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You must read, you must persevere, you must sit up nights, you must inquire, and exert the utmost power of your mind. If one way does not lead to the desired meaning, take another, until if your strength holds out, you will find that clear which at first looked dark.

Giovanni Boccaccio

I MARIE'S PROLOGUE

The usual opinion of *Lanval* and the other *lais bretons* of Marie de France is that they are elegant "secular" love tales or realistic psychological studies, symbolic in the Jungian sense, written by a "medieval Jane Austen."¹ And these critics assume the existence of "l'amour courtois," whether they believe that Marie adhered faithfully to the code or that she recorded with remarkable and psychological acumen both the beauty and the failings of this medieval courtly code.² However, the suggestiveness of historical criticism has produced new scholarship which has called into question many of the basic assumptions which had previously been unquestionably accepted, and has fostered implications for a new reading of Marie's poetry. This new scholarship, rather than attempting to judge medieval poetry within its own aesthetic, prefers to utilize important medieval
pedagogical and religious writings in an attempt to re-create, as accurately as possible, the intellectual atmosphere in which secular poetry was created. This paper is an attempt to demonstrate, by showing that Lanval is more than a "secular" love story, that Marie wrote completely within her tradition, utilizing Romanesque modes of perception. Lanval expresses conventional, yet nonetheless important, doctrinal "sentence" in a pleasing manner.

The critical approaches or interpretations of Lanval which have gained the greatest acceptance today are basically insufficient for they are concerned only with the surface or chaff of the poem. S. Foster Damon writes that Marie is not concerned with courtly love, but with a realism which is based on observing that code, and that she employes a supernatural background as a fit setting for a character study of repressed persons or "introverts." Lanval becomes the story of a psychologically repressed idealist, an outsider whose ideal dream-love comes to life. For Alfred Ewert, the special appeal of the lais resides in the magical fantasy of the Celtic elements, which in Marie's hands are replaced by realistic human elements which became a means of portraying human passions of analyzing psychological motives and presenting a spectacle of human frailty in the face of destiny. Marie's
lais also show a familiarity with the views of love exemplified in Classical romance and the even more fully developed code of love of the troubadours fused with Ovidian theory. But love for Marie is a mutual passion demanding equal duties and obligations from man and woman, not the sensualism of the chansons de geste nor the tyrannical ritual of the "Court of Love." For Ernest Hoepffner, the most prominent critic of the lais, Marie is also concerned with psychological realism. Lanval is the story of a dreamer, "dolent, pensif," a psychological weakling who without reflection abandons himself to the impulse of the moment. The "fée" is an unconscious complexity of supernatural being and "la femme," whose anger is less a folk-lore remnant than the just wrath of an infraction of one of the basic laws of "l'amour courtois." The fundamental idea of Lanval is to furnish an illustration of the leit-motif of "boasting" which occurs in the last part of the lai. But a profound sense of justice and equity allows Marie to pardon Lanval after his sincere repentence. These interpretations fail because, in their concern with poetic surface, they neglect the "sentence" which can be derived from the doctrinal implications which the surface contains.

Marie herself, in the oft-quoted and much abused
prologue to her lais, tells us how she should be read. Here she states, quite openly and quite emphatically, that those who possess wisdom should express it so that it may be gathered and understood by those who seek truth. The truths will be expressed obscurely, for only through diligence and study can one avoid the transient things of this life and prepare for the eternal reward of heaven. Most critics avow that Marie feels constrained to excuse both the fictional matter and poetic form of her lais. They find the prologue, in other works, a "typically medieval" justification of literary activity, moralizing in tone and not to be regarded seriously. But if we understand its aesthetic implications we will see that it is more than a "conventional exordium;" it is an invitation to real allegorically.

Ki Deus ad dune escience
dE de parler bon eloquence,
Ne s'en deit taizir ne celer,
Ainz se deit voluntes mustrer...
Quant uns granz biens est molt oiz,
Dunc a primes est il fluriz:
E quant loez est de plusurs,
Dunc ad espadues ses flurs.
Custume fu as anciens,
Ceo tes [ti] moine Preciens,
Es livres ke jadis feseient
Assez oscurement diseint
Pur ceus ki aprendre les deveient,
K'i peüssent gloser la lettre
Et de lur sen le surplus mettre.
Li philosophe le saveient,
E pur eus memes entendeient,
Cum plus trespasserunt de sens,
Plus seroient sotil de sens
E plus se savreient garder
De ceo k'i ert, a tresspasser.
Ki de vice se volt defendre
Estudier deit entendre
Et grevosi ouvre comencier:
Par [ceo] se puet plus esloignier
Et de grant dolur delivrer.  (l-27) \textsuperscript{9}

(He to whom God has given wisdom [science] and eloquence should not remain silent and hide it, but gladly show it forth. When some great good thing is heard widely, it begins to flower; and when it is praised by many, the flowers bloom. It was the custom among the ancients, so testifies Priscian, to express themselves rather obscurely in the books they wrote, so that those who were to come after them and who were to learn from them might be able to gloss the letter and from their own sense [understanding] add a fuller meaning to the text. The philosophers knew and understood this themselves that the more time they passed [i.e. as they gained maturity] the more subtle they would be in understanding, so that they would know better how to guard themselves from transient things. Whoever wishes to avoid vice ought to study and to understand and undertake hard work. In this way he can separate and deliver himself from great grief). \textsuperscript{10}

Versus 1-4 do not merely "treat in general terms the obligation of the writer not to remain silent if he discovers in himself talent to write. \textsuperscript{11} "Escience" meant not only "science" or scientia in Old French but also "savoir, intelligence" and could mean "sagesse" or sapientia. \textsuperscript{12} Concerning this difference John of Salisbury writes that "prudence and science" are used with reference to temporal, sensible things, but "understanding and wisdom" are reserved for
the knowledge of spiritual things. "Thus it is customary to speak of 'science' relative to human things, but of 'wisdom' with regard to divine things." And by mentioning "esclence" with "eloquence" Marie suggests an awareness of the prominent pedagogical and cultural ideal of the twelfth century—the scientific erudition of *studiosus rerum* and the literary eloquence of *studiosus verborum*. This theme of *sapientia-eloquentia* had enormous influence in the Middle Ages. Much of this interest is reflected in the commentaries on the *De nuptiis philologia et Mercurii* of Marianus Capella. Mercury was the personification of eloquence. John the Scot explicates the name Philologia as "studium rationis, rationis diligentia, studium sapientia et amor." Remi d' Auxerre, a contemporary of John's says: "For Philology is interpreted as a love or zeal. . . . Philology is, therefore personified (put in the person of) by wisdom and reason, Mercury in the likeness of eloquence or speech." John the Scot was also the first to unite these two lines of thought which had been separated by Cicero: "Philology indeed suggests a pursuit of reason, Mercury—an eloquence of speech, as if the pursuits of wisdom came together in the minds of scholars as it were by a marriage, without any difficulty; it is very easy to achieve the knowledge and the disposition of the liberal
This theme became in the first half of the twelfth century a veritable pedagogical apogee. In the preface of the *Eptateuchon* of Thierry de Chartres we are told that there is unity and marriage between the trivium and the quadrivium for the increase of the noble tribe of philosophy. "Pour philosopher il faut deux instruments (*organa*): l'esprit et son expression; l'esprit s'illumine par le quadrivium, son expression, elegante, raisonneuse, ornée est fournie par le trivium." He considers the seven liberal arts as an organ of Philosophy.  

Guillaume de Conches, on the other hand, states clearly at the end of the introduction to his *De philosophi mundi* that the trivium or eloquence is a preparation for rather than a part of philosophy. Philologia becomes symbolic of *sapientia*, the quadrivium and philosophia.  

For Hugh of St. Victor, however, these seven liberal arts are the tools of philosophy and the foundation of all learning "because without them the philosophical discipline does not and can not explain and define anything."  

Also, what Christian humanists sought in pagan literature may be summed up in two words: eloquence and wisdom. St. Augustine points out that pagan teachers of rhetoric held that "wisdom without eloquence is of small benefit to states;
but eloquence without wisdom is often extremely injurious and
profits no one." And, he adds, if those who taught the rules
of eloquence "were forced by the powers of truth to confess
this, being ignorant of that true wisdom which descends super-
nal from the Father of Lights, how much more ought we...to
think in no other way." 21 Thus, Bernard Silvestris says
at the beginning of his commentary on the Aeneid that the
poem "has a twofold unity: first a skill at writing which may
be gained by imitation, and second, prudence concerning right
action which is gathered from the teaching of examples." 22

What is important here is that Marie does not reflect
merely learning and facility at writing but an important
pedagogical tradition and a specific school of study which
was organized in great part for the purpose of instructing
students in allegorical interpretation in an active search
for wisdom. 23 John of Salisbury says that the liberal arts
are called "liberal" "because their object is to effect man's
liberation, so that, free from cares, he may devote himself
to wisdom." 24 This is not to imply that Marie herself studies
a particular curriculum, but rather, that she expected her
readers to be aware of the erudite and philosophical bases
behind her writing. That is, she expects her lais to be
approached with the same learning and in the same manner that
an obscure passage in the Scriptures would be approached. She possesses what she regards as respectable and useful philosophical ideas. And for the twelfth century ideas of this kind are more pleasantly comprehensible when poetized by those to whom God gave eloquence.

There is also a definite philosophical doctrine which suggests implications much more significant than the personal obligation of the poet to write within a pedagogical tradition. This doctrine is St. Augustine's distinction between the things which are to be used and those things which are to be enjoyed. To enjoy a thing, he says, is to cling to it with love for its own sake. To use a thing, however, is to employ it in obtaining that which you love, provided that it is worthy of love. If a thing is "used" in any other way it is abused and wasted and deflects the user from his true course, shackling him to an inferior love. But the only proper object of love is God, so that only God is to be enjoyed: "We should use this world and not enjoy it, so that the 'invisible things' of God; 'being understood by the things that are made' may be seen, that is so that by means of corporal and temporal things we may comprehend the eternal and spiritual." 25

This limitation becomes much less severe when it is understood that St. Augustine goes on to say that "to enjoy" and
"to use with joy" are similar, so that the proper use of a thing may be enjoyable and pleasant, but should not be clung to and made an end except with reference to the Trinity.\(^{26}\) His preliminary reservations about not only eloquence but music, which are in themselves pleasant things, are to insure that they are "used" rather than enjoyed improperly for themselves.

John of Salisbury writes that "Knowledge puffeth up; it is charity alone that makes one good."\(^{27}\) Hugh of St. Victor admonishes those who start on the road to knowledge to be stirred not only by the art of literary composition. He further warns that it is not conducive to their aim that they be "carried away by an empty desire for knowledge . . ." lest mere study take such a hold that they are forced to give up good works. "For the Christian philosopher, reading ought to be a source of encouragement, not a preoccupation, and to feed good desires, not to kill them."\(^{28}\) Elsewhere he cautions that the inordinate concern with supplying the needs of this life is an "evil" associated with the vain solicitudes for food, drink and clothing of the Sermon on the Mount and is second only to an inordinate zeal for knowledge as an occupatio. Of this latter occupatio he says: "I have pro-
posed in my mind to seek and investigate wisely about
everything which happens under the sun. This extremely bad business God has given to the sons of men to keep them busy . . . "29 Thus it is demanded of the good Christian who possesses the ability and Wisdom that he "use" it and strive to teach others the precepts of Christ. Otherwise, he is abusing that which was given him by God.

St. Augustine, in the prologue to the De doctrina, states that "charity itself, which holds men together in a knot of unity, would not have a means of infusing souls and almost mixing them together if men could teach nothing to men."30 Also, he reasons why a man who understands what is obscure in Scripture through a divine gift does not rather send men who lack understanding "to God that they also may be inwardly instructed, not by men but by Him? Obviously because he may fear lest he hear from the Lord, 'wicked servant . . . thou oughtest therefore to have committed my money to bankers.'"31

Marie cites Priscian as an authority concerning obscurity in the pagan authors. She is referring to the opening sentence of Priscian's Institutiones. Here, Priscian writes about the generations of grammarians before him. He states that recent grammarians are more knowing and less obscure than more ancient writers because they may draw on,
expand and correct ancient works.

"That Marie is not paraphrasing Priscian is obvious enough." Priscian is writing about ancient grammarians; Marie is writing about pagan auctores in general and poets in particular. Also, Priscian states that in the Institutiones he will correct the obscurity of the ancient writers, while it appears that Marie reflects no specific intentions. This is not to say, as does Mortimer Donovan, that Marie is "purposefully ambiguous," only that her Romanesque aesthetic is so distant that what was obvious to her contemporaries is confusing to us.

Marie's use of Priscian can now be understood when seen in the light of the sapientia-eloquentia ideal which had such enormous influence in the Middle Ages. The Christian who read pagan literature expected to find both eloquence and wisdom. The discovery of eloquence among pagan auctores was not difficult. Wisdom of a kind easily adaptable for Christian uses was also easily discovered, especially in the works of Cicero like the De amicitia, and in the moral essays of Seneca. But poetry, when it is neither openly historical nor sententious, required interpretation; and allegory proved quite suited to this task. The classical idea that poetic fables are veils covering underlying truth enjoyed an unbroken
tradition throughout the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{34}

Thus Lactantius wrote, "it is the business of the poet with some gracefulness to change and transfer actual occurrences into other representations by oblique transformations," so that he represents a "truth veiled with an outward covering and appearance."\textsuperscript{35} Isidore of Seville echoes this idea, which achieved immense popularity, in his \textit{Etymologiae}: "Of-ficium autem postae in eo estiat ea quae veri gesta sunt in alias species obliques figurationibus cum decore aliquo con-vera transducat," and he adds that for this reason Lucan is an historian rather than a poet.\textsuperscript{36} Isidore's statement was incorporated in the \textit{De universo} of Rabanus\textsuperscript{37} and by the twelfth century this idea had become quite common.

The gentile poets, then, wrote not lies but fables. Alanus de Insulis writes: "Yet in the superficial shell of the letter, the poetic lyre sounds forth falsehood; but within it speaks to those who hear the secret of higher understanding, so that the exterior shell of falseness having been cast away, the reader may discover within secretly the sweet kernel of truth."\textsuperscript{38} This pagan gold and silver was obscure because the truth which they discovered was not instituted by themselves but "dug up from certain mines of divine Providence."\textsuperscript{39} And in reading these auctores Augustine
warns the good Christian to beware lest he think the pagans had truth without divine inspiration: "Every good and true Christian should understand that wherever he may find truth, it is his Lord's." A similar view is expressed by John of Salisbury: "It may be assumed that all writings except those that have been disapproved should be read, since it is believed that all that has been written and all that has been done have been ordained for man's utility although at times he makes bad use of them." We should recognize an echo of Romans 15.4, "For what things soever were written, were written for our learning." Secular learning, like the letter of the Old Testament, is an evil when taken alone; when like the letter it leads to spiritual understanding, it is a valuable asset.

The pagans were not deliberately obscure but, because they were ignorant of Christ and His Truth, they were unable to write with knowledge of the Divine Wisdom. But Christian readers who came later were able to lift off the veil of poetic fabric and arrive at the truths with the pagans had used unknowingly.

