

# MEDIOEVO ROMANZO

RIVISTA QUADRIMESTRALE

DIRETTA DA D'ARCO S. AVALLE, FRANCESCO BRANCIFORTI, GIANFRANCO  
FOLENA, FRANCESCO SABATINI, CESARE SEGRE, ALBERTO VARVARO

VOLUME VI - 1979

NAPOLI GAETANO MACCHIAROLI EDITORE

## THE CONTRASTING USE OF TIME IN THE ROMANCES OF « JAUFRE » AND « FLAMENCA »

Morris: The paradigms of fiction are essentially the same whatever the medium. Words or images, it makes no difference at the structural level ...

Philip: I don't think that's entirely true. I mean, take the question of endings... You remember that passage in *Northanger Abbey* where Jane Austen says she's afraid that her readers will have guessed that a happy ending is coming up at any moment.

Morris: (nods) Quote, « Seeing in the tell-tale compression of the pages before them that we are all hastening together to perfect felicity ». Unquote.

Philip: That's it. Well, that's something the novelist can't help giving away, isn't it, that his book is shortly coming to an end? It may not be a happy ending, nowadays, but he can't disguise the tell-tale compression of the pages...

Penultimate page of *Changing Places*,  
David Lodge, London, 1975.

A good deal of attention has always been paid to the time structure of medieval romances, both to their implicit chronology (the ordering of incidents) and to their explicit statements about the temporal relations between these incidents<sup>1</sup>; but there has been little attempt

<sup>1</sup> The following works dealing with the internal time structure of *Flamenca*, *Jaufre* and the romances of Chrétien are listed here for convenience of reference later:

- (a) C. Révillout, *De la date possible du roman de « Flamenca »*, « Revue des Langues Romanes », 8, 1875, pp. 5-18.
- (b) P. Meyer, c.-r. of the above, « Romania », 5, 1876, pp. 122-3.
- (c) R. Lavaud & R. Nelli, *Les Troubadours: « Le Roman de Jaufre », « Flamenca », « Barlaam et Josaphat »*, Pléiade (Bibliothèque Européenne), Paris, 1960, pp. 637-41.
- (d) H. Breuer, « *Jaufre* »: *ein altprovenzalischer Abenteuerroman des XIII. Jahrhunderts*, Gesells. für Roman. Lit., 46, Göttingen, 1925, Notes.
- (e) C. Brunel, « *Jaufre* »: *roman arthurien du XIIIe siècle en vers provençaux*, S.A.T.F., Paris, 1943, Introduction, p. xxxvi and Notes.

to relate the study of internal chronology to the time experienced by the public in the course of performance, and thus to the wider question of to what extent literature (and specifically medieval literature) is a time art.<sup>2</sup> A literature whose primary mode of presentation is oral recitation is only accessible to the listening public as it is retailed through time; its organisation is conveyed independently of the visual (i.e. spatial) signals contained in modern, read fiction, which include not only the « tell-tale compression of the pages » referred to above, but also division into chapters. If its organisation is made explicit at all, it will be made so via the narrative, hence orally, and hence through time<sup>3</sup>. On

- (f) G. Pinkernell, *Realismus* (v. 1-6234) und *Märchenhaftigkeit* (v. 6235-10956) in der *Zeitstruktur des Provenzalischen « Jaufré-Romans »*. Ein Beitrag zur *Stützung der Zwei-Verfasser-Theorie*, « Germanische-Romanische Monatsschrift », 53 (N.F. 22), 1972, pp. 357-76.
- (g) D. Kelly, *La forme et le sens de la quête dans l'« Erec et Enide » de Chrétien de Troyes*, « Romania », 92, 1971, pp. 326-58.
- (h) P. Noble, *Alis and the problem of time in « Cligès »*, « Medium Aevum », 39, 1970, pp. 28-31.
- (i) E. Soudek, *Structure and time in « Le chevalier de la Charette »: an aspect of artistic purpose*, « Romania », 93, 1972, pp. 96-108.
- (j) H. J. Weigand, *Die epische Zeitverhältnisse in den Galdichtungen Crestiens und Wolframs*, « P.M.L.A. », 53, 1938, pp. 917-950.
- (k) M. de Riquer, *Perceval y Gauvain en « Li contes del Graal »*, « Filologia Romanza », 4, 1957, pp. 119-147.
- (l) J. Frappier, *La composition du « Conte du Graal »*, « Le Moyen Âge », 64, 1958, pp. 167-102.
- (m) P. Ménard, *Le temps et la durée dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes*, « Le Moyen Âge », 73, 1967, pp. 375-401.
- (n) R. Glasser, *Studien zur Geschichte des Französischen Zeitbegriffs. Eine Orientierung*, München Romanische Arbeiten, Heft V, München, 1936.

