, and Françoise Heulot-Petit, ‘L’Étude de la reconnaissance comme scène et comme principe d’action: un instrument critique’, in *La Reconnaissance sur la scène française (XVII^e-XXI^e siècle)*, ed. by Françoise Heulot-Petit and Lise Michel (Arras: Artois Presses Université, 2009), pp. 7-18
- Michelant, H., ‘Préface’, in *Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. by H. Michelant (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1876), pp. i-xxii
- Michelet, Fabienne L., *Creation, Migration, and Conquest: Imaginary Geography and Sense of Space in Old English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)
- Mickel, Emanuel J. Jr., ‘A Note on the Pine Tree in the *Chanson de Roland*’, *Romanische Forschungen*, 88 (1976), 62-66
- Mieszkowski, Gretchen, ‘Urake and the Gender Roles of *Partonope of Blois*’, in *Partonopeus in Europe: An Old French Romance and its Adaptations*, ed. by Catherine Hanley, Mario Longtin, and Penny Eley (New York: Global Academic Publishing, 2004), pp. 181-95
- , *Medieval Go-betweens and Chaucer’s Pandarus* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006)
- Milesion, S. A., *Parks in Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- Miller, Hartley R., “‘Hey, you look like a prince!’ Ideology and Recognition in *Guillaume de Palerne*”, *Cahiers de Recherches Médiévales et Humanistes*, 24 (2012), 347-60
- Mora-Lebrun, Francine, *L’‘Eneide’ médiévale et la naissance du roman* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994)
- Muir, Lynette R., *Literature and Society in Medieval France: The Mirror and the Image, 1100-1500* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1985)
- Murphy, James J., *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974)
- Murray, Erin, ‘The Masculinization of Enide’s Voice: An Ambiguous Portrayal of the Heroine’, *Romance Languages Annual*, 8 (1996), 79-83
- Muscatine, Charles, ‘The Emergence of Psychological Allegory in Old French Romance’, *PMLA*, 68 (1953), 1160-1182
- , *Chaucer and the French Tradition: A Study in Style and Meaning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957)
- Nelson, Deborah, ‘Enide: Amie or Femme?’, *Romance Notes*, 21 (1981), 358-63

- Nims, Margaret F., 'Introduction', in Geoffrey de Visnauf, *Poetria Nova*, trans. by Margaret F. Nims (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1967), pp. 9-12
- Noacco, Cristina, 'La Dé-mesure du loup-garou: un instrument de connaissance', *Revue de langues romanes*, 111 (2007), 31-50
- Noble, Peter, 'The Character of Guinevere in the Arthurian Romances of Chrétien de Troyes', *The Modern Language Review*, 67 (1972), 524-35
- , *Love and Marriage in Chrétien de Troyes* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1982)
- Notz, Marie-Françoise, 'Hortus conclusus: Réflexions sur le rôle symbolique de la clôture dans la description romanesque du jardin', in *Mélanges de littérature du moyen âge au XX^e siècle offerts à Mademoiselle Jeanne Lods*, 2 vols. (Paris: Ecole Normale Supérieure de Jeune Filles, 1978), I, pp. 459-72
- O'Meara, John J., 'Introduction', in Gerald of Wales, *The History and Topography of Ireland*, trans. by John J. O'Meara (London: Penguin Books, 1982), pp. 11-18
- O'Rahilly, Cecille, 'Introduction', in *Eachtra Uilliam: An Irish Version of William of Palerne*, ed. and trans. by Cecile O'Rahilly (Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1984), pp. vii-xxiv
- Ollier, Marie-Louise, 'Le Discours "en abyme" ou la narration équivoque', *Medioevo Romano*, 1 (1974), 351-64
- , 'The Author in the Text: The Prologues of Chrétien de Troyes', *Yale French Studies*, 51 (1974), 26-41
- , *La Forme du sens: Textes narratifs des XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, *Etudes littéraires et linguistiques* (Orléans: Paradigme, 2000)
- Orr, Mary, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003)
- Otten, Charlotte, *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1986)
- Pairet, Ana, *Les Mutacions des fables: figures de la métamorphose dans la littérature française du Moyen Âge* (Paris: Champion, 2002)
- Paris, Gaston, 'La Sicile dans la littérature française du moyen âge', *Romania*, 5 (1876), 108-13
- , 'Compte-rendu: Romanische Studien, III, i (No. 10)', *Romania*, 7 (1878), 470-73
- Paterson, Janet M., 'L'Autoreprésentation: formes et discours', in *L'Autoreprésentation: Le Texte et ses miroirs* (Toronto: Trinity College, 1982), pp. 177-94
- Payen, Jean-Charles, 'Figures féminines dans le roman médiéval français', in *Entretiens sur la Renaissance du 12^e siècle*, ed. by Maurice de Gandillac and Edouard Jeuneau (Paris: Mouton, 1968), pp. 407-28
- Pearsall, Derek, and Elizabeth Salter, *Landscapes of the Medieval World* (London: Elek Books, 1973)