This obscurity of the ancients went hand in hand with the exegetical practice of the fathers who desired to see not only doctrinal truths but prefigurations of Christ's actions
in the New Testament in the less obvious sections of the Old Testament. Augustine wished to show story and expression are so much chaff unless they lead the mind to conceive of the truths of the faith. For his scriptural obscurity was divinely ordained "to conquer pride by work and to combat disdain in our minds, to which those things which are easily discovered seem frequently to become worthless." 42 Obscurity stimulates a desire to learn and it excludes the unworthy from the mysteries of the faith. He continues, "No one doubts that things are perceived more readily through similitudes and that what is sought with difficulty is discovered with pleasure." 43 This basic principle was established with important consequences to medieval literature. Obscurity and difficulty, whether figurative or allegorical, are virtues because they exercise the mind and prepare it to grasp with enthusiasm and illumination the doctrines of the faith. For St. Augustine, the beauty of literature resided precisely in discovering a truth of reason behind the sensual motion of the stone-filled husks of the surface, no matter how elegant. 44

It is now possible to understand what use Marie makes of the reference to Priscian, and to discover how she expected her lais to be read. The pagans wrote obscurely "so that
those who were to come after them . . . might be able to gloss the letter and from their own understanding add a fuller meaning on the text." The medieval exegesis (expositio) consists of three sorts of explanation called littera, sensus and sententia. Littera is the grammatical explanation; sensus is the sense that the littera gives upon first inspection; and the sententia is the profound meaning of the author's thought, the doctrinal content. Once the littera has been understood, one proceeds to the sensus or obvious meaning. The higher meaning or sententia, toward which the exposition (or gloss) of a text is directed, is comprehended from the sensus. The pagan authors, who were unconsciously inspired by divine Providence, veiled in obscurity truths which Christ's coming has allowed to be unveiled. Those who came after, following Christ's teachings, could gloss the letter, that is interpret the signs and symbols which make up the sensus and use their own understanding of the spiritual significance of those signs to arrive at an allegorical, spiritual meaning. Also, this fuller meaning should not only be spiritual with reference to God's charity but the reader should utilize the meaning for the correction of his own weaknesses. That is, the poem should be read tropologically with reference to the spiritual constitution of the individual
as well as allegorically.46

Also, "lur sen" in Marie is not a personal interpretation but the Christian attitude in which commentators consult obscurity, whether in Scripture or the pagan poets. St. Augustine, in attempting to establish a framework for allegorical interpretations of the Bible which would explain away what seemed inconsistent, unintelligible or carnal and which would use the Divine Light of Christ to tear away the "veil" of the Old Law, established the Truth which was to be discovered: "Scripture teaches nothing but charity, nor condemns anything except cupidity, and in this way shapes the mind of men."47 He says further, that when considering figurative expressions, "that what is read should be subjected to diligent scrutiny until an interpretation contributing to the reign of charity is produced."48 And just as charity or the condemnation of cupidity is the limiting principle in Scriptural interpretation, so also should it be the limiting principle in action generally or in reading or exposition of any kind. John of Salisbury makes this point when he writes "this is the true and unvarying rule for philosophers, that each one busy himself in all that he reads or learns, does, or abstains from doing, with advancing the cause of charity."49
Marie demonstrates her desire to be considered one of these philosophers who advance the cause of charity. The "philosophes knew that as they grew older, they would gain in wisdom and be able to avoid the transitoriness of earthly existence." The "philosophes" that Marie mentions are not savants; rather they are "poetae-theologi-philosophi." This idea is a medieval commonplace. St. Jerome says of poets: "Pleni sunt (allegoriis) oratum et poetarum libri." He reads in Macrobius "philosophe non mediocre" and that Homer, the source and origin of all the inventions concerning the gods, had given truth to be heard by the sages under the veil of poetic fiction. Isidore of Seville comments that "quidam autem poetae theologie dicti sunt, quoniam de diis carmina faciebant." Theodolhus of Orleans, a leader of the Carolingian Renaissance, gave a significant title to one of his own poems "De libris quos legere solembam et qualiter fabulae poetarum a philosophie mystice pertracten-
tur." Bernard Silvestris affirms that "sunt namque poetae ad philosophium introductorii." John of Salisbury finds that "Poetry is the cradle of Philosophy" and "Poetas phil-
osophorum cunas ease, celebre est." 

Both poetry and philosophy reduce an obscure exterior to a comprehensible truth. Peter Abelard, citing Macrobius,
affirms that philosophy had "always" preferred to publish its secrets "nudis verbis" and had always enveloped them in fables or proposed them in enigmas.\textsuperscript{58} John the Scot writes: "Just as the poetic art through invented stories and allegorical similes composes moral or physical teaching for the exercise of human minds, for this is the proper function of heroic poets, who praise the deeds and characters of brave men figuratively, so a theological, as it were, poetry conforms Sacred Scriptures with invented images and the resolution of our mind and a restoration with corporeal exterior sensations, as if from an imperfect boyhood, to perfect knowledge of intelligible things, as if to a longevity of the interior man.\textsuperscript{59}

Philosophy is the study of and love for Christian wisdom or sapientia. "Philosophy," writes Hugh of St. Victor, "is the love and pursuit of Wisdom . . ." not, however, that "'wisdom' which is concerned with certain tools and with knowledge and skill in some craft, but of that Wisdom which, wanting in nothing, is a living Mind and the sole primordial Idea or Pattern of things."\textsuperscript{60} And this Wisdom can not be obtained without Charity: "quicunque igitur ad sapientiae culmen pervenit, ad fastigium charitatis perveniat necesse est quia nem perfecte sapit, nisi is qui recte diligit."\textsuperscript{61} John of Salisbury identifies philosophy with Charity or the love
of God since God is wisdom: "si verus deus est hominum sapientia vera/ tunc amor est veri philosophia dei." 62 Since poetry is an adjunct of philosophy, therefore, it must also be an adjunct of Charity, which is the vivifying principle of Philosophy. Thus, to the medieval mind the sententia of any serious poem leads to charity. And any writings which do not conduce to charity are but empty fables deserving the wrath of God. John of Salisbury writes: "All that has not this aim of advancing the cause of Charity in the arts and in literature is not philosophic doctrine but the idle fable and pretext of those over whose impiety the wrath of God is revealed in heaven. All their chattering seems flat, silly senseless to the true philosopher . . . . 'The wicked have told me fables but not as thy law'" (Psalms.118.85). 63

Marie, then, is not talking of the poets who write the melodious but empty verse of which St. Augustine says: "This husk shakes noisy pebbles within its sweet cover; but it provides food for pigs, not men." 64 She is referring to the "poetae-theologi-philosophi" who studies to gain Wisdom for his own correction and for the edification of his readers. Fallen man desires transitory satisfaction, which makes him forget what is truly good and the true source of human happiness. The mind of man, "stupified by bodily sensations and
enticed out of itself by sensuous forms, has forgotten what
it was, and because it does not remember it was anything dif-
f erent, believes that it is nothing but what is seen.\textsuperscript{65} It
is restored by instruction, for Divine Wisdom alone can call
man back to Itself, and can restore the proper force and the
purity of his nature.\textsuperscript{66} Hugh of St. Victor writes that be-
cause man was aware of the evil which infected his nature,
the pursuit of Wisdom arose "so that knowledge of truth might
enlighten our ignorance, so that love of virtue might do away
with wicken desire."\textsuperscript{67}

Marie continues, "Whoever wishes to avoid vice ought
to study and undertake hard work." This is the task of any
true Christian, to avoid sin and deliver himself from the
grief of transient things, from Fortune whose temporal pros-
perity and adversity dominates and enslaves her unwary victim.
Hugh of St. Victor comments: "Because, with superstitious
curiosity, the philosophers of the gentiles investigated the
nature of things, that is, the works of creation, they came
to nothingness and vanity in their thoughts. Because the
philosophers of the Christians ceaselessly ponder the works
of salvation, they drive away all vanity from their thoughts."\textsuperscript{68}
John of Salisbury records a similar observation: "It is cer-
tain that the pious and wise reader who spends time lovingly
over his books always rejects errors and comes close to life in all things. Hence... Jerome: Love the knowledge of the Scriptures and you will not love the errors of the flesh." 69 Marie surely feels that this study of wisdom is her obligation and desire. She does not want to be like those whom Hugh of St. Victor denounces, who have been granted the ability to come to Truth but fail. There are some who, "caught up in the affairs and cares of the world beyond what is needful or given over to vices and sensual indulgences of the body, bury the talent of God in earth, seeking neither the fruit of wisdom nor the profit of good work. These, he says, "are completely destable." 70

The philosopher-poet pursues Wisdom so that he may escape false earthly delights and seek the one true good, the eternal salvation of Heaven. And the poet was entrusted with the task of not only pursuing Wisdom but using his knowledge to aid others in escaping Fortune's tenuous grasp. Marie will write obscurely like the pagans. But unlike them she is aware of the Divine Wisdom and will write a literal surface using Christian iconography so that her lais can be glossed and a spiritual meaning discovered. We should, then, look for more than a "secular" love tale in Lanval; we should study and understand and undertake hard work to find a
meaning consistent with the teachings of Christ. Failure to read allegorically would involve reading the letter, a practice severely condemned as a miserable servitude by both New Testament and Patristic commentators. Not only in regards to pagan literature but also in the study of Scripture the church fathers show profound contempt for those who understand only the letter and cannot proceed to the "sentence." And a similar attitude prevailed among Christians whose concern was the composition or study of secular texts. St. Augustine warns that:

You must be very careful lest you take figural expressions literally. What the Apostle says pertains to this problem: 'For the letter killeth, but the spirit quickenth.' That is, when that which is said figuratively is taken as though it were literal, it is understood carnally. Nor can anything more appropriately be called the death of the soul than the condition in which the thing which distinguishes us from beasts, which is the understanding, is subjected to the flesh in the pursuit of the letter. He who follows the letter takes figurative expressions as though they were literal and does not refer the things signified to anything else . . . There is a miserable servitude of the spirit in this habit of taking signs for things, so that one is not able to raise the eye of the mind above things that are corporal and created to drink in eternal light.71

Thus, Marie has shown that she expects her reader to be aware of the pedagogical framework of scientia-eloquentia which underlies the composition of the lais. She will work
diligently to avoid the transient cares of the world and construct her poems obscurely, on Priscian's authority. And if we are to understand her as she wished to be understood, it will be necessary for us to work as diligently as Marie did and to read allegorically in order to understand the obscurity which she has presented.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I


2. The first view is implicit in the tangential nature of much of the early criticism. Since the lais were merely "love poems" for the "fashionable English court" and had no meaning except to exemplify motifs of courtly love, the critics ignored the possibility that there could be any value in the lais except a closer look at twelfth century court life. The earlier criticism was concerned with identifying the enigmatic Marie and discovering to whom were dedicated her works, a controversy which is by no means settled, and establishing what exactly belongs to the Marie canon. Also, the scholars have dealt with sources and analogues, both folk-lore and literary and have studied the geography, place names and the whole question of the "matiere de Bretagne." These studies are certainly not valueless, but we must first discover how these concerns were utilized in the poetry within the Romanesque aesthetic before we can judge their value and utilize their contents to aid us in understanding the lais. For the most complete bibliography of the Lais Cf. Marie de France, *Lais*, ed. Alfred Ewet (Oxford, 1963), pp. xxvi-xxxiii, which is fairly comprehensive to 1960, though ignoring two articles by D. W. Robertson.


4. Damon, 976, 984-986.

5. Ewet, pp. xii, xvii.

6. The conventional attitude of most medievalists, which is commonly seen in books and journals, is that if something which the writer does is incomprehensible or inconsistent, one must blame it on either the naiveté of the author or upon medieval literary conventions. There is no
grounds for believing that the medieval artist was any less conscious of his art or his material than is our modern artist. Those critics who scorn conventions fail to realize the doctrinal meaning of these conventions and how they were used to create the poem. How often, for example, does a character in a modern novel with the initials J. C. represent on some levels a Christ figure, yet we would be shocked if Crane, Steibek and others were criticized for their naïveté or reliance on "conventions." The greatest advancement in medieval criticism will be made when the scholars accept their ignorance, rather than blaming the artist whom he is studying.


9. Ewert, p. 1. All quotations, unless specified, are from this text.
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De precevoir et mal et bien
(Vie de Peres. Ars. 3641. f 12’ 1d.)
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23. This search for wisdom and study of the liberal arts almost always was ultimately concerned with allegorical interpretation of Scripture. Cf. G. Paré, A. Burnet, P. Tremblay, *La Renaissance* du XIIe Siècle (Ottawa, 1932), pp. 116-117.


25. *On Christian Doctrine*, 1.3.3-1.5.5. The works in which St. Augustine expresses his aesthetic principles, which harmonize with the basic tenets of Christian theology which he left as inheritance to his medieval successors, continued to be copied and read throughout the Middle Ages where they enjoyed an authority second only to the Bible. Cf. *A Preface*, Chapter 2 passim.
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Whosoever seeks to exalt the honor of these doors
Should marvel not at the gold and the expense, but
at the workmanship;
The work is nobly luminous, but because it is
nobly luminous
It will illuminate minds that they may travel
through true lights
To the True Light were Christ is the True Door.

For the importance of Suger and his work of Abbot Suger, On
the Abbey Church of St. Denis and Its Art Treasure, trans.
and annotated by Erwin Panofsky (Princeton, 1946).

Within the hierarchal system all things could be seen
as hidden signs or symbols which could be interpreted doc-
trinally. This idea, borrowed from Neo-platonic and Rab-
bínical sources and first used by St. Paul in a Christian
context, gained patristic sanction especially through the
work of St. Augustine. The Bible used figurative language
so that the faithful Christian might grasp with illumina-
tion and enthusiasm the doctrines and mysteries of the faith.
The Bible not only contained all human wisdom, but was also
the highest model of eloquence (On Christian Doctrine, 4.6.9-
10). To understand the Bible, it was necessary not only to
interpret the language, but also to know the properties of
things since all animals, stones, herbs have a symbolic
meaning (2.16.23-26). To further this vital knowledge Augus-
tine called on Christian writers to prepare encyclopedic
works in whatever was pertinent to Scriptural interpretation,
the ultimate use of any knowledge. And as the interpreta-
tion, the ultimate use of any knowledge. And as the Middle
Ages progressed, the idea developed that if the things in
the Bible are significant, other things are significant also,
so that creation itself was regarded as an allegorical bood
revealing beneath the "literal" or visible surface or ob-
jects "the invisible things of God" (Roman 1:30).

A special impetus to the development of this view was
given by John the Scot. For him the eternal Light could be
shown either by Scripture or by creation: "Dupliciter ergo
Lux aeterna se ipsam mundo declarat, per Scriptarum vide et
creatarum" (Hom. in PROL. Jo., PL 122, col. 289C). Both
Scripture and creation are equally sacrament and symbol and
every perceptible thing, whether man-made or natural, becomes
a symbol of the unperceivable and a path to Heaven. The
mind, abandoning itself to the "harmony and radiance," which
is the criterion of terrestrial beauty, finds itself guided
upward to the transcendent cause of this "harmony and radiance"
which is God (Suger, p. 20). To depart from "the simplicity
of the letter and the visible creation" it is necessary to
let ourselves be led up to the summit of contemplation (PL
122, col. 342 B. Cf. also col. 343A-B). For "the surface
of Scriptures" and "the ensible forms of the world" are the
two vestments of Christ; they are as two veils, which filter
through the too brilliant light of Divinity. They are, at
the same time, signs, images, which allow us to glimpse,
across "reason or the spirit" which contains them, the beauty
cf. X Lubac, II, pp. 121-122.) Without the fall, the symbol
of the world would have sufficed in its material transparency.
Now, to interpret nature, we must have the succor of Scrip-
ture (Super Hier. coel. II, 1, PL 122, 146C. For a fuller
study Cf. Lubac, pp. 121-124. For the importance and currency
of this idea up through the fourteenth century Cf. Lubac,
pp. 124-128).