<sup>2</sup> By time art is meant an art-form which is expressed *through time* as opposed to *in space* (e.g. music, as opposed to painting or architecture), and which derives some part of its aesthetic value from the fact that it unfolds through time. For a discussion of story-telling in this context see W. B. Gallie, *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding*, London, 1964, and M. Price, *The Fictional Contract*, in *Literary theory and structure: essays in honour of William K. Wimsatt*, New Haven & London, 1973, pp. 151-178.

<sup>3</sup> Thus for example *laisse* division in *chansons de geste* strikes the modern reader visually, but would have been conveyed by acoustic signals (change of rhyme/assonance, change of melody (?)) to the medieval public.

the other hand, medieval fiction is characterised by two important factors: 1) a great bulk of the narrative material consisted of stories known in advance to the audience; 2) even in cases where the actual story-line might be unknown, generic<sup>4</sup> conventions would predispose an audience to form certain expectations about its outcome. Thus, even excluding cases where the public had already heard a particular version of a story, its general outline might be said to be known to them *in toto*, and thus independently of the time taken in recitation. The purpose of this paper is not to provide a neat resolution of these opposing factors but rather to argue their relevance to the study of time within individual texts. *Flamenca* and *Jaufre* are chosen not because they are typical of two well-constituted groups of texts — although *Jaufre* closely resembles other Arthurian romances in its use of time, *Flamenca* seems to be in this as in other ways exceptional — but because they present an admirable range of contrast.

The distinction between narrative time (the time which is experienced by the characters in a text) and audience or reading time (the time taken by the public to get through that text) seems, at first sight, simple — so simple that there can be no need to posit any connection between them. Yet this is not so. In the first place, the term «narrative time» designates two quite different things: *a*) the temporal-clausal sequence of the fictional events referred to in the narrative; *b*) the actual order in which these events are recounted in the narrative. This distinction was originally made by certain Russian Formalist critics, notably Shklovsky and Tomashevsky, who called the former the «story» and included the latter in the domain of the «plot»<sup>5</sup> i.e. the way in which the «story» is told by the individual author. It is particu-

<sup>4</sup> For example expectation about the career of a hero of a romance differ markedly from expectations about that of an epic hero.

<sup>5</sup> This distinction has recently been taken up by Cesare Segre in *Le strutture e il tempo*, Torino, 1974, who uses it as the basis for elaborating a theory of text analysis (pp. 3-72). In English, this use of the term «plot» is somewhat misleading, but I retain it because it is further necessary to distinguish the «plot» (= arrangement of material) from the narrative which realises it: cf. Segre's distinction between narrative (*discorso*) and «plot» (*intreccio*), *Le strutture*, p. 4, and see also my definition of tempo below, p. 41.

larly helpful when dealing with kinds of time shift commonly found in medieval narrative, such as the use of prophecy, or its converse, the withholding of explanatory or expository material. In the case of prophecy, for instance, an event is signalled at one point in the plot, but is understood as taking place at a later point in the story<sup>6</sup>. Another feature of medieval narrative for which the distinction between story and plot is useful is digression. A digression belongs by definition not to the story but to the way it is told and hence to the plot<sup>7</sup>.

A third aspect of narrative time is the use of explicit chronological indications, e.i. « on Thursday », « at prime », « three years ago ». I propose to consider these as belonging to the domain of plot rather than of story, that is as relating to the particular way in which the story is told. The story is defined by Tomashevski as « the aggregate of motifs in their logical, causal-chronological order »<sup>8</sup>, which suggests that for him the notion of causation is inseparable from that of temporal sequence; yet it is clearly ordering (relative time) which he has in mind, rather than exact chronology (specific times), which would probably come under his heading of « free motifs », i.e. all those elements in the narrative which are capable of omission without making the story unintelligible<sup>9</sup>. L. O. Mink has gone further in excluding temporal indications from the domain of the story by seeking to define this without relation to time at all<sup>10</sup>. The relatively superficial nature of explicit chronological indications is perhaps confirmed by the

<sup>6</sup> It may also, of course, reappear in the plot on this later point and be told fully.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Victor Shklovsky, *Sterne's « Tristram Shandy »: stylistic commentary*, in *Russian Formalist Criticism. Four Essays*, ed. by L. T. Lemon & M. J. Heis, Univ. of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1968, pp. 25-57.

<sup>8</sup> Boris Tomashevsky, *Thematics*, in *Russian Formalist Criticism* etc. (see note 7), pp. 61-95, p. 68.

<sup>9</sup> Tomashevsky is very sparing in attributing any detail whatever to the story, regarding both characterisation and the emergence of a central character as hero, as belonging to the domain of plot — see *Thematics*, pp