- Perez, Rosa A., 'The Forest as a Locus of Transition and Transformation in the Epic Romance *Berte as grans piés*', in *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: The Spatial Turn in Premodern Studies*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 433-50
- Petersen, Holger, 'Introduction', in *La Vie de Saint Eustache: Poème français du XIII^e siècle*, ed. by Holger Petersen (Paris: Champion, 1928), pp. iii-xv
- Petit, Aimé, *Naissances du roman: Les Techniques littéraires dans les romans antiques du XII^e siècle* (Geneva: Editions Slatkine, 1985)
- Pinborg, Jan, 'Bezeichnung in der Logik des XIII. Jahrhunderts', in *Medieval Semantics: Selected Studies on Medieval Logic and Grammar*, ed. by Sten Ebbesen (London: Variorum Reprints, 1984), pp. 238-57
- , 'Some Problems of Semantic Representations in Medieval Logic', in *Medieval Semantics: Selected Studies on Medieval Logic and Grammar*, ed. by Sten Ebbesen (London: Variorum Reprints, 1984), pp. 254-78
- Poirion, Daniel, 'Écriture et ré-écriture au Moyen Age', in *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 109-18
- , 'Qu'est-ce que la littérature? France 1100-1600', in *What is Literature? France 1100-1600*, ed. by François Cornilliat, Ullrich Langer, and Douglas Kelly (Lexington, KY: French Forum, 1993), pp. 11-29
- Polak, L., 'Cligès, Fénice et l'arbre d'amour', *Romania*, 93 (1972), 303-16
- Pomel, Fabienne, 'Présentation: Réflexions sur le miroir', in *Miroirs et jeux de miroirs dans la littérature médiévale*, ed. by Fabienne Pomel (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003), pp. 17-26
- Pouchelle, Marie-Christine, 'Des peaux de bêtes et des fourrures: Histoire médiévale d'une fascination', *Temps de la réflexion*, 2 (1981), 403-438
- Powrie, Sarah, 'Alan of Lille's *Anticlaudianus* as Intertext in Chaucer's *House of Fame*', *The Chaucer Review*, 44 (2010), 246-67
- Pratt, Karen, 'Medieval Attitudes to Translation and Adaptation: the Rhetorical Theory and the Poetic Practice', in *Medieval Translator II*, ed. by R. Ellis (London: Queen Mary and Westfield College, 1991), pp. 1-27
- , 'Analogy or Logic: Authority or Experience? Rhetorical Strategies for and Against Women', in *Literary Aspects of Courtly Culture*, ed. by Donald Maddox and Sara Sturm-Maddox (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1994), pp. 57-66
- , 'The Image of the Queen in Old French Literature', in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), pp. 235-62
- , 'De vetula: the Figure of the Old Woman in Medieval French Literature', in *Old Age in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Interdisciplinary Approaches to a Neglected Topic*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), pp. 321-43
- Press, A. R., 'Chrétien de Troyes's Laudine: A Belle dame sans mercy?', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 19 (1983), 158-71