Not only are things spiritually significant, they are
frequently involved in some kind of action so that patterns
of action may be considered significant also (Huppe and
Robertson, pp. 6-8. Cf. A Preface 295-300. For example,
actions of the Old Testament were frequently thought to look
forward to actions of the New Testament, as Jonah vomited
from the whale signifies the Resurrections. And these actions
in turn are prophetic of the actions of Christians in the
future. Thus Bishop Suger, had Old Testament stories carved
in the pillars and on the portico at St. Denis which were to
evolve an intellectual response which prepared worshippers
to receive the New Law spiritually inside the church (Bishop
Suger was greatly influenced by the writings of John the
Scot, especially his commentary on pseudo-Dyonisious.
Suger's aesthetic endeavors were highly influential in
Romanesque art and extended far into the Gothic period. Cf.
Emile Male, L'art religieux du XIIe siecle en France, 2nd.
ed. [Paris, 1924]
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II LANVAL

The beginning of the pride of man is to fall off from God: Because his heart is departed from Him that made him: For pride is the beginning of all sin. Ecclus. 10:14-15.

For all that is in the world, is the concupiscence of the flesh, and the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life. . . . 1 John 2:16

Cil met ent lur vie en nun cure
Que d'amur n'unt sen e mesure;
Tels est la mesure de amer
Que nul n'i deit reisun garder.

Equitan, 17-20.

Maire will tell us the adventure of another lai, "fait fu d'un mut gentil vassal; En bretans l'apelant Lanval" (3-4). Lanval is a foreign knight who has joined the legendary court of Arthur, but is neglected when the king distributes bounty to his fellowship. Sorrowing over his poverty, Lanval rides out from the court, where he encounters two beautiful maidens who inform him that their mistress desires his presence. He readily consents and is led to a pavilion of inconceivable magnificence where a beautiful pucele, offers him, if he remains courteous and discreet, her love, great wealth and much joy. When he accepts she tells him that he may see her whenever he wishes so long as
he is alone but he must never tell anyone of this love or he will lose it. Soon after Arthur's queen offers Lanval her love and when she is refused, rebukes him with a charge of homosexuality. Lanval reacts indignantly and responds that he loves and is loved by a maiden whose meanest servant surpasses the queen in beauty and courtesy. This boast enrages the queen and when Arthur returns she says that Lanval has approached her for his love and insulted her when she refused. Arthur is enraged at this report and vows to revenge himself on the unfortunate knight. Lanval meanwhile has sorrowfully discovered that his "amie" will no longer respond to his summons because of his boast. While he is grieving over his loss he is questioned by Arthur about the queen's accusation. Lanval denies that he sought the queen's love but admits that he had a love whom he lost because of his folly. Arthur submits the case to his vassals who decide that Lanval should be brought to trial. As the court is deciding Lanval's fate the pucele enters. She informs the court that Lanval was indeed her lover, and allows the court to decide who is more beautiful. They decide in favor of the maiden and Lanval returns with her to Avalon.

On the literal surface this lai seem to be an elegant secular love tale, which glitters on the outside but which
has little, if any, serious meaning. But the actions which Lanval demonstrates through the lai are similar to the attributes of the proud man. Conventionally, the proud are found in three species, according to the three kinds of sins which occur in the world: avarice, lechery and vainglory (1 John 2:16). This idea recalls the three temptations which all Christians must encounter for these are the three sins to which the temptations appeal. As this explication develops, it will be shown that Marie envolves Lanval in actions which continually emphasize his rejection of Charity and pursuit, through pride, of the carnal delights of this world.

Thus, the "lur sen" of this lai will either praise charity or condemn cupidity, the "soul's enjoyment of one's self, one's neighbor, or any corporal thing for the sake of something other than God." The enjoyment of any thing for its self originates in "amor sui," or pride, a deliberate turning away from the true God to elevate the self to the level of "goodhood." No one would prefer the gratification of transitory object to the eternal joys of heaven unless he is puffed up with pride and equates his desires with the will of God. And pride, or the fall of a proud man, is the scriptural concept which furnishes thematic coherence to the lai, and scriptural guidance to those who read it.
The usual critical approach to *Lanval* is to consider it a faithful rendering of *l'amour courtois* or a psychological study written within the framework of this amorous code. But the literal level of the story contains several inconsistencies which have either been ignored or sloughed off as evidence of Marie's carelessness. For example, why does the courteous Arthur neglect Lanval's due? Or why does the queen suddenly proposition Lanval? These actions are basic to the story, yet on the literal level they cannot be explained. If we have read carefully and understood what Marie has written in the prologue, we will read the literal surface of *Lanval* conscious of a spiritual meaning, veiled in obscurity, which underlies Marie's lai. The contradictions which occur on the literal level should not be ignored, for on the more important allegorical level the doctrinal significance of these events becomes clear and the inconsistencies disappear.

Marie composed her lais before the substantial Gothic iconography was fully established, and, in constructing her poem, seems to have relied more on the significance of words actions than on the symbolic nature of things or verbal Scriptural allusions. What iconographic detail she does employ seems lost to us and remains an enigma. In our reading, we
will follow generally the story line of the lai, discussing
the spiritual significance of the action in temporal order.
In this way it will be easier to comprehend how Marie con-
structed her poem, and, vaguely, how her readers may have
understood the poem, at least on the allegorical level.

Marie will tell us another lai, the adventure of a
gentle vassal called Lanval. She continues: "A Kardoel sur-
jurnot li reis,/ Artur li pruz e li curteis" (5-6). It is
Pentecost and Arthur holds a feast at which he dispenses
rich gifts, "femmes e tere," to those who have served him
at the Round Table. Among her lais, Marie locates the action
in the court of Arthur only in Lanval. While in most of the
other lais, she contents herself with local indications more
or less vague by returning here to the court of the legendary
king she aids in developing the story of Lanval. For
Arthur is not the chivalric and bountiful king of our boy-
hood dreams, nor are all his vassals ideal knights.

At his feast Arthur bestows gifts on all those who
have served him but unexplicably neglects Lanval, a knight
much admired for his valor, beauty and largesse. Lanval is
a foreigner, the son of a king and of "haut parage." John
of Salisbury, a contemporary of Marie's who was probably
known personally by Marie's audience, says that to conduct
a civil banquet successfully the feast must be enlivened with joy, generosity and courtesy, and that each guest should receive in accord with his rank.\(^4\) "He who displays kindness to a guest, and in addition charity, withholds none of the things he can reasonably be expected to offer. \(...\) Consequently all courtesy is to be shown to a foreign guest."\(^5\) Since Lanval is a foreigner of high lineage and Arthur's bounty is his due, the king's inexplicable disregard of the young knight can only be considered a breach of hospitality and charity.

The feast takes place on Pentecost. Yet we find at Arthur's feast a serious deficiency, even opposition, to the joys of the Pentecostal festival of which the faithful are recipients. At this time in heaven the elect feast in joyousness and are inebriated from the torrent of God's pleasure. "Today," continues Honorious d'Auctun," is the day when he has distributed the spoils to his soldiers, while while he has bestowed the various gifts of the Holy Spirit on the faithful."\(^6\) "Femmes e tere" are insignificant when contrasted to the "spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and piety, the spirit of [fear] of the Lord" (Isa. 11). Nor can the court's joy be equal to that of the faithful "because
they are loved by God as sons, by the angels as brothers."  
For the gifts which Arthur gives are the transitory gifts
of the earth while those who possess the gifts of the Holy
Spirit possess the highest security, and "they will have
full joy in these things without end." "Further, "Honorable
continues," those who are found void of the seven gifts of
the Holy Spirit, because they are thoroughly enjoying good
things. . . . so many will be tortured with punishment."  
Arthur's failure at hospitality shows that he is one of
those who lacks these gifts. And this failure makes his
feast uncharitable and therefore lacking in regard to the
true Pentecostal inspiration. Moreover, as the king is
God's vicar on earth, Arthur's failure to imitate God on
this important occasion emphasizes how far from charity
and how immersed in cupidity he is. Arthur demonstrates a
lack of reason, a femininity which will be reflected in his
court and among his vassals.

In this proud court we find Lanval. Lanval is not
one of the heroes of the Round Table in Chretien's  
Erec
(1691-1750), nor is he named among the hosts of the king in
the same poem (1915-2006), though Guigemar, the hero of the
lai of the same name appears as the sire of Avalon (1954-54).
Nor does Lanval appear in any other poem of Chretien's nor
among the Arthurians in the *Lai du Cor*. But *Lanval* is one of the first works in medieval literature which attaches the hero to the legendary court of Arthur. The king distributes rich gifts to all those who have served him except Lanval, who is penniless. He has dispensed all his wealth and has demanded nothing from the king. "Ore est Lanval mut entrepris;/ Mut est dolent e mut pensis" (33-34). Lanval becomes ill and pensive because he has no money left. But only the proud man would bemoan his poverty and refuse to demand what is his rightful due. And pride is the root of all evils and "the fuel that feeds the fire of death."* Lanval also suffers from cupidity or *luxuria*, a lust after the things of the world. For, as Rabanus writes, pride and cupidity are one sin, and a proud man can not be found who is without cupidity nor a cupidinous man who is without pride. Even the devil, in whom pride originated, was desirous of power.*

St. Augustine considers poverty "the quickest way to the home where God himself is our true riches," and St. Gregory writes that "they that choose poverty shall be judged with Christ." This may seem to be what Lanval does when he neglects to ask Arthur for his due, but it is not, because there is no joy in his choice. Poverty, writes John of Salisbury, is "the breeder of men, guard of true humility, and the
ally of virtue." It is one of the keys to philosophy because with its spirit of moderation, it may check luxury and by its incentive force men to press on without interruption in their task of virtue. "An honorable thing...is cheerful poverty; yet it is no poverty if cheerful but something to be preferred to the riches of Croesus."¹⁴ Lanval's poverty is rather the poverty of the hypocrite. This poverty, says Hugh of St. Victor, is pretended and brings damnation.¹⁵ This is not to say that Lanval is grievous when he really has money, but that his poverty is pretended because only his pride prevents him from asking Arthur for his due.

Lanval should rejoice in his poverty for the poor are favorites of Christ and the reward for the patient suffering of poverty is great.¹⁶ Furthermore, it is Pentecost, and he who mourns temporalia or worldly goods on this day commits a grievous sin against the Holy Spirit. And he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be returned to Him, neither in this world nor in the future.¹⁷ Why then does Lanval become despondent in his poverty? Because he is not the true pauper. Poverty is not the lack or absence of material goods. The true poor man, says St. Augustine, is the pious, humble man who trusts not in his own strength.¹⁸ Poverty denotes humility for some of the righteous possess
earthly goods and some abandon them.\textsuperscript{19} True poverty, that is humility, is efficacious against pride and the cares of the world. It allows one to possess what goods he owns honestly and without calumny; it is a gift of God which protects both spirit and flesh. It promotes health, security, and wisdom and renders the cares of the world trivial.\textsuperscript{20} For "God counteth among his poor all the humble in heart, who are established in the twofold charity, whatever they may have in this world."\textsuperscript{21}

Likewise, the gifts that the poor and humble hunger for are not those which Lanval laments. Poverty in the elect is a longing for grace. "For it is the want of the elect," writes St. Gregory, "when the true riches of the heavenly country recur to their mind, and when placed in the sorrowful banishment of this present life, they remember they are poor." But the want of the reprobate is yet another matter. They are dumbfounded over the poverty of the elect because while they pursue those things which they behold, "they neglect to think of the invisible things which they have lost." It is correctly called a 'want' for they are emptied of the riches of virtues and in the madness of their pride; "they discern not that they are poor also in good deeds."\textsuperscript{22} Those who possess abundant wealth and those who lack possessions,
as long as they desire them, are the same. Commenting on
Job 21:23-26, St. Gregory writes that there are some in this
world that "have not riches but long to have, and seek to be
exalted, though in this world they are unable to get the
things they desire." These too, because of their evil desires
are judged guilty by the conscience. "For every such person
is very often in this accounted distressed, because he can-
not be rich and carry himself proudly. . . . Observe from the
same cause whence the rich man emptily rejoices with a proud
heart, another that is poor more emptily sorrows with a
proud heart. . . . ' And yet they shall lie down together in
the dust, and the worms shall cover them'" (Job 21:25). They
close their minds in earthly desires and they are covered
alike for the worms which spring from the flesh cover them
alike in that carnal cares beset the mind of both poor and
rich who carry themselves proudly.23 Lanval is likened to
those of who St. Augustine writes: "a proud beggar, or not
proud only because he hath nothing, nevertheless seeking
whereby he may puffeth up."24 This is the poor man Marie is
talking of. One who seeks not the true wealth of heaven
through humility, but one who pursues the things of the
world through pride. Lanval has forsaken God in his cupidity,
his desire for worldly goods. And by mourning their absence,
he has put himself still further from his Redeemer. And it is ultimately his pride, his apostacy from God which makes him a spiritual pauper.

That these are the implications that Marie desired her reader to make is made clearer in the next lines. Marvel not at this, gentle sirs, she writes:

Hume estrange descunseillez
Mut est dolent en autre tere,
Quant il ne seit u sucurs quere.

This is not emotional empathy between Lanval, the foreign knight, and Marie, the poetess, who longed to return to France. For considered thus, the lines are curiously out of place when the poem is considered as a whole. Rather, these lines contain important spiritual implications which emphasize further Lanval's turning from God through pride.

Properly, all Christians are strangers in the world: "I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims to refrain yourselves from carnal desires which war against the soul" (Peter 2:11). Hugh of St. Victor echoes this thought: "All the world is a foreign soil to those whose native land should be heaven..."Therefore comes a time for scattering stones' (Eccle. 3:5), so that man may see that he has no stable dwelling here and may get used to withdrawing his mind and freeing it from the chains of earthly pleasure."
John of Salisbury, a contemporary of Hugh's, writes that Philosophy exacts a sojourn in a foreign land, but that she does not feel the burden of this exile because she drives away the worried of the flesh "with the result that the man entirely devoted. . .to the spirit regards as foreign all that impedes the progress of wisdom."\(^{27}\) And the Christian escapes from this temporary sojourn "by loving God. . .and by loving their neighbour."\(^{28}\) Marie is employing here an irony which now becomes understandable. Though all men are strangers in a strange land, none are helpless for they can turn towards God who will lead them to their rightful home among the elect. But Lanval, who has turned from God in his pride, ignores this help which is offered to all men.

Just as Lanval is not the true pauper, neither is he the true pilgrim of Christ. The direction of a man's journey is dependent on the kind of love that moves his will. Those who trust in Charity bring peace to the mind, to society and to the "Celestial city where its radiance is all-pervasive." Those who trust in cupidity, like Lanval, however, foster upon the individual mind and society a Babylonian confusion which leads ultimately to eternal damnation.\(^{29}\) Just as the true Christian possesses a fatherland in the heavens, "the reprobate have their fatherland here, for which they long
for, and therefore they will be banished into everlasting exile, having the need of pleasure." The wandering elect have a fatherland in the future and the less they delight in the transitory joys of lust, the more future joys will they reap without end and reign with Christ unto eternity. But these false men have a fatherland but only know that they desire the things which are desired and likewise, after this life, are regulated into perpetual exile. So that they who care for every pleasure suffer adversely in torment.30

Thus, Lanval is not only a stranger in the physical sense, but a spiritual exile as well from his "true country," just as he is not only materially poor, but also a spiritual pauper. He has forsaken God and forgotten the Celestial City where the one and only King "rejoices in the presence of his citizens, not in their expulsion."31 Lanval has forgotten his true nature and allowed concupiscent passions to control his reason. And his plight is his own responsibility. No one is expelled from the Heavenly Kingdom except through his own volition.32 By setting his heart on the wealth and fame which he hoped to harvest in Arthur's service, he has lost his freedom of will and become a slave to Fortune. True freedom is a spiritual possession and cannot be controlled by external events. It is maintained by reason and lost when reason is abandoned. Thus, in subjecting himself to Fortune
through his pursuit of temporalia, Lanval is subjecting himself to vices. He has wandered away from the true good in search of worldly satisfactions. For the reason should be subjected to God, and "sensuality" or worldly pleasure should be subjected to the reason.33 "The very self that has been obeyed," writes St. Augustine, "when he [Man] sinned is now become a tyrant to torment and, in place of the liberty he longed for, he had to live in the misery of servitude."34

Hence, in joining Arthur's court to pursue fame and wealth Lanval has turned from the true path. And seeking these false worldly satisfactions he has abandoned his reason. Through his cupidity he has lost his free will so that when adversity strikes, and when Arthur neglects to bestow bounty on him, he is unable to avoid offending God in his sorrow. Had he maintained his faith in providence he would know that he had nothing of value when Fortune was with him nor that he had lost nothing now that she had deserted him.35 His departure from reason is a corruption of the image of God. He is no longer a man but a beast.36 John of Salisbury writes of those for whom the darkness of worldly success, implacable foe of virtue, has clouded the truth from their minds. "The light of reason is extinguished, and the whole being is carried headlong into the abyss of destruction." Thus the
creature of reason becomes a brute (Ps. 47:21); thus the image of the Creator is transformed into a beast by virtue of similarity of character; thus man degenerates and falls from his pinnacle having become like to vanity (Ps. 143:4) because, "swollen with pride, pride has destroyed his understanding." 37

Lanval is no longer a man, seeking the true good of heaven but a beast who strives after the vanity of this world. In his pride he has joined the proud court of Arthur and he offends God when he mourns his poverty after Arthur grants him nothing. This interpretation is supported by the passage where Marie pities Lanval as a stranger in the land. For unless it is understood on the allegorical level it is inconsistent with the rest of the poem, even on a literal level.

This degradation and departure from reason is pitiable enough. But those who burn with the spirit of cupidity need the pity which restores spiritual freedom and not their dignity nor their purse. 38 Thus St. Gregory instructs those who would give to the poor to give only what they require and ask for with humility, what is begged for, not from desire but from necessity, "for it is to be henceforth very full of pride, to desire anything beyond the limits of want. 39 Marie, though she seems to be asking for pity on
Lanval because he is a foreigner who has lost his wealth, is really asking for pity because he is a stranger from the Kingdom of God. Through his pride he has sought after vain and transitory pleasures. And in the pursuit of these *temporalia* he has surrendered his free will, making his reason subject to his passions. Lanval has become one who subjects himself to the whims of Fortune and she has three followers: the lecherous, the avaricious and the proud. Now that Marie has shown conclusively, if we have read allegorically, that Lanval is subject to pride, she will continue her lai to show how this proud man falls victim to all the sins which the proud man succumbs to.

Lanval, despairing from unsatiated *luxuria*, "munta sur sun destrer/ Si s'est alez esbaneer" (41-2). Alanus, in his *Distinctiones*, writes that "they are asleep who mounted horses. Those who trust in the honor of the present life shut up the mind of the soul in death from the light of truth."⁴⁰ This deliberate avoidance of truth is also characteristic of those who suffer from *tristidia* and spiritual sloth which go hand in hand with *luxuria* or cupidity.⁴¹ Melancholy is the anxiety of a troubled mind arising from the will's frustration by adverse affairs, and is a loathing of doing good well and performing good works.⁴²
This spiritual sloth (acedia) prevents good works, disturbs the mind, and puts on the delinquent person a destructive despair of the soul. It proceeds from loss of money or worldly melancholy and from the scorn and contempt of the divine precepts, both of which faults, Lanval is guilty. And that Lanval rides off alone shows that he has no desire to alter his condition, for those who wish to escape the pangs of damning sloth rejoice in the spiritual joy of brotherly association and the exercise of holy works or trust in conversation with good men. But Lanval desires succor from none, preferring solitary tristidia to the joy of brotherhood in God.

He rides until he approaches an "ewe courant." This suggests the temporal water of cupidity, the rivers of Babylon (Ps. 136:1) about which St. Augustine says that they symbolize all that is loved or transitory in the world. Lanval wishes to cross the river and avoid the dangers but his horse was fearful and trembling. The horse was commonly allegorized as the flesh or passions. Thus Rabanus warns: "Equus libidinosus, quidibet, ut in Psalmis 'Nolite fieri sicunt equus et mulus' (Ps. 31:9), id est nolite luxuriosi et infractusi." Bede also warns man not to be likened unto "a horse or mule, that is irrationable and ungovernable. . . horses and mules
have no intellect, that is reason to you." Thus Lanval, in his sloth, is unable to control his libidinous cravings and avoid the waters of cupidity. The reasonable man should control his cravings, but Lanval has vanquished his free will and abandon his reason through pride.

Also, one of the characteristics of the slothful man is idleness, an idleness which makes him lazy in the pursuit of prayers, good works or wisdom. This idle man grows sluggish in carnal desires. He finds no happiness in the salvation of the soul, but only desires and craves. Through his pride and luxuria Lanval has become the slothful man. The cupidinous waters and the meadow suggest a false paradise of earthly delights, a forerunner, though less iconographically detailed, of Ameonitas or the garden of Deduit, a paradise which becomes more identifyable when Marie introduces the pucele's tent. Just as the dreamer in the Roman de la Rose gains entrance to Deduit through its porter, Oisuse, or Idleness, Lanval's idleness perverts his will and renders him incapable of escaping the river. Idleness is an invitation to the devil for it is more difficult to tempt a man caught up in good works. But Ovid also has something to say on this subject. For those who wish to avoid the pangs of love, he advises in his Remedia Amoris, "first of all shun
leisure. . . .Take away leisure and Cupid's bow is broken."48 Though this kind of love, illicit and damnable, is exhibited by Lanval in his desire for worldly goods, it also suggests cupidinous sexual love. And Lanval, in his perturbed state of mind, will be unable to resist those fleshy temptations which delight the sinful man but are abhored by the fellowship of the just.

Failing to cross the stream, Lanval descends and, using his mantle as a pillow, attempts to fall asleep. "Mut est pensis pur sa mesaise/II ne veit chose ke li plaise"(51-52). Lanval cannot sleep because of his unfilled desire for the slothful are ever without peace. Sleep is the quies vitae which intimates for the faithful the source of the true rest.49 He is unable to do "what he wishes" because he is full of sorrowful imaginings and does not desire the contemplation of spiritual things. Those who are slothful through despair of worldly goods should conquer their melancholy through spiritual gladness and meditation and by thoughts on the hope of future goods (spiritual), and by the consolation which is gained by reading Scripture.50 But Lanval's conscience is burdened with pensive thoughts and he is unable to sleep. Alanus, commenting on the symbolic sense of "bed" writes: "Just as in bed the sick man labors, the healthy man
is at peace."51 Lanval's will is again thwarted. Once more he shows that he is less than a man because he is no longer controlled by his reason.

In this state of unrest and spiritual misease Lanval looks up and sees two maidens approach from the river. Both are richly clad and they approach him directly. The elder sets before him a gold basin, while the other offers him a linen towel. They request that he accompany them and return to their mistress who desires to speak with Lanval. He readily complies and, as they go, Lanval sees a pavilion which is valuable beyond description and so precious that the most fabuously wealthy people can barely begin to afford it. None of the critics who have dealt with Lanval have ever attempted to justify the seeming inconsistency of the pucele, her equipage and her tent, in all their splendor and magnificence, appearing almost out of nowhere. Though recognizing that it may be partly attributed to the donnée of the supernatural Celtic legend, find it more plausible that Marie is conveying much which can be found to be valuable doctrinal import. It is questionable, also, whether Lanval's "amie" can justifiably be called a fee, as all of the critics have unhesitatingly assumed. Marie never calls her a fee, and there is only meager proof that Valon is necessarily
populated by fairies alone. The specific fairy references do not occur until the Middle English Lavendall, which was written about 160 years after Marie's lai. How then are we to understand allegorically this maiden who is usually considered an ideal lover?

A first hint occurs in the description of the pavilion. Marie writes that neither Semiramis, whatever her wealth and power, nor Octovien could have paid for even one of the tent flaps (82-86). Octovien is Augustus, whose riches became as proverbial as the wisdom of Solomon. The legend of Croesus was transferred to him. Croesus is the mythical king who administered to himself a draught of molten gold which ends his life. And Marie's use of Octovien suggests Lanval's despair over his financial condition. Just as Croesus suffered physical death because of his lust for money, Lanval's avarice will lead to a spiritual death. But the name Semiramis is much rarer.

In classical times Semiramis had been famous for her military and architectural exploits. But in the Middle Ages she was renowned for her luxuria, and best known for her sexual perversions. Semiramis was the wife of Ninus, King of Assyria. Ninus, in whose reign, 3184 years after Adam, Abraham was born, was moved by a lust for power and waged war
throughout Asia during his fifty-two blood-soaked years. During the siege of the city of Zoroaster he was slain and Semiramis succeeded to the throne. She restored Babylon, which Nimrod had founded and for forty-two years continued the bloody conquests of her husband, and was truly the empress of "many tonuges." For the rest of her life she was devoted to luxuria: "Burning with desire, thirsting for blood among unceasing debaucheries and murders, since she was killing all those whom she summoned royally, but whorishly treated and delighted with copulation; finally, when her son had been ignominously conceived, wickedly exposed, and incestuously known, this woman hid the private disgrace with a public crime. For she ordered that between parents and offspring there would be no reverence of nature offered concerning the seeking of marriages, in order that it (incest), became free to whomever it was pleasing."53 Dracontius wrote in De Laudibus Dei: "This woman, when widowed of her husband Ninus, was the first of leaders to invade the kingdom and chambers of a loved child: wretched one, she revealed a mother of incestuous heart and was most shamefully wife to her son, mother-in-law to herself.54 And the troubadour poet Arnaute de Mareuil, in expressing the "force of his love to his dame," claims that his love is stronger than the loves of Biblis,
Blancflors, Tibes, Leyda, Elena, bel Ysseulz and Semiramis, all famous for their sexual prowess in the twelfth century. Part of Semiramis' reputation can be attributed to her being taken as a symbol gathered together from the sordid associations of Assyria, Nineveh and Babylon. Abraham was born and lived during the reign of Ninus and his consort. And as they were contemporary with the seeds of a holy race, and yet not part of it, they became the pagans of the civitas mundi just as Abraham founded the civitatis Dei. Babylon is the city of confusion and chaos of a world without Christ. Historically Babylon is a city. In Rabanus' Allegoriae in sacram scriptoram, however, it appears allegorically as the church of the Gentiles; analogically as Hell; topologically as the corrupt spirit. And those who reside in Babylon are those who love temporalia. Otto of Freising has stated the difference of the two cities most succinctly: "Since there are two cities, the one temporal, the other eternal, the one mundane, the other celestial, the one of the devil, the other of Christ...this one is Babylon, that one Jerusalem." St. Augustine, in contrasting the two cities, writes that one is the love of God as opposed to cupidinous love: "Duas istas civitates faciunt duo amores: Jerusalem facit amor Dei, Babylonia facit amor saeculi." And he advises
that those who find themselves citizens of Babylon should root out cupidty and implant charity. This is sound advice, but Lanval, if he is aware of it, ignores it for cupidity is strongly implanted in his heart.

Semiramis' relation to Babylon, the *civitatis mundi*, has obvious significance for Lanval's pursuit of things of the world. Also, Marie's reference to a woman, infamous for her sexual perversions and closely connected with Babylon, a city whose citizens are damned with the curse of the just, may give some insight into how the *pucele* is to be understood. The beautiful vestments and magnificent riches of the maiden strike Lanval with wonder, just as St. John was stricken with wonder at the resplendent whore of the *Apocalypse*, the *filia Babylonis* of Psalm 136. First, there is a similarity between the clothing of the pucele and that of the Whore: "And the woman was clothed round about with purple and scarlet" (Apoc. 17:4). The pucele is described as wearing a mantle of ermine "coverd de purpre alexandrine" (102). The whore's clothing signifies for the commentators the allurements of falsehood, particularly such allurements as are concerned with royalty. The *Glossa ordinaria* says that kings deck themselves in royal garments to deceive. Rupert writes that purple is the royal fashion, and designates the kings of the world, or
pride. "How much vanity there is in the royal deportment of the proud," who are outwardly beautifully decorated but inwardly are "full of sores because of loose desires."\textsuperscript{61} This clothing is contrasted to the simple, unadorned linen with which the blessed are clothed. St. Martin of Lyons writes that these vestments are spiritual: "id est innocentium in baptismo acceptam et charitatem et caeteras virtutes."\textsuperscript{62} Thus, the pucele's clothing is symbolic of temporal concerns, which are deceptively furnished with external beauty that hides the decay and corruption which is found inside.

Also, though her state of undress prevents her from being "gilt with gold, and precious stones and pearls," (Apoc. 17:4), the splendor and richness of her silk and golden pavilion serve the same symbolic purpose. Rupert says of these riches that they are "the riches of woman. . . . the fruits of false and deceiving human cupidity." Human presumption, not seeking its own beauty outside itself and unable to change its nature" wraps itself with yellow gold and precious stones, and pearls, sometimes filthy with mange and ghastly leprosy."\textsuperscript{63} Bede also discusses the "poison stink in gold, that is a beast lying under the outward appearance of a whore."\textsuperscript{64} The "aigle d'or" which the pucele has before her tent, though not connected with the whore specifically,
conveys similar allegorical significance. This eagle is the
eagle of Ezekiel 17:4 and signifies Nebuchadrezzar, King of
Babylon. This eagle, writes Rabanus, signifies the king of
power which is full of the various deceits of worldly glory.
It makes a hostage of Jerusalem and leads out all the cap-
tured people.  In other words, it too is symbolic of the
false allurements of temporalia and has a specific connection
with Babylon.

Also, the pucele's maidens approach Lanval from the
river, which suggests the river of Babylon, and they offer
him a golden basin. This basin may suggest the golden cup
"full of abominations and the uncleanness of her fornica-
tion" (Apoc. 17:4) which the whore carries. This cup repre-
sents hypocrisy, or the beauty of outward appearance which
covers up every kind of filth. Rupert finds that the cup has
no other purpose than as a vehicle for the whore to offer her
drink to all passers-by. "What, however, is her drink except
error and forgetfulness, by which the senses of man recede
from God, besmeared with the allurements of vices?. . .And
it is the whole fruit or effect of cupidity to undermine
snareable man and to overwhelm completely his senses, so that
he fornicates away from God with mind and body, handed over
in the spirit of idolatry, subdued in the whole body by un-
cleanliness and all the passions igrominy." The woman
possessed the golden cup to deceive and to seduce more easily the desirous and ambitious eyes of men."\(^{66}\) And in just such a manner is Lanval approached by the pucele's maidens so that he is allured by the poisonous stink of riches to succumb to the maiden.

The beauty of this woman is as alluring as her vestments and her gold. She is likened to "Fur de lis \([e]\) rose nuvele"\(^{(94)}\). The use of the rose to typify fading beauty was common in the Middle Ages. Also, because of the use of roses in Wisdom 2:8 these flowers were associated with luxuria, the sweet pleasure and enjoyments of the present life. Fulgentius says that the rose blushes and pricks with its thorns just as the libido blushes with the shame and pricks of sin; and like the libido, quickly fades in time.\(^{67}\) St. Jerome describes the transient flower as symbolic of the beauty of a girl: "Pulchra mulier que adulescentorum. . .fasticidio est. . .Expiccata est igitur. . .permaneat in aesternum."\(^{68}\) This transitory beauty is contrasted to the beauty of the Virgin which is eternal. Also, her beauty is not merely physical, but connotes spiritual and moral beauty. In the beauty of the Virgin is reflected the humility and chastity which is more beautiful than her external grace.\(^{69}\)

Also, as the pucele has her tent by a river, this
harlot sits on many waters (Apoc. 17:1), that is, in the waters of cupidity she performs her ravishings. Lanval finds himself in a worldly paradise magnificently resplendent with the allurements of the flesh and quite similar to Ameonitas. And as he was admitted by idleness and lack of will to this "amoenitas," so his lack of reason and obeisance to his passions will render him helpless to resist the temptations which are offered him. The pucele calls Lanval to her tent and offers him:

Se vus estes pruz e curteis,
Emperere ne quens ne reis
N'ot unkes tant joie ne bien;
Kar jo vus aim sur tute rien.