- Prince, Gerald, 'Introduction à l'étude du narrataire', *Poétique*, 14 (1973), 178-96
- , 'Reader', in *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, ed. by Peter Hühn et al. (Hamburg: Hamburg University Press, [n.d.]), <hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/index.php?title=Reader&oldid=1465> [accessed 15 June 2015]
- Quénet, Sophie, 'Mises en récit d'une métamorphose: le loup-garou', in *Le Merveilleux et la Magie dans la Littérature*, ed. by Gérard Chandès (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999), pp. 137-63
- Rabinowitz, Peter J., 'Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences', *Critical Inquiry*, 4 (1977), 121-41
- , "'What's Hecuba to Us?'" The Audience's Experience of Literary Borrowing', in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 241-63
- , *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998)
- Ramey, Lynn Tarte, 'Representations of Women in Chrétien's *Erec et Enide*: Courtly Literature or Misogyny?', *The Romanic Review*, 84 (1993), 377-86
- Read, Stephen, 'Concepts and Meaning in Medieval Philosophy', in *Intentionality, Cognition, and Mental Representation in Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by Gyula Klima (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015), pp. 9-28
- Régnier-Bohler, Danielle, 'La Fonction symbolique du féminin: Le savoir des mères, le secret des sœurs et le devenir des héros', in *Arthurian Romance and Gender: Selected Proceedings of the XVIIth International Arthurian Congress*, ed. by Friedrich Wolfzettel (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995), pp. 4-25
- Reinhard, John R., *The Survival of Geis in Medieval Romance* (Hulle: Niemeyer, 1933), pp. 233-99
- Reynders, Anne, 'Mélior de Chef d'Oire: manipulatrice habile ou femme résignée? Les réécritures du *Partonopeu de Blois* et le rôle social de l'héroïne dans le roman propre', *Neophilologus*, 94 (2010), 407-19
- Ribard, Jacques, 'Espace romanesque et symbolisme dans la littérature arthurienne du XIIe siècle' in *Espaces Romanesques*, ed. by Michel Crouzet (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982), pp. 73-82
- Richard, Jean-Pierre, *Poésie et profondeur* (Paris: Seuil, 1955)
- Ricœur, Paul, *Parcours de la reconnaissance: Trois études* (Paris: Stock, 2004)
- Riffaterre, Michael, 'Sémiotique intertextuelle: l'interprétant', *Revue d'esthétique*, Vol. 1-2 (1979), 128-50
- , 'L'Intertexte inconnu', in *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 4-7

- Robertson, D. W. Jr., 'Translator's Introduction', in Saint Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, trans. by D. W. Robertson Jr. (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1958), pp. ix-xxi
- Robertson, Duncan, *Lectio Divina: The Medieval Experience of Reading* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011)
- Rolfe, John C., *Cicero and his Influence* (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1963)
- Rose, Margaret A., *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-modern* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- Ruhe, Ernstpeter, 'Inventio devenue troevemens: la recherche de la matière au moyen âge', in *The Spirit of the Court*, ed. by Glyn S. Burgess and Robert A. Taylor (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1985), pp. 289-97
- Sandidge, Marilyn L., 'Hunting or Gardening: Parks and Royal Rural Space', in *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: The Spatial Turn in Premodern Studies*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 389-406
- Sangsue, Daniel, *La Parodie* (Paris: Hachette, 1994)
- , *La Relation parodique* (Paris: J. Corti, 2007)
- Sargent-Baur, Barbara N., 'Rewriting Cligès', in "*De sens rassis*": *Essays in Honor of Rupert T. Pickens*, ed. by Keith Busby, Bernard Guidot, and Logan E. Whalen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), pp. 577-88
- Saunders, Corinne J., *The Forest of Medieval Romance: Avernus, Broceliande, Arden* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993)
- Schaefer, Jacqueline T., 'Specularity in the Medieval *Folie Tristan* Poems or Madness as Metadiscourse', *Neophilologus*, 77 (1993), 355-68
- Schaus, Margaret, ed., *Women and Gender in Medieval Europe: An Encyclopedia*, (Routledge: Abingdon, 2006)
- Schiff, Randy P., 'Cross-Channel Becomings-Animal: Primal Courtliness in *Guillaume de Palerne* and *William of Palerne*', *Exemplaria*, 21 (2009), 418-38
- Schmidt, Henry J., "'Text-Adequate Concretizations" and Real Readers: Reception Theory and its Applications', *New German Critique*, 17 (1979), 157-69
- Shahar, Shulamith, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1983)
- Shirt, David J., 'The Dido Episode in *Enéas*: The Reshaping of Tragedy and its Stylistic Consequences', *Medium Aevum*, 51 (1982), 3-17
- Schofield, William Henry, *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1925)