(113-116)

The riches which she offers have been shown to be the fruits of false and deceiving human cupidity, the hypocritical presumption of beauty underlying a cankerous abomination. And the joy is the temporary joy of worldly pleasure, which the Christian accepts at the loss of eternal joy. Were Lanval still a man, still in possession of his reason he would be horrified at these offerings, for he would recognize the same temptations which felled Adam but which Christ overcame. The temptation of Adam and the temptation of Christ in the Wilderness were found to be parallel and to consist of an appeal to the same three weaknesses which the proud fall heir to. The classic statement of this concept may be found in one of
the homilies of St. Gregory which is quoted by Peter Lombard
in the Sententiae: "The Ancient Enemy raised himself in three
temptations against our first parents, for he tempted them
with gluttony, vainglory and avarice. And in tempting he was
triumphant, for he made them subject to his through consent.
. . . . But in the same way that he topped the first man, he
lay subdued before the second." 70 Lanval chooses to follow
Adam rather than Christ, who paved the way for mankind to
reap the bounty of eternal reward. By accepting, Lanval shows
himself gluttonous or cupidinous because he desires an earthly
love rooted in carnality rather than the charitable love of
God; covetous or avaricious as he chooses great possessions
and riches over the Christian wealth of good works, and vain-
glorious for he prefers earthly joy to the eternal reward of
heaven. And just as for Adam, the beginning of Lanval's sin
was pride, an inordinate exaltation which cuts the self off
from its true Source. 71 In making the choice of Adam, rather
than of Christ, Lanval has chosen the path to eternal damnation
rather than the way to eternal salvation. To refuse
the whore is not in itself a great positive virtue, but to
accept her is a vice which bars the receiver from Christ.

Lanval, however, has consistently showed scorn and
contempt for the commandments of God, a characteristic of
those who have lost the ability to control their passions through pride. He listens to her offer:

Il l'esgarga, si la vit bele;  
Amurs le punt de l'estencl;  
Que sun quor alume e esprent.  
(117-119)

The "spark" which burns in the Book of Ecclesiasticus (9.9) and in the description of Libido in the Psychomachia of Prudentius now burns in Lanval. John of Salisbury says of this fire: To caress the body of others and burn with lust for woman is akin to madness. All that any of the senses strive for is mere jest and mockery in comparison to that which this frenzy brings."72 Lanval's acceptance of the offer, his yielding to temptation, recalls Ecclus. 10:10: "There is not a more wicked thing than to love money; for such a one setteth even his soul to sale." That this applies to Lanval becomes even more apparent at the end of the lai. Also, the alacrity with which Lanval accepts this offer of love meets with stern condemnation from Ailred of Riveaulx: "This friendship (amicitia) therefore is not undertaken after deliberation, nor approved by critical judgement nor ruled by reason; but it is born through various circumstances according to the impulse of the state of mind (affectionis), keeping no limit, respecting no morals, viewing nothing as useful or
useless; but proceeding to all limits without thinking, without judging, without seriousness, without moderation. 

Lanval regards the pucele, he sees that she is beautiful, and his heart is enflamed with love. This is not a description of charitable love which is rational but cupidinous love which is ruled by the passions. And it involves a similar progression in Andreas which is indicated by the terms visio, cogitatio, passio. This kind of love suggests a well-known biblical verse which involves the concept of vision in a similar manner: "But I say to you, that whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Matt. 5:28). The commentators on this verse furnish both the pattern of behavior and the resultant passio. Bede writes: "Quie viderit mulierim et ejus anima fuerit titillate, hic propassione per cursus est; qui autem delectatione consensum praebuerit, de propassionem transit; et sic tribus gradibus prevenitur ad peccatum, suggestione, delectatione, consensu." He who looks at a woman in a certain way is open to "suggestion." If the suggestion is accepted and pleasurable the result is propassio. And if the reason consents to the delight, the result is passio. Augustine, borrowing from Cicero, defines passio as "motus animi contra rationem," an act which is no
longer foreign to Lanval. The consent of reason is as it were an unreasonable act of reason or a corruption of the rational process; just as John of Salisbury writes that "it is hard to love wisely as to be rationally insane."\textsuperscript{77} Bede goes on to say, however, that the process represents the step toward sin, not toward adultery or fornication, but toward any sin. The sexual act which is implied on the literal level was taken to represent sin in general. The \textit{Glossa ordinaria} defines \textit{fornicatio} as "idolatry. . .when Scripture so constantly calls idolatry fornication. . .who would doubt that every evil of those in concupiscence is called a fornication. . .since there is corruption of the soul, as it were for reward. . .by the evil will of the lower natures."\textsuperscript{78} If fornication means sin in general, what should be understood by \textit{mulerium}? John of Scot writes: "Qui viderit mulierum. . . forsooth giving generally the name 'woman' to the beauty of all sensible creatures."\textsuperscript{79} The false sensual beauty of the world, first apparent to man when Eve looked around her after eating the forbidden fruit, may be spoken of figuratively as the beauty of woman. Thus, in the consummation of his love ("s'amur e sun cors li otreie" 133) Lanval commits fornication on the literal level, the only sin which stains both body and soul.\textsuperscript{80} But he also shows that he is devoted
to concupiscence and the delight of earthly beauty. The commentators who have written on *Apocalypse* echo this thought. Of this whore St. John writes: that she is one "with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication; and they who inhabit the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her whoredom" (Apoc. 17:2). Bede says that the multitude are lost from the Creator since they prostrate themselves to be ravished by daemons. Opposed to these, however, are the believers who have "all one heart and one spirit." Concerning those who fornicate with this whore he writes that they are proudly seeking the things of earth. "These inhabitants (and kings) the temptations of their time ravish with the lust for vices and make drunk with an insanity of the soul."81 "By fornicating," writes Rupert, "they become drunk with the cupidity of this world. . .those who are drunk with wine lose the power of discretion and do and say everything devoid of reason." Those who bow to the earth through cupidity are blind to the true God in heaven, "and they dream that the power of the Divinity is in their idols."82 Thus Lanval becomes drunk with earthly pleasure, and in his blindness he neither loves God nor fears the punishment of hell. He has passed through the three-fold progression toward sin and the weakness of his reason is powerless to prevent him from
granting both his body and his soul to a most detestable prostitute.

Lanval's acceptance of and participation in concupiscent desire, not only on the sexual level, but concerning all mundane goods, has other serious implications. Lanval replies to the pucele's offer:

Que vus me vousissez amer,
Ne savriez rien comander
Que jeo ne face a mien poeir,
Turt a folie u a saveir.
Jeo f[er] ai noz commandemenz.
(123-127)

He has surrendered himself to the commands of a woman. And though one of Andreas' suitors lists as one of the chief rules of love as "being obedient in all things to the commands of ladies," Scripture says: "Give not the power of thy soul to a woman, lest she enter upon thy strength and thou be confounded. . . .Give not thy soul to harlots" (Ecclus. 9:2, 6). This external submission to the pucele recalls not only Adam's submission to Eve, but tropologically, it represents the submission of the reason to "sensuality," a pattern which every mortal sinner was said to follow. Adam, Eve, and the serpent represent respectively higher reason (superior rationis portio), lower reason (inferior rationis portio), and the motion of the senses. When an individual is properly
oriented, there exists a "marriage" between the higher reason and the lower reason so that the higher reason is in a position to protect the soul from bestial motions. The senses offer the lower reason "fruit," that is, they tempt it. If the lower reason accepts, the result is "delectatio cogitationis" or pleasing thought on the attractiveness of worldly pleasures. When the lower reason accepts, it offers it to the higher reason, which, if accepted, causes the individual to fall as Adam before him. The higher reason is that part of the reason which perceives the Laws of God and its end is sapientia. The higher reason should see to it that the scientia, the concern of the lower reason, is directed toward the fulfillment of God's laws and not to the satisfaction of the flesh. A mortal sin, that is, a passio for any worldly good, is the corruption or perversion of a "marriage" since the "woman" becomes dominant over the "man," when the higher reason submits to the lower. And this submission is called fornicatio, or idolatry which consists of caring more for the things of the world than for God.85

Thus Marie has shown Lanval's descent into mortal sin which operates on several levels. Not only does he readily, joyously yield to the temptations of one who suggests the Whore of Babylon and fornicated with her, but this fornication
involves the concupiscent lust of all worldly goods with a resulting idolatry. Also, Lanval's submission to his "amie," while it coincides with the rules of "courtly love" and the prescriptions of Andreas' lover, is a direct violation of Scripture. But this submission can also be understood tropologically with relation to Lanval's soul. Not only has he lusted after carnal pleasures but he has consciously and willfully perverted his reason and made it subject to the flesh. And this servitude to the flesh is a surrendering of the free will which is man's only way of avoiding the ravages of Fortune and journeying toward God. For all who give themselves up to cupidity are in bondage. Those who submit to the temptations of the flesh, says St. Ambrose, are the true servants; "that one is master who did not endure the fiery love of the woman, who did not experience the bonds of the pander...who preferred to die free of sin that to choose association with a sinful force. He is free who believed not in returning shame in place of grace."\textsuperscript{86} The human soul is most free when engaged in the contemplation of the divine mind, but Lanval, who was unable to enjoy the sleep of this contemplation before, is even less able now to experience joyful contemplation now. And the human soul is in utter slavery when it loses possession of its reason and
consents wholly to vice. It becomes captive of its own free-
dom. True Christian love enters through the reason, not
through the eyes "since death does indeed enter through the
windows of the eye when one takes delight in the shapely
forms of women, the sparkle of gems, gorgeous raiment, pre-
cious metals." Lanval shows that he has no desire to re-
tain the freedom that he lost when he mourned the loss of
his Fortune. He has dedicated himself to become a true follow-
er of Fortune, and therefore a confirmed idolater.

Marie emphasizes these considerations when she des-
cribes the feast. Here Lanval is given the false rewards of
fleshy desire. Here he is feasted with food and drink in
abundance. But Lanval now prefers, more than food or drink,
the tender kisses of his love. He prefers, more than money
or feasting, those sexual delights which are most dangerous
to body and soul. Sexual excitement does not merely invade
the outward members of the body but takes passionate domi-
nation of the whole man, both physically and emotionally. Thus,
at the moment of crisis, this passion paralyzes the power of
deliberate thought. When in the grasp of continual crises,
one cannot turn toward God, but thinks only of the present
delights. And this tends more toward idolatry, the longer
it is pursued.
The pucele also forbids Lanval to discover their love to any other person on penalty of losing her friendship. This, of course demanded of those who engage in cupidinuous love, not because "l'amour courtois" demands discretion but because "wherever sexual passion is at work it feels ashamed of itself." Even between husband wife, continues St. Augustine, or in houses of prostitution, the sexual act requires darkness and secrecy. The reason for this is lust's tyranny, and it is this tyranny which makes men ashamed. This is rightly so because there is an inward rebellion, "for lust is a usurper, defying the power of the will and playing tyrant." The soul can not control itself to be free from lust for it controls the body in defiance of the will. "Our soul is ashamed because our body, which by its own lower nature is subject to the soul, defies higher nature." Aside from thematic considerations, there is an important doctrinal point to be recognized. It is doubtful that the pucele is ashamed for herself, being subject to the father of lechery. But perhaps she fears that should Lanval's folly become widespread throughout Arthur's court, he will be shamed into recognizing who his "amie" is and be moved to perform righteous actions.

Now it is time to depart. Supper has been concluded and Lanval is satiated with physical pleasures and granted
valuable gifts. Lanval mounts his horse, richly decorated with costly trappings, and heads back to town. But Lanval, who should be rejoicing because he has all that he craved, is unhappy and afraid.

Suvent esgarde ariere sei;
Mut est Lanval en grant esfrei;
De s'aventure vait pensaunt
E en sun curage dotaunt;
Esbaiz est, ne seit que creir [e],
Il ne la quide mie a veir [e].
(195-200)

This fear that Lanval has is the fear which all cupidinous lovers suffer. A lover is always in fear that his love may not gain its desire or he feels that his poverty or lack of beauty may cause the woman of his affection to scorn him. But even after love has been granted the fears that arise are great for the lover feels that what has been aquired may be easily lost, and it is worse to lose what one has than what one merely desires. Clearly, a love which involves such continuous and incurable anxiety is not very reasonable. The fact that cupidity is always accompanied by fear, even if it is successful, is a medieval commonplace. There are two fears associated with the two loves. Peter Lombard writes that charity, that is the love of God and his holy fear, leads to every good. But cupidinous love is always accompanied by the fear of earthly misfortune. "Each love burns, each love
humbles," but cupidinous love takes one away from God, for he fears losing that which is of the world and he sacrifices the eternal joys of heaven for the fears of earth. 93

This suffering, Andreas continues, does not rise from external actions, but comes about "only from the reflection of the mind upon what it sees. . . . This inborn suffering comes, therefore, from seeing and meditating." But not every kind of meditation can cause this suffering; it must be excessive, for a restrained thought does not rule the mind. 94 To be a good lover, Lanval must turn his reason completely away from God and recognize as divine only corporeal images. Then the soul commits fornication, sinning against itself. 95 Acts of fornication of this kind lead to idolatry, in which the corporeal image becomes more important than anything else on earth. Lanval is becoming an idolater, for no sooner does he leave his "amie" then he begins to fear that he will never see her again, in spite of her promise to attend him whenever he desires, as long as he is alone. He is beginning the excessive meditation in which the lecherous man turns his carnal desire into mortal sin. Thus, she has already become so important to him that her physical absence can make Lanval fear for her loss. And this is idolatry. This theme, the three temptations that the proud man succumbs to, becomes
the scriptural basis for the second part of Marie's lai. In his pride Lanval has turned away from God and concerned himself with the transitory pleasures of this life. In this weakened condition he is tempted as Adam and Christ before him were tempted. But Lanval falls before the delights of the flesh and casts his lot with Adam, refuting Christ who redeemed mankind by his repudiation of these sins. The rest of the poem will carry this theme to its ultimate conclusion. St. Augustine says that man does not reach the lowest degradation of the human soul at once, but by degrees when the senses and lower reason gain control over the higher reason and turn its thoughts away from God, towards a false divinity in corporeal pleasures. This fornication becomes more and more confirmed in Lanval, and in the end he is completely vanquished by the originator of all fornication, the Devil. Of those taken in by lust or depraved love St. Augustine writes "that delight at once blinds them, that they dare not tear away their love thence and apply it to profitable objects." This failure to despise lust and turn toward God comes from not recognizing the true good because these fornicators have turned themselves over to the lust in their hearts. Marie will demonstrate this in the rest of the poem, while showing how Lanval is guilty of avarice, vainglory and lechery.
Lanval returns to his lodging and discovers that his fear was unnecessary, that what had occurred was real. He fairs richly and generously bestows gifts on all.

Lanval donout les riches duns,
Lanval aquitout les prisuns,
Lanval veseit les jugleurs,
Lanval feseit les granz honurs.
N'i ot estrange ne privé
A ki Lanval n'eust doné.

(209-214)

This generosity appears on the surface to be a virtuous action and on which Lanval, based on his previous spiritual weakness, seems ill-suited to make. But this generosity is not a true virtue, rather it is that liberality of lovers which Andreas' suitor commends; "Thou shalt avoid avarice like to deadly pestilence and shalt embrace its opposite." But the irony here is that for the lover, the opposite of avarice is not generosity but prodigality: "For love inevitably forces a man to give without regard to what he should give and what he should not; and this is not generosity, but...prodigality, a vice which sacred Scripture teaches us is a mortal sin" (Luke 15:18,21). Prodigality is not despising money, it is only being ordered about by other passions; it is not a contempt of money, but not knowing how to spend it properly. He who spends his money on fit objects is a man of high soul, who accounts money to be nothing and is not enslaved to his
passions. But he who has sumptuous banquets, harlots and parasites is enslaved and subject to gluttony, flattery and a desire for inordinate pleasure. The more he spends, the more exclusively is lust a master over him.100 Lanval does not discriminate with his gifts; his recipients are all those whom he sees. Nor does he give to the poor or widows only but wastes his money on clothing, jugeleurs, and rich feasts. A virtue, to be a true virtue and not a honey-coated vice, must have both officium et finis, function and end, "that the work be directed to God and be done in charity."

Lanval's so-called generosity is not directed toward God but toward the praise of men and it is prodigality because of its unworthy purpose. The prodical is one who fails to discern between use and abuse.103 They abuse their wealth, even in giving because they do not dispense it charitably, before God. And this should be especially applicable to followers of the king's law which should reflect divine law.

In giving alms Scripture advise, "Ne sciat sinistra quid faciat dextra" (Matt. 6:3), do not let the left hand know what the right hand is doing. That is Bede informs us, do not let the intention of fulfilling divine precepts be concerned with the delight of human praise. And alms which are given not in secret, but openly so that not a good
conscience is discovered but merely good acts, are not charitable. Augustine, in his commentary on this passage, also advises that alms should be given privately so that the reward comes from God and not from man. Those who give openly do not give in their conscience; they bestow wealth but their hearts are empty of charity. Thus, they are hypocrites, for they "flaunt before the eyes of men" what they do not entertain in the heart. Even hypocrites can be rewarded with human praise as long as they deceive those to whom they appear righteous; "but from God, the discerner of the heart, such men receive no recompense but the penalty of deceit."  

Lanval shows then, not true virtue but that hypocritic virtue which led Andreas to exclaim, "O what a wonderful thing is love, which makes a man shine with so many virtues," This is the false virtue of false love which Ailred finds also: "They falsely arrogate to themselves the distinguished name of love (amicitia), although among them is a conformity of vices. . . . From this it is deduced that they are boasting with the false name of love, and its false likeness and that it is not strengthened with truth. Notwithstanding, when in this kind of love, which lust pollutes and avarice deforms, or luxury defiles, is a sizeable amount of a kind of sweetness." And in this prodigality we see evidence of both
avarice and vainglory. For concupiscence of the eyes can exist in the giving as well as the desiring because of the enjoyment which is felt by displaying magnificence and great bounty. The mere pleasure which Lanval experiences in having this wealth to distribute is a sign of his avarice. Also, one who performs virtuous actions for which he credits not God but himself, and for which he desires the praise and glory of men while losing the glory of God must be accounted vainglorious. And Lanval gives not through charity but to gain the good opinion of his friends for his "largese."

But Gawain and his companions are not to be blamed for finding Lanval "largese et curteis." For only God can penetrate the hypocrite's veil of virtue and discover the corruption which lies underneath. Lanval's friends desire the pleasure of his company and request that he join them in the garden located beneath the queen's tower. This garden, though it lacks iconographic details, serves much the same significance as the earlier meadow where Lanval first met the pucele. It is a garden of earthly delights, a false paradise where the joys of fleshy love are engendered. Also, the idleness of the court and their desire for solace and amusement leads them beneath the queen's tower. This is not to imply that the entire court is seeking to engage in illicit
fornication or is guilty of luxuria, only that through idleness they have placed themselves in a situation where perilous possibilities may present themselves. This idea is made more clear when the queen descends with thirty of her most beautiful dameiseles to join the knights and are greeted with great joy. The queen has arranged the party so that she may be free to engage the attention on one whom she chooses and offer her love. In other words, she is encouraging illicit sexual activities by offering the opportunity for Arthur's knights to pair off with her maidens.

But Lanval has no desire for this sport. Like the lover who follows the God of Love's rules, he is "constantly and without intermission possessed by the thought of his beloved."107 Idlely, pensively, he draws apart from the gaiety of his companions and reflects on the pleasures which he will be accorded with his amie:

```
Que s'amie puist tenir,
Baiser, acoler e sentir;
L'autrui joie prise petit,
Si il nen ad le suen delit.
```

(255-258)

Lanval's excessive meditation recalls that of Andreas, in discussing the inborn suffering of those who burn for love. "He begins to think about the fashioning of a woman and to differentiate her limbs... and to pry into the secrets of
her body, and he desires to put each part of it to its full-
est use."\textsuperscript{108} Lanval, having already experienced these joys
can think only on returning to them again. He has perverted
that joy which should be found in God and obeying His command-
ments so that he can only find joy in the carnal embraces of
the flesh and in obeying the commands of his pucele. He has
reached the most fatal level of sin, that is, habit. He is
the confirmed idolater, who can experience pleasure only in
the physical embraces of his "amie," and who is otherwise
fearful that he will never enjoy those cupidinous delights
again.

But Lanval is not left long to meditate on the plea-
sures of future embraces. When the queen notices Lanval
walk aside she approaches him and offers her love. It should
be remembered that the queen's character is subordinate to
the thematic structure. She has no name, no physical traits,
no real emotions, but acts iconographically in a way pro-
scribed by the necessity of the allegorical plot. It is
wrong to consider her a person, even as it is wrong to con-
sider the pucele or even Lanval as a person. They are, rather,
iconographic representations, personifications as it were,
of spiritual and moral states and actions. Lanval replies
to her offer, "j'eo n'ai cur de vus amer" (270). He refuses
an adulterous liaison but shows himself entirely lacking in charity. Were he really interested in the queen's spiritual condition and desirous of curing her concupiscence he would advise her to turn her thoughts toward God and forget the unclean pleasures of the flesh. But he means only that he has no physical cure for her, that is, he will not fornicate with her. There are two ways of refusing a libidinous offering, charitably and vaingloriously. 109 Lanval, in his pride of life, in his glorious state of well-being, does not even consider helping the queen, but only in vaunting his own glory.

This glory which Lanval boasts is that of his "chastity." One of the chief rules of loves states that the lover should keep himself chaste for the one he loves. 110 Love makes the lover chaste, for he who has centered all his attention, even to idolatry, on one woman, can hardly thing of embracing another just as his faithfulness is the inverted faith of idolatry. Were Lanval really honorable and courteous he would have responded charitably to the queen, who is in need of spiritual guidance. But Lanval himself is so spiritually weak that he responds without thought, without reason. Because he has turned so far from God, he cannot even consider advising another to turn toward Him.
The queen, enraged at this refusal, accuses Lanval of sodomy. You hardly love these delights, and of women you have no desire: "Vallez avez bien afeitiez, / Ensemble od eus vus deduiiez" (280-281). This charge of homosexuality was quite serious in the twelfth century. In Scripture, the punishment for sodomy is death (Lev. 20:10), and the Fathers found it so abominable that they preferred not to discuss it. Lactantius writes that those who practice such abominable intercourse, which is against nature and God, are likened to the impious and parricides. And though the commandments of God do not trouble Lanval, those of Love do. Andreas says that between two persons of the same sex love may not exist because the partners would be unfit for practicing the acts natural to it. "Whatever nature forbids, love is ashamed to accept." This sexual perversion is often associated with the Britons and with Arthur's court. Geoffrey writes of Malgo, a brave, courageous and generous monarch who "made himself hateful to God, for he was given to the vice of homosexuality." The vice is peculiarly attributed to the Britons, perhaps because they claimed descent from the Trojans and this vice was associated with Ganymede, a Trojan. Also, this "crime against nature" was widespread among English and Norman patricians at the courts of
of William II and Robert of Normandy. St. Anselm and the other clergy railed against long hair, luxurious raiment, and general effeminacy, and he excommunicated offenders. Also, Anselm and Henry of Huntingdon make it clear that the vice was regarded as something new in England. 114

This imputation, against one who loves as strongly as Lanval, arouses grief and kindles his wrath in denial. He informs the queen that he loves and is loved by one so rich in state and beauty that her meanest maiden excels the queen. And in body, visage, upbringing and bounty none can surpass her. Lanval is still an irrational lover, for he does not look for virtues in his "amie," but shows a most insane idolatry because all that he sees is a physical image. Those who love reasonably love the virtue which is reflected in physical beauty, but the love of beauty alone is an abuse. Also, the pride which originally got Lanval into this spiritually precarious situation flares up again. The proud man "is prompt to revenge an insult. For he who is proud cannot bear to be insulted even by his superiors much less his inferiors." 115

And if this is true of Lanval, it is equally true of
the queen. She flees to her chamber weeping, wrathful and
dolorous because of the words that had besmirched her. Not
only does she seek revenge, because of her pride, but her
tears are just as much caused by her inability to win Lanval's
love. This bitterness and grief is characteristic of all the
cupidinous, for they mourn what they are unable to possess.

In her thirst for revenge the queen inverts the truth
and tells the king that Lanval has sought her love. Arthur
becomes infuriated and threatens Lanval with death. This
incident bears a remarkable resemblance to the Old Testament
story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife (Genesis 39). Also, in
Queen Mary's Psalter (14th century) it is not the lascivious
wife of Potiphar but Pharaoh's queen who offers herself to
Joseph while Pharaoh is hunting. Joseph responds that "il
ne fera mie," and the queen, after unravelling her hair and
tearing her petticoat, tell the sergeant that Joseph had tried
to rape her.¹¹⁶ But there is one fundamental difference in
the stories, a difference which would not have escaped Marie's
audience. Joseph replies to his temptress that he cannot com-
ply with her wants because of his gratitude to his master,
because of her position as wife and because it would be a sin
in God's eyes. Lanval, paralleling Joseph's first two re-
plies, refuses because he does not wish to break his troth
with his lord. But where Joseph finds a sin against God, Lanval, who is apostate from God, does not even consider God's commandments. He can only boast that he loves and is loved. In other words, Joseph, who is a precursor of Christ, refuses to sin against God: Lanval uses a sin against God as a means of revenging his wounded pride. Rabanus says that Joseph is Christ and the woman is the Synagogue who fornicated with strange Gods. She wanted to hold Christ in the sin of her adultery so that he would deny that he was God. Christ, however, not acquiescing to the illicit doctrine of adultery, stripped himself of his garment, that is his flesh, and ascended to heaven. Lanval, unlike Joseph and Christ does not refuse the adulterous doctrine but tries to find refuge behind it. For him there will be no ascent to the freedom and eternal joy of heaven. Again Marie utilizes the analogy of heresy in Lanval's action. This is not to imply that he is a heretic, in the sense that he actively preaches false doctrines. But his life is one of the most vile untruth, for he has chosen to follow the path of the devil, falling from God's grace because of his pride.

Lanval returns grief-striken to his room. Because of his bragging he has lost his "amie." And though he must answer to the king's wrath, he finds no solace in his love,
for she has deserted him. Marcabru, in "Bel m'es quam son
li fruich madur" (XIII) tells us that he has set himself to-
ward a love that does not deceive, unlike the hypocrisy of
sensual love. False lovers debase love, but that does not
mean that love has deteriorated for it has not changed its
appearance. In this love Marcabru finds happiness in summer,
winter and at Easter, implying that his love pleases him in
prosperity, adversity and in the contemplation of the Resur-
reption which promises resurrection for the just.118 This
charitable love is opposed to the love which Lanval possess-
es. Like all those who follow cupidinous love he experiences
only fear and torment except in his lover's embraces. Thus
the proud man always loves in trouble and is always unhappy
because there is nothing to satiate his passion.119

The Marcabru looks forward to greater happiness be-
cause a man becomes better through Amors, not like Lanval
where false virtue and hypocrisy is most hateful to God.
But he still lacks "un pauc de seguransa" and he must not
boast for fear of offending the one whose gifts he hopes for.
Boasting is saying that you have something which in truth
you do not have120 and thus he is fearful that he will fall
into pride and be damned if he boasts of this divine love.
The poet seems to be following the Scriptural "caritas....
non inflatur" (1 Cor. 13:4) Chretien de Troyes reflects the same source with an assertion that "Charite . . . de sa bone oeuvre/Pas ne se vante" (Li contes del graal, 43-44). Marie, rather, chooses to illustrate the negative element as an attack on those who do not seek Divine Love but strive after the fleshy lust of concupiscence. Divine Love puffeth not up. He who loves with charity cannot, will not boast of his love. But Lanval, in his carnal desire does boast because he has proudly set himself up on the level of God. No one can secure the transitory gifts of Fortune, no one can boast that they are his unless they have reached the habitual stage of pride.

Lanval finds that his "amie" no longer responds to his plea; he has lost the love which has become idolatrous. This is not surprising, however, for idolatry is characteristic of secular love. This love or "amicitia mundalis," says Ailred, like the vices is nourished by wealth and leads ultimately to bitterness and frustration. For no matter how anxiously the lover seeks to avoid prodigality, he cannot escape losing both his wealth and the object of his desire. Often Lanval calls to the pucele but she will not answer. He is so confirmed an idolator that he cannot perceive the true source of help. "In perils, in sore straits, in difficulties, writes
Bernard of Clairvaux, "think on Mary, call on Mary. Let her not be absent from the lips. Let her not be absent from the heart. . . . Following her thou shall not stray, praying to her thou shalt not wander." But Lanval, caught in the throes of idolatrous fornication and overcome with tristidia, cannot turn his thoughts to God.

Lanval is the man who has surrendered his freedom to the demands of his passions. He has trusted in Fortune and though in prosperity, he was always anxious and fearful, in adversity his grief is overwhelming. Yet he does not turn to God for help, because the man who suffers from acedia despairs of God's succor. Rather, in his sorrow, his thoughts turn toward suicide. Lactantius condemns as homicides those who in despair seek to end their life: "You take it hard that you are subject to evils, as though you deserved anything good, you who did not know your Father, your Lord, your King." And he speaks of the error and injustice of those who seek death as a good and avoid life as an evil. "For when they pass an entire life in exquisite and varied pleasures, they desire to die if by chance any bitterness comes upon them, and they so consider life as it had never been well with them, if things that should at some time go badly." These are condemned for they have despained
over worldly things and forsaken God. Only the proud despair unto death over earthly misfortune; the just rejoice in their hearts for they seek true joy and eternal happiness with God. The just realize, unlike Lanval, that in earthly misfortune they have lost nothing, but to be banished from their eternal reward is the greatest affliction that the soul can experience. Suicide is the final act of despair and the consummation of the irremissible sin against the Holy Spirit. Lanval has made a woman's love the controlling factor of his universe. He has worshipped in idolatry rather than to God and when his love fails, a spiritual chaos descends upon him resulting from the universalization of a selfish passion.

While Lanval is suffering these torments Arthur is attempting to satisfy his queen's furious rage by a revengeful punishment of him who has insulted his wife. And he continues to show himself to be much less than the ideal sovereign. The king is not a representative of the people but the "image of God on earth:"rex in regni sui corpore partis omnipotentis optinere videtur imaginem."\(^{125}\) The ministry is conferred upon him not by the people but by God "for the punishment of evil-doers and for the reward of good men."\(^{126}\) Therefore, he will be judged by God and held accountable for his ministry. Also the king should seek the welfare of others,
not his own and wholly forget the affections of flesh and blood, "doing only what is demanded by the welfare and safety of his subjects." The relationship of the king to his vassals should be as one of father and husband. Thus, those whom he punishes should not suffer because of personal revenge, but as demanded by the welfare of the state. "The prince most justly punishes offenders from no motive of wrath but at the behest, and in accordance with the decision of the passionless law." And in these actions he must avoid levity and carelessness. Arthur fails as the ideal prince. He seeks personal revenge and does not concern himself with the interests of government. He acts rashly, impetuously, without thought in his desire to punish Lanval.