- Schor, Naomi, 'Fiction as Interpretation / Interpretation as Fiction', in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 165-82
- Schwartz, Debora B., "'A la guise de Gales l'atorna": Maternal Influence in Chrétien's *Conte du Graal*", *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 12 (1995) <<http://www.illinoismedieval.org/ems/VOL12/schwartz.html>> [accessed 13 May 2014]
- Sconduto, Leslie A., 'Blurred and Shifting Identities: The Werewolf as Other in *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Romance Languages Annual*, 11 (1999), 121-26
- , 'Rewriting the Werewolf in *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Cygne: Bulletin of the International Marie de France Society*, 6 (2000), 23-35
- , 'Introduction', in *Guillaume de Palerne: An English Translation of the 12th Century French Verse Romance*, trans. by Leslie A. Sconduto (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2004)
- , *Metamorphoses of the Werewolf: A Literary Study from Antiquity through the Renaissance* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2008)
- Sheridan, James J., 'Introduction', in Alan of Lille, *Anticlaudianus: or the Good and Perfect Man*, trans. by James J. Sheridan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1973), pp. 7-38
- , 'Introduction', in Alan of Lille, *The Complaint of Nature*, trans. by James J. Sheridan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980), pp. 1-66
- Sienaert, Edgard, *Les Lais de Marie de France. Du conte merveilleux à la nouvelle psychologique* (Paris: Champion, 1978)
- Simons, Penny, 'The 'Bel Sanblant': Reading in *Le Bel Inconnu*', *French Studies*, 50 (1996), 257-74
- , 'A Romance Revisited: Reopening the Question of the Manuscript Tradition of *Partonopeus de Blois*', *Romania*, 115 (1997), 368-405
- , 'The Significance of Rural Space in *Guillaume de Palerne*', in *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: The Spatial Turn in Premodern Studies*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 407-31
- Simpson, James, *Sciences and the Self in Medieval Poetry: Alan of Lille's 'Anticlaudianus' and John Gower's 'Confessio Amantis'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 22-26
- Simpson, James R., *Fantasy, Identity and Misrecognition in Medieval French Narrative* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000)
- Sinclair, K. V., 'Guillaume de Palerne, A Source for *Tristan de Nanteuil*', *Mediaeval Studies*, 25 (1963), 362-66

- Small, Susan, 'The Medieval Werewolf Model of Reading Skin', in *Reading Skin in Medieval Literature and Culture*, ed. by Katie L. Walter (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 81-97
- Smith, Kirby Flower, 'An Historical Study of the Werwolf in Literature', *PMLA*, 9 (1894), 1-42
- Sobecki, Sebastian I., 'A Source for the Magical Ship in the *Partonopeus de Blois* and Marie de France's *Guigemar*', *Notes and Queries*, 48 (2001), 220-22
- Sodigne-Costes, Geneviève, 'Les Simples et les jardins', in *Vergers et jardins dans l'univers médiéval* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications du CUER MA, 1990), pp. 329-42
- Soja, Edward W., *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989)
- Sollers, Philippe, 'Ecriture et révolution', in Tel Quel, *Théorie d'ensemble* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1968), pp. 67-79
- , 'Niveaux sémantiques d'un texte moderne', in Tel Quel, *Théorie d'ensemble* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1968), pp. 273-81
- Stanesco, Michel, 'Le Texte primitif et la parole poétique médiévale', in *Ecriture et modes de pensée au Moyen Age (VIII^e-XV^e siècles)*, ed. by Dominique Boutet and Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Presses de l'École Normale Supérieure, 1993), pp. 151-55
- Stierle, Karlheinz, 'The Reading of Fictional Texts', in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 83-105
- Still, Judith, and Michael Worton, 'Introduction', in *Intertextuality: Theories and practices* ed. by Michael Worton and Judith Still (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990)
- Stock, Brian, *Myth and Science in the Twelfth Century: A Study of Bernard Silvester* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972)
- , *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983)
- , 'History, Literature, and Medieval Textuality', *Yale French Studies*, 70 (1986), 7-15
- Stone, Anne, 'Self-reflexive Songs and their Readers in the Late 14th century', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 180-94
- Strubel, Armand, 'L'Allegorisation du verger courtois', in *Vergers et jardins dans l'univers médiéval* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications du CUER MA, 1990), pp. 343-57
- , 'Littérature et pensée symbolique au Moyen Age (Peut-on échapper au "symbolisme médiéval"?)', in *Ecriture et modes de pensée au Moyen Age (VII^e-XV^e siècles)*, ed. by Dominique Boutet and Laurence Harf-Lancner (Paris: Presses de l'école normale supérieure, 1993), pp. 27-45