And in his desire for Lanval's death he shows himself lacking in another princely quality. The pious king, who rules for the benefit of his realm and not for himself, must utilize mercy as well as justice. Thus Isidore writes that "the kingly virtues... are two, justice and piety, but piety is more praiseworthy among kings, since justice alone is severe." Scripture says: "For judgement is without mercy to one who has shown no mercy; yet mercy triumphs over judgement" (James 2:13). Justice without mercy is a violation of the charity which should exist between a monarch and his
vassals, for feudal amity should imitate the Divine Love which God bestows on His vassals. 130

Thus, Arthur is not concerned with justice but revenge and, in the heat of lust, he does not temper his justice with mercy. He is not a prince but a tyrant. His will is not dependent on the laws of God but is slave to his desires. 131

The king must rule according to Divine Law and the perception of this law requires something higher than scientia; perception of Divine Law requires higher reason, or sapientia. 132

Godefroid asserts that a sovereign without sapientia is little more than a beast: "Whence he says [Aristotle, Pol II, 1287a] that who orders the intellect, [that is laws instituted according to right reason] to rule seems to order God to rule and the just laws themselves; he however who orders man to rule appoints merely a beast." 133 And Arthur has shown himself to be less than a man because he is not following reason but the desires of his queen who is a cupidinous beast. Like Lanval, like Adam, he has inverted the natural order and placed the reigns of his kingdom in the hands of a woman, or lower reason.

Arthur questions Lanval concerning the queen's accusation. But Lanval denies the charges, protesting that he has never shamed his lord. Though he is not guilty of approaching
the queen, his answer is ironically untrue. Arthur should be "God's vicar on earth" and in Lanval's denial of God's commandments he is denying the king's laws also. So that his entire actions would bring shame on the king, were Arthur an ideal ruler. Lanval also admits that that which he has spoken of the lady is true, though through his folly he has lost her. Were Arthur a just an ideal prince, he would have responded charitably to Lanval, trying to guide him back to the chosen path. But he, like Lanval with the queen, has no succor for the knight. The lines of charity which should exist between monarch and vassal are broken. And Arthur fails in his most important task, guiding his vassals toward God.

Arthur shows some judgment by submitting the case to his barons and acting on wiser counsel. The lords appoint a certain day on which Lanval should abide by the judgment of his peers. Lanval is also required to pledge surety to his lord that he will come before this judgment and lacking surety, he should be held captive. Lanval is bewilder at this demand for he believes that he has neither friend nor kindred in the land. This is understandable, for Andreas writes that he who neglects the honor of a friend for the sake of the flesh lives for himself alone. But Gawain shows that
Lanval has one true friend, and he pledges surety for him. Gawain illustrates the true amicitia, for poverty is a virtue in true friendship and a true friend "is even more faithful in his friend's adversities and more constant in every misfortune." 135

Gawain and his companions return to Lanval's lodging with him:

Mut l'unt blasmé e chastie  
K'il ne face si grant dolur,  
E maudient si fol' amur.
(408-410)

This is true friendship and true charity to those who are spiritually poor; not to condone their loss but to criticize their folly, not to replenish with their purses but to give them wise and charitable words so that they may turn toward God and strive after that true wealth in heaven. But Lanval is too committed to the flesh and ignores the advice of his friends. Through amor sui he has cut himself off from the world and his inability to live in charity has cut him off from God. Rather than accepting the guidance of those who are concerned with saving his soul, he can only mourn the loss of she who desires to burn him, both physically with the pangs of the flesh and spiritually with the flames of ever-burning hell.
Lanval continues to mourn, lamenting the loss of his "amie" in spite of the concern of his true friends. On the day appointed for judgment, the king and queen and the lords of the household come together in the court. The sureties bring Lanval into the hall and render him into the hands of the peers. Many are sorrowful because of Lanval's plight. These are Gawain and the knights of his fellowship, who are more sorrowful because they were unable to free Lanval from his grief and bring him into the light of charity as a true miles Christi, than because of any impending judgment the court may make. They were not fearful that Lanval would be imprisoned for as for Joseph prison would be a state of safety from that den where the wild beast was kept. And as Joseph offended his master and made God his friend, prison might free the errant soul of Lanval and bring him closer to God, the true master, and away from his pucele who had enslaved him to the concupiscent pleasures of the flesh.136

There are others who think that Lanval should be punished because it is the will of their lord. These knights who follow Arthur demonstrate the decay which seeps into a court which is not ruled by reason and Divine Law. A true prince and true knights, like Gawain, imitate Christ by living reasonably and charitably. The vassals' willingness
to submit to Arthur's vengeance shows their willingness to forego the principles of nature and Divine Law and reflects their devotion of earthly concerns. They are not unlike Lanval in their concern for temporal goods and their actions may justly be attributed to the jealousy of avarice. This is the peace of carnal consent, "inordinate, false, wrongful, abominable." There is a weakness, a complacency in accepting Arthur's tyranny which is slothful and compromising through the fear of loss. And it is a contempt of God and the spirit; an obeisance of the devil and the flesh. Arthur's pride and lust have created a court which is not modelled after heaven, but which follows the precepts of the flesh.

Ernest Hoepffner theorized that the trial scene in Lanval was inspired by the trial of Daire la Roux in the Roman de Thebes. But E. A. Francis has shown that it is probably based upon contemporary court procedure and even borrows the legal terminology cited by Maitland in descriptions of actual trials. Arthur refers the case for judgment. The court, consisting of Arthur's vassals, decide that there is a case to be heard, but that it should be for the court in full attendance to give the "medial judgment." The central problem, whether there is a case at all, is expounded in Count Cornwall's statement "nus ne l'apele fors le roi,"
and the case would lapse were Arthur's court ruled by charity and reason. But Lanval has spoken words which can reflect upon the prestige of his overlord. His claim of the great beauty of his mistress belittles the king. In other words, Arthur is a tyrant who rules with the lower reason and in this "up-side-down" court the queen has the power to force the king to disregard Divine Law and succumb to her desire for revenge. When the pucele does appear, it is not merely her presence which fulfills the task set to the defendant. She makes a formal statement, asserting that Lanval's denial is true. "This seems to be exactly the function...of an overlord." Lanval has been taken from the protection of Arthur, God's vicar on earth, and is now ruled by his "amie." Not only has he surrendered his reason to his passions by placing himself in the hands of a woman, but he has put his soul in control of a prostitute. He has turned away from God and is now abandoned to His adversary.

No one can deny the artistry with which Marie builds the tension which leads up to the dramatic conclusion. There is little doubt that the pucele's servants should be iconographically significant but the meaning remains enigmatic. Lanval's "amie" also remains an enigma, especially her physical appearance. But, as before, the richness of her
trappings and equipage and the mantle of royal purple signify
deceit and hypocrisy and cupidity. And this deception will
become clear to Lanval when he realizes that he has earned
eternal damnation along with the transitory delights of the
flesh. Also, the pucele is described with "un espervier sur
son poin tient,/ E un levrer apre li vient" (573-4). Were
Marie more prone to use classical iconography it would be
possible to consider this figure as the hunt of Venus, the
pursuit for the pleasures of sexual lust. Thus, we could
say that the pucele has come for Lanval to take him to some
earthly paradise. 141 But Marie has possibly another meaning.
The pucele is not looking for her lover, she is hunting for
the soul she has gained. Lanval has forsaken God and wor-
shipped sensual pleasure and the physical beauty of a woman.
But she is also the Whore who fornicates with the kings of
the earth and makes men drunk with the wine of her fornic-
ation. As such, she is a symbol of or closely related to the
devil. And she has come to claim the soul that she has
turned from God. This makes even clearer the purple which
symbolizes the deceit of government. The powers which the
devil has are granted by God and without them he is powerless.
Also, under the pretense of presenting Lanval with the worldly
gifts that he craves, she is able to win his worship. The
deceit and hypocrisy of her external appearance have overcome the proud man who has shunned the simple unadorned truth of God. When this whore speaks before Arthur's court she places Lanval in her governance. He has not only lost control of his reason and his free will but given up his soul to the false glitter of cupidity. He may no longer serve God on earth, but is now a subject of the Devil.

Hoepffner writes that "vanter," "boasting" is used as a leitmotif to illustrate the courtly rule that lovers should be discreet and not discover their loves. But Marie's use of this word has much more doctrinal significance. Boasting is associated with vainglory, a subtle and noxious beast which overcomes flesh and spirit. It is associated with those who prefer the praise of men to the rewards of God and thus, Lanval's "generosity" is a type of vainglory. And those who wish to have the glory of God must flee boasting. Boasting also consists of saying something is yours alone or that you have what is not yours. Thus Lanval lost his love through boasting, not because of any "code" but because he never really had it. He never really had a mistress. She tempted him and he succumbed. And in his idolatry he gave her complete control over his body and his soul. In discussing this spiritual blindness which causes a man to forsake God and
busy himself with the devil, Andreas writes that though the devil promises his soldier many pleasant things he pays them very bitter ones. "He always does the opposite of what he has promised, since he has been a liar from the beginning and stood not in the truth."143 This is the great double irony with which Lanval has been japed. The gifts of Fortune, the worldly goods and mundane happiness were never really his, for these gifts can never be owned securely, thus his continual and meaningless anxiety. And when he boasted, or said he had what he didn't the devil, like the liar he is, took everything away. He does not even have an "amie;" she owns him entirely. Lanval does not even end up with an ideal fairy love at the end of the lai. This fornatrix has won his soul and he has turned from the source of Truth and worshipped false gods.

Lanval is ravished by this whore to the island of Avalon, just as all proud men, since they are lost from the Creator, prostrate themselves to be ravished by daemons.144 The insula Auallonis, where Arthur's sword Caliburnus was forged and where, after his battle in Modredus, he is carried to be healed, is not recorded before Geoffrey.145 Avalon seems to be closely associated with insula Fortunata, an island of great fruitfulness and beauty, inhabited often by
Morgan and her eight sisters. 146 This place is, however, not as pleasant as it might first appear. Isidore says that on account of the richness of the soil the gentiles considered it to be Paradise, but that it is a false paradise. 147 Those who inhabit this paradise, writes Rabanus, are those who rejoice in the glory of temporalia. That is, they are those who live in the world, the flesh and the devil, who seek the joys of the world rather than the eternal rewards of heaven. 148 And like all gifts of the devil, it is a lie and Lanval will soon discover that he is not to spend a season in hell but all eternity.

This story of a proud man's fall from grace and his failure to resist the three temptations which signify the three sins to which the proud are given is the basic allegorical meaning of Lanval. And, as St. Augustine demanded, it is a condemnation of cupiditas. For the enjoyment of any thing for itself originates in "amor sui," or pride, a deliberate turning away from God to elevate the self to the level of "goodhood." And pride makes one apostate from God and idolatrous before the goods of the earth. Also, the poem should be interpreted tropologically as a warning to man to avoid falling into pride over a concern for these temporal joys. There may also be an anagogical meaning, for much of
the action can be seen symbolically as dealing with the problem of heresy and false doctrine. Also, there seems to be a contemporaneous meaning to the lai and it seems perhaps that Marie was writing for a specific court circle. The topical allusion to homosexuality, which seemed to be a flourishing problem in twelfth century England and Giraldus's severe condemnation of Henry II, in terms similar to those which could describe Arthur's court support this contention. Also, there may be a topical allusion to the dividing of fiefs and other spoils, which is one of the fundamental actions of the lais. But to recover the factual data necessary to establish this idea seems to be more the job of the historian than the literary critic.

The most significant part of this paper, however, is the realization of several characteristics of Marie's allegorical method which may prove useful to future scholars. Marie's use of classical imagery and classical conventions, which were gaining so much popularity in France, seems quite limited, even non-existent. In addition to the romans based on classical sources Chretien uses the doctrinal significance of Ovidian and other classical works while Marie seems to share in their usage rarely, if at all. As a serious but unproveable hypothesis, it is possible to believe that Marie
not only did not use them as sources but that she may not have even known the works. In constructing her lai Marie seems to use primarily scriptural allusions, while relying often on the popular commentaries to devulge the meaning she intended. But unlike later medieval writers she rarely paraphrases Scripture. Also, Marie seems to rely less on set iconographic details and more on symbolic actions and verbal responses than writers of the Gothic and later medieval periods. For example, the meadow and garden become symbolic not so much because of any iconographic details as Deduit or Amoenitas, but the action which occurs at both scenes makes Marie's intention obvious. Marie seems to be a forerunner of the later writers with their more detailed garden conventions which were used so successfully. Also, Marie was one of the first writers of secular verse to utilize Arthur's court and its characteristic pride as a symbolic setting. This use may be utilized in two ways. First, in the study of Marie's other lais, though she never uses Arthur's court again, it may be profitable to examine the nature of the court in which the action takes place. Second, and probably more significant, it may force a revaluation of the commonly accepted character of Arthur and his less than ideal court. For we have found there, in Marie's lai, an absence of charity
and the lines of dependence which should unite the vassals strongly in spiritual love is noticeably absent.

Finally, in defense of the validity of drawing spiritual significance from numerous sources and applying them to a single poetess several things must be said. In most cases the Fathers which were used were the most influential authors and their works the most used in the Middle Ages. And though it may be argued that Marie was not familiar with all the writings which this exegesis of her lai uses, it may be said that Marie, as a religious person, constantly heard sermons. Many of the spiritual ideas which Marie uses in her lais were commonplace in the twelfth century. And many of the sermons that deal with the themes which she used drew their material from the fathers whose works made the ideas so prevalent. In other words, though she may not have had access to the specific works quoted here, she undoubtedly heard numerous sermons which were created and composed from these same works.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. The commonly excepted opinion of Ernest Brugger, that Lanval was named after Alain de Lanvaux who founded an Abbey of the Order of Citeaux in 1138 has justifiably been questioned. Miss E. A. Francis contends that Willemus de Lanveli, a member of Henry II court and often witness to his charters is the historical person behind our hero. Unfortunately we know nothing of William's character, so that the significance which it may have had for Marie's audience is totally lost to us. For Brugger's view Cf. "Eigennamen in den Lais der Marie de France," ZPSL, 49(1927), 251. For Miss Francis' idea Cf. "Marie de France et son Temps, Romania, 72(1951), 88-89. For citations of William in the records Cf William Farrer, Honors and Knights Fees (Manchester, 1925), Vol. I; Round, The Red Book of Exchequer; Pipe Rolls for the reigns of Henry II, Richard and John, and Rev. R. W. Eyton, Court, Household, and Itinerary of King Henry II, (London, 18???) The medieval poet used contemporary history to reflect and reinforce his spiritual content. A knowledge of Henry II's court and the people in it may help us understand how Marie used Lanvel to develop her theme. For an interesting article on this subject Cf Paul Olsen, "Le Roman de Flamenca, History and Literary Convention, Studies in Philology, 55 (1958), 7-24.