- Sturges, Robert S., 'Textual Scholarship: Ideologies of Literary Production', *Exemplaria*, 3 (1991), 101-31
- Suard, François, 'Bisclavret et les contes du loup-garou: essai d'interprétation', *Marche Romane*, 30 (1980), 267-76
- Suleiman, Susan R., 'Introduction', in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 3-45
- Sullivan, J. M., 'The Lady Lunete: Literary Conventions of Counsel and the Criticism of Counsel in Chrétien's *Yvain* and Hartmann's *Iwein*', *Neophilologus*, 85 (2001), 335-54
- Sullivan, Penny, 'Love and Marriage in Early French Narrative Poetry', *Trivium*, 19 (1984), 85-102
- Tibbals, Kate Watkins, 'Elements of Magic in the Romance of *William of Palerne*', *Modern Philology*, 1 (1904), 355-371
- Tobin, Prudence Mary O'Hara, 'L'Élément breton et les lais anonymes', in *Mélanges de langue et littérature françaises du Moyen Âge et de la Renaissance offerts à Charles Foulon*, 2. vols (Liège: A. R. U. Lg, 1980), II, pp. 277-86
- Tobler, Adolf, *Tobler-Lommatzsch altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, 11 vols (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1925-1976)
- Tokarz, Bożena, 'Transversal Gardens', in *Space of a Garden – Space of Culture*, ed. by Grzegorz Gazda and Mariusz Golab (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2008), pp. 7-23
- Tompkins, Jane P., 'An Introduction to Reader-Response Criticism', in *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, ed. by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. ix-xxvi
- Trachsler, Richard, 'Du nouveau sur le garou? Observations sur le roman de *Guillaume de Palerne* médiéval et sa mise en prose', in *Le Moyen Âge par le Moyen Âge, même. Réception, relectures et réécritures des textes médiévaux dans la littérature française des XIV^e et XV^e siècles*, ed. by Laurent Brun et al (Paris: Champion, 2012), pp. 211-21
- Turnbull, Jessica. and Penny Simons, 'The Pear-Tree Episode in *Joufroi de Poitiers*', *French Studies Bulletin*, 75 (2000), 2-4
- Varvaro, Alberto, 'Elaboration des textes et modalités du récit dans la littérature française médiévale', *Romania*, 119 (2001), 1-75
- Vinaver, Eugène, 'La Forêt de Morois', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 41 (1968), 1-13
- , *The Rise of Romance* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971)
- Vincensini, Jean-Jacques, 'Le Jardin de la fée: phénoménologie de la séduction et régulation actantielle', in *Vergers et jardins dans l'univers médiéval* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications du CUER MA, 1990), pp. 389-404

- Vuagnoux-Uhlig, Marion, *Le Couple en Herbe: 'Galeran de Bretagne' et 'L'Escoufle' à la lumière du roman idyllique médiéval* (Geneva: Droz, 2009)
- Walter, Philippe, 'Tout commence par des chansons... (Intertextualités lotharingiennes)', in *Styles et Valeurs: Pour une histoire de l'art littéraire au Moyen Age*, ed. by Daniel Poirion (Paris: CDU et SEDES, 1990), pp. 187-209
- Walters, Lori, 'The Poet-narrator's Address to His Lady as Structural Device in *Partonopeu de Blois*', *Medium Aevum*, 61 (1992), 229-41
- Warren, F. M., 'Notes on the Romans d'Aventure', *Modern Language Notes*, 13 (1898), 170-76
- , 'On the Date and Composition of Guillaume de Lorris's *Roman de la Rose*', *PMLA*, 23 (1908), 269-84
- , 'The Works of Jean Renart, Poet, and Their Relation to *Galeran de Bretagne*, II.', *Modern Language Notes*, 23 (1908), 97-100
- , 'A Byzantine Source for Guillaume de Lorris's *Roman de la Rose*', *PMLA*, 31 (1916), 232-46
- Whitehead, Frederick, 'Tristan and Isolt in the Forest of Morrois', in *Studies in French language and Mediaeval Literature presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1939), pp. 393-400
- Williams, H. F., 'Les Versions de *Guillaume de Palerne*', *Romania*, 73 (1952), 64-77
- Wilmot-Buxton, E. M., *Stories from Old French Romance* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, c. 1910)
- Wilmotte, Maurice, 'Le Conte de *Guillaume d'Angleterre*', *Le Moyen Age*, 2 (1889), 188-91
- , 'Chrétien de Troyes et le conte de *Guillaume d'Angleterre*', *Romania*, 46 (1920), 1-38
- , *Origines du roman en France: l'évolution du sentiment romanesque jusqu'en 1240* (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1941)
- , 'Introduction', in Chrétien de Troyes, *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, ed. by Maurice Wilmotte (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1962), pp. iii-xiv
- Wolfzettel, Friedrich, 'Zum Stand und Problem der Intertextualitätsforschung im Mittelalter (aus romanistischer Sicht)', in *Artursroman und Intertextualität*, ed. by Friedrich Wolfzettel (Giessen: Wilhelm Schmitz, 1990), pp. 1-17
- Wright, Monica L., *Weaving Narrative: Clothing in Twelfth-Century French Romance* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009)
- Young, Archibald M., 'Some Aspects of St. Augustine's Literary Aesthetics, Studied Chiefly in "De Doctrina Christiana"', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 62 (1969), 289-99

- Zaddy, Z. P., 'Chrétien misogyne', *Mediaevalia*, 80 (1980), 301-07
- Zeeman, Nicolette, 'The schools give a license to poets', in *Criticism and Dissent in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Rita Copeland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 151-80
- Ziethen, Antje, 'La Littérature et l'espace', *Arborescences*, 3 (2013), <<http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1017363ar>> [accessed 19 January 2015]
- Zingarelli, Nicola, 'Il "Guillaume de Palerne" e i suoi dati di luogo e di tempo', in *Miscellanea di archeologia, storia e filologia dedicata al Prof. Antonino Salinas nel LX anniversario del suo insegnamento accademico* (Palermo: Virzi, 1907)
- Zink, Michel, 'Chrétien et ses Contemporains', in *The Legacy of Chrétien de Troyes* ed. by Norris J. Lacy, Douglas Kelly, and Keith Busby, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987), I, pp. 5-32
- , *Littérature française du Moyen Age* (Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, 1992)
- Zovic, Neda Chernack, *Les Espaces de la transgression dans le Tristan de Béroul* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996)
- Zumthor, Paul, *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris: Seuil, 1972)
- , 'Le Texte-fragment', *Langue française*, 40, (1978), 75-82
- , 'Intertextualité et mouvance', *Littérature*, 41 (1981), 8-16
- , 'L'Intertexte performancier', *Texte*, 2 (1983), 49-59
- , *La Poésie et la voix dans la civilisation médiévale* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1984)
- , *La Lettre et la Voix de la « Littérature » Médiévale* (Paris: Seuil, 1987)
- , *La Mesure du monde: représentation de l'espace au moyen âge* (Paris: Seuil, 1993)

Appendix

Major Dramatis Personae discussed in this study

Alixandrine	Cousin and confidante of Melior
Alphonse	Son of King Alphonse of Spain, turned into a werewolf by Brande
Brande	Second wife of King Alphonse of Spain, mother of Brandin
Brandin	Son of King Alphonse of Spain and Brande
Embron	King of Sicily, husband of Felise, father of Guillaume
Felise	Queen of Sicily, wife of Embron, mother of Guillaume
Florence	Daughter of Embron and Felise, sister of Guillaume
Guillaume	Principal protagonist, son of Embron and Felise, heir to Sicily
King Alphonse	King of Spain, husband of Brande, father of Alphonse and Brandin
Melior	Daughter of Roman Emperor Nathaniel, beloved of Guillaume
Nathaniel	Roman Emperor, father of Melior
‘Vachier’	Unnamed cowherd who adopts Guillaume for seven years

Plot summary

Guillaume de Palerne is a story with two heroes; Guillaume of Palermo, and the werewolf Alphonse. The romance follows Guillaume’s adventures after Alphonse snatches him as a child from Palermo and takes him to Rome, where he is discovered and adopted by a cowherd. Seven years later Guillaume joins the household of the Roman Emperor, and falls in love with the Emperor’s daughter, Melior. However, unable to marry legitimately, the couple elope, both dressed in bearskins. Alphonse appears in the forest and guides the couple to Palermo, helping them along the way and providing deer-skin disguises. In Palermo, Guillaume fights the invading Spanish army (led by Alphonse’s father, the King of Spain). After the battle is won by Guillaume and the Sicilian forces, Alphonse is recognised by his father and is restored to his human state. Once in human form, Alphonse reveals Guillaume’s identity, and the eponymous hero is then able to claim his kingdom and marry Melior.