2. On Christian Doctrine, 3.10.15.

3. Ernest Hoepffner, "Pour la Chronologie des Lais de Marie de France," Romania, 59(1933), p. 352-353. The character of Lanval is undoubtedly a creation of Marie. He appears twice (p. 305, 320) in L'Estoire de Merlin as a member of Arthur's court and in Jehan's Les Merveilles de Rigomer, a roman of the thirteenth century, he appears twice again (4497, 7087) an Artusritter. In Le Roman de la Rose ou Guillaume de Dole he appears as a lover, like Tristram, who is unable to satisfy himself with embraces and kisses (5497). In the prose Tristan he is an unsuccessful "geuteur du Graal." Cf Louis-Fernand Plutre, Table des Noms Propre (Poitiers, 1962), p. 119. Hoepffner contends that Marie borrowed the
idea of Arthur's generosity from the feast of the coronation of the king in Wace's Brut. Marie, however, retaining only essential. Further, the source of Arthur's bestowing of gifts can be traced to Wace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brut</th>
<th>Lanval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Munt dona li rois riches dons</td>
<td>Assez i dona riches dones:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As chevaliers et as barons</td>
<td>E as cuntes e as barons,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10899-900)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Li rois les damoiseaus fieva Femmes e tere departi, 
Honors et terres lor donna; Par tut, fors in ki l'ot servi: 
Lors services a cels rendi Qui por terre l'orent servi 
(10869-72)

The wording, however is not precise enough to assume Wace as Marie's source. Being in England she could have just as easily gotten the information from Geoffrey. Wace is more properly an analogue, one that Marie might have known, but to consider similar ideas which use few enough of the same words as a source is an unacceptable contention. It seems most probable that in conveying a similar allegorical meaning, both have drawn from a common source.

4. **Policraticus**, Pike, 8.8.


6. Honorius d'Auctun, "In Pentecosten," PL 172, cols. 962, 966. Honorious was an influential twelfth century clergyman and author. His Speculum Ecclesiastes from which this sermon on Pentecost is taken, is the standard twelfth century authority on Church holidays.


11. PL 109, col. 1079. Cf. on this idea Peter Lombard, Sententiae, 2.42, PL 196, col. 753.


15. *PL* 177, 784-785. The other two kinds of pauper which Hugh discusses are forced and voluntary. Lanval's poverty is not forced because he can ask Arthur for his due, nor is it voluntary which derives from the will and from the truth and is humble in spirit.


22. St. Gregory, 34.5-6.


25. Hoepffner, *Les Lais*, p. 59. This is a very popular idea, though entirely unsubstantiated. Marie offers, to my knowledge, no other information that she was unhappy in England and that she longed to return to France. Unless read allegorically, these lines do not really belong in the poem, but on the spiritual level they make complete sense.
26. Hugh of St. Victor, In Ecclesiasten homiliae, PL 175, col. 221C. Cf. Alanus de Insulis, Suma de arca praedictoria, PL 210, col. 186-7. "The Christian, therefore, in wandering about this life ought to live as if in a military camp so that he may not think of himself as possessed of any definite home but awaits an eternal residence in heaven. . . he should live as if he were going to die on the moment and he must inhabit the tabernacle of the flesh as if he were to leave it in the next moment. He should be free from the embrace of earthly desire. . ." This is exactly what Lanval doesn't do, hence his overwhelming concern with transitory things which stems from his pride of life. He considers this life more vital than the next. Cf. also St. Augustine, Expositions on Psalms, Ps. 39:12, p. . .8. "For as long as we are in body we are strangers from the lord." Ps. 119, p. 563. "We are tenants or strangers on earth because we have found our country above." Lanval, unfortunately for his soul's sake, prefers the country below.


29. City of God, 14.28.

30. Bede, PL 92, col. 673.

31. Boethius, The Consolation of Philosophy, trans. with notes by Richard Green (New York, 1962), I Pr. 5. "You have not been driven out of your homeland, you have willfully wandered away."

32. Boethius, I Pr. 5.


34. City of God, 14.15.

35. Boethius, 2 Pr. 1.


37. Policraticus, Pike, 1.1.


40. Alanus de Insulis, PL 210, col. 780. Dormitaverunt qui ascenderunt equos, id est in mortem animae mentem a veritatis luce clariserunt qui in praesentis vitae honore confisi sunt.


42. "De fructibus," Chap. VIII.


44. Expositions on Psalms, p. 631.

45. PL 112, col. 916.


50. De Vitiis, PL 112, 1377.

51. PL 210, col. 843.
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63. Rupert, PL 169, 1133.
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65. PL 112, col. 862.

66. Rupert, PL 169, 1133. Cf. on the cup Bede, PL 93, 183. Ernest Hoepffner attempts to find the source for Marie's feé in both the Roman d'Eneas and the Roman de Thebes. In her first appearance the pucele shows herself to Lanval "en sa chemise senslement," a rich mantle, thrown on casually, hiding nothing of her charms so that "tut ot discouvert le costé" (99, 104). She appears like Antigone going to the Greek camp, who wears a robe of purple rather than a "chemise" but wears it "tot senslement a sa char nue" (3808) Camile imitates the Theban princess in wearing "a sa char nue" but the poet fails to reveal her whiteness. The lines in question
make it doubtful if they were Marie's sources.

Thebes
D'une porpre inde fu vestue
Tot seglement a sa char nue:
La blanche char desoz pareit
(3807-9)

Eneas
a un fil d'or lest ot treciez
bien fu la dame estroitvestue
de porpre noire a sa char nue;
(4010-12)

Lanval
En sa chemise seglement.

. . . . . . . . .
Un cher mantel de blanc hermine
Covert de porpre alexandrine,
Ot pur le chaut sur li gete
Tut ot discovert le costé,
99,101-104.

Here it appears that Marie used neither as her source, though
all three may have utilized a commonplace iconographic detail,
the meaning of which remains an enigma. It should be pointed
out, however, that both Antigone and Camille were often alle-
gorically "good"while our pucele seems connected with the
Whore of Babylon, hardly the girl Lanval could take home to
his mother.

67. Glossa ordinaria PL 112, 1040D. For Fulgentius
and other material Cf. A Preface to Chaucer, pp. 95-96 n.
82 and Alanus, PL 210, col. 579-80.

68. PL 14, 416-17.

69. Cf. for example The Liturgical Poetry of Adam of
St. Victor, trans. Digby S. Wrangham (Vol. III), (London,
1881) esp. pp. 84-137, and Raby, pp. 363-375.

70. Sententiae, 2.21.15, quoted from A Preface to
Chaucer, p. 382.

71. City of God, 14.15.

72. Policraticus 8.6.

73. De spirituali amicitia, PL 195, col. 665.

74. Andreas Capellanus, The Art of Courtly Love,
the following argument is developed from D. W. Robertson,
"The Subject of the De Amore of Andreas Capellanus, MP, 50
(1953), 151-153.
75. PL 92, 28. Cf. Rabanus PL 107, 811. The idea is based primarily on St. Augustine's On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount, i, 12(33-36) There are three steps to the commission of sin: suggestion, pleasure and consent. Suggestion occurs through the bodily senses and pleasure must be repressed if it is sinful. "But if consent is given, then a sin is fully committed in the hear and it is known to God." If the sinner goes so far as to preform the corresponding act, the craving seems satisfied, but a more intense pleasure in enkindled when the suggestion is repeated. This pleasure is far less than that which has become habit by continuous act, for it is difficult to overcome habit. Just as sin is reached in the three successive stages of suggestion, pleasure, consent, "so also there are three distinct degrees of the same sin, according as it is in heart, in a deed, or in habit. These three degrees of sin are, as it were, three types of death."

76. City of God, 8.17.

77. Policraticus, Pike, 8.3.

78. PL 112, 811. Cf Sermon on the Mount"under the name adulterers. . .we are to understand every kind of carnal and lustful concupiscence. . .who can doubt that every evil concupiscence may be rightly called fornication."1, 12(36).


80. Andreas, p. 189. "Other sins stain the soul alone. . .fornication stains not only the soul but the body." Peter Lombard, Commentary on First Corinthians vi. 18. Quoted from Andreas, p. 189.

81. Bede, PL 93, col. 182.

82. Rupert, PL 169, 1131.

83. Andreas, Fifth dialogue, p. 81.

84. Cf. Rabanus, PL, cols. 819-820. In Rabanus' commentary on this passage, the woman is taken allegorically as a heretic. Lanval is, in a way, a heretic because in his worship of temporalia and his idolatry toward the pulcele he has turned from the true way.

86. Liber de Joseph Patriarcha Caput V, PL 14, col. 684B.

87. Boethius, V pr. II, Cf. III met. X, "Come all of you who are trapped and bound by the foul chains of deceiving lust which occupies earth-bound souls."

88. Policraticus, Pike, 8.6.

89. City of God, 14.16.

90. Andreas, p. 81. "Thou shalt not have many who know of thy love affair."

91. City of God, 14.18-20, 23.

92. Andreas, pp. 28-29.


94. Andreas, p. 29.

95. Cf. also St. Augustine, De Trinitae, 12.10.

96. "The subject of the De Amore," 156.

97. Expositions on Psalms, Ps. 9, p. 35-36.

98. Andreas, p. 81.


103. Videtur enim humanae laudis delectatio in sinistera significare, et in dextra inteno implendi praeccepta divina. Et quid est eleemosyna in abscondo, nisi in ipsa bona conscientia, quae humanis oculis demonstrati non potest, quae et efficitur in voluntate bona, quamvis non sit quod tributatur in pecunia; nam in his solet sinistera operari, qui eam non intus, sed fortis faciant. *PL* 92, col. 31.


105. Andreas, p. 31.


108. Andreas, p. 29.

109. All man's actions are either charitable or cupidinous. Cf. *City of God*, 14 passim.

110. "Thou shalt keep thyself chaste for the sake of her whom thou lovest." Andreas, p. 81. Cf. p. 185, "A true lover does not desire to embrace in love anyone except his beloved."

111. Lactantius, 6.23. Cf. *Homilies on Acts and Romans*, p.p. 3759. They (homosexuals) are neither men nor women but traitors to both and are "deserving both of men and women to be driven out and stones, as having wronged either sex."


113. Geoffrey, 11.7.

114. For the possibility that Marie is making a contemporary allusion Cf. J. S.P. Tatlock, *The Legendary History of Britain* (Berkeley, 1950), pp. 381-385. Hoeppfner, "Chronologie," wrote that Marie borrowed this scene from a similar
scene in the Eneas where both Lavinia and her mother accuse Aeneas of this sexual perversion. Only Lavinia accosts Aeneas with this accusation and much more kindly than does Arthur's queen, and both occurrences in the Eneas are surrounded with classical trappings which Marie did not employ in this scene so that it is possible to discount this as a source. For classical sources and Marie's contemporaries that used them Cf. Faral, p. 132, n. 1. "Sur cette question, cf. C. Vieillard, Gilles de Corbeil: Essai sur la société médicale et Religieuse au XIIe Siècle (Paris, 1909) qui donne les indications bibliographiques essentielles et cite de texte de Hildebert de Larvardin, de Jean de Salisbury, d'Alain de Lille (PL 210, 121) et de Gilles de Corbeil. Ajoutons que, lorsqu'il était question de ce vice, on pensait souvent de Ovide." Faral goes on to mention especially the stories of Orpheus and Ganymede which are in the Metamorphoses.


120. Alanus, PL 210, col. 821.


123. De laudibus virginis Matris, PL 183, col. 70. Quoted in Raby, p. 364.

124. Lactantius, 3.18, 19. On suicide Cf. also City of God, 1.16-27.


126. *Policraticus*, Dickinson, 4.1. "All power is from the Lord God, the power which the prince has is therefore, from God, for the power of God is never lost or severed from Him, but he merely exercises it through a subordinate hand.

127. *Policraticus*, Dickinson, 4.4. On the ideal ruler Cf. also *City of God*, 5.24. Could Marie possibly have Henry II in mind in her criticism of Arthur, an idea which would lend much contemporaneity to her lai? Giraldus Cambrensis, in the Preface of his *Concerning the Instruction of Princess* writes of Henry: "For what prince is there, of the present day, who does not indiscriminately use the power granted to him from above for the gratification of every inclination of his mind, for every carnal desire and luxury, for every atrocity of depraved despotism? Quoted from *Church Historians of England*, Vol. 5, pt. 1, trans. by Rev. Joseph Stevenson, (London, 1858), p. 133.


133. Quoted from *Piers Plowman*, p. 29. Unde dicit [Arist...]ibi quod qui iubet intellectum id est leges secundum rectam rationem institutas principari, videtur iubere principari Deum et ipsa iustas leges, qui autem iubet, principari hominem, apponit et bestiam. Cf. Innocent III, *De contemptu mundi*, 15, PL 217. "The king who is governed by reason is a just king."

135. Andreas, p. 189. On true friendship Cf. De spiritu-tuali amicitia and Liber amicitia, both by Ailred of Riveaulx, PL 195, cols. 688-689, 840, and Cicero, De amicitia which was very popular during the twelfth century, influencing Ailred and many other writers of the period.


140. Hoepffner again tries to find sources for this action. Marie borrows from Tristan the "triple gradation" or "L'emerveillment croissant." To show Isuelt's beauty Kaherdin and Tristan pass laundresses and chambermaids, then Brangain and court ladies. Each seems so beautiful that Kaherdin thinks she must be Isuelt, but when her appearance is made, her beauty and radiance make pale those who have gone before. Marie, to show the triumphant beauty of the pucele and the astonishment of her sudden appearance at court, borrowed the idea from Tristan. The technique, however, is such a literary commonplace and such an obvious idea, it seems unnecessary to find a "source." He also traces the descriptions of the maidens to the Eneas. Rather than enter a lengthy discussion, it would be more profitable to point out some of the characteristics which prove conclusively that these romans were not Marie's source. Probably they are analogues, drawn from a similar iconographic source, though it is even possible that the facial characteristics meant very little and it was merely the way beautiful women were described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thebes</th>
<th>Eneas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheveus ont blois, lons et deugiez</td>
<td>lo jront ot blanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>et bien traitiz, la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les fronz aprez et hauz et blans,</td>
<td>greve drocet an la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bien eschevies par les flans;</td>
<td>vertiz, les sorcis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les ueuz ont vairs et amaros,</td>
<td>noirs et bien doe-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ainc hon ne vit tant merveillos;</td>
<td>gieze, les irelz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les nes ont dreiz et bien seanz</td>
<td>reanz et trestos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Les col plus blanc que neif sur brance;
Les oillx ot vairs e blanc le vis.
Bele bouche, ne bien a sis,
Les surcilz bruns e bel le frunt
E le chef cresp e aukes blunt;
Fil d'or ne gette tul luur
Cum si chevel cunte le jur.
564-570

141. The figure of hunting is taken from Ovid where the lover under the auspices of Venus is compared to a hunter. Arnulf of Orleans comments: "Scit bene venator, quaerindis et poteris invenire si tantummodo ames. Quod ostendit a simili per venatorem et per aucupem." Cf. "On the De Amore," p. 147. This idea, which was not Marie's exact intention is strengthened by a thirteenth century addition to the text:

.1. gent damoisel ladestroit
.1. cordiaire o lui portoit
Molt vindrent bel parmi la rue.
Tant grant beaute ne fu veue
En venus qui estoit roine
Ne en dido, ne en lavine.

There is no doubt that these lines are spurious, but they were added by a scribe who was surely much close to the "sentence" which Marie presents. Venus is the mother of fornication and Lactantius writes (1.17) "a prostitute to the lusts of all, not of gods only, but of men as well... She . . . instituted the prostitute's art... so that she would not seem alone, different from other women, in her unchaste pursuit of men. Dido is an infamous fornatrix and Lavina was known as the "secundus Helena," by no means a compliment. It is interesting to note this usage of classical material about seventy years after Marie wrote Lanval. By this time the Gothic iconography had become more settled and had incorporated much of the classical knowledge into common usage.

143. Andreas, p. 195.

144. Bede, PL 93, col. 182.


147. Etymologiae, 14.6, PL 82.

148. PL 112, 2022A.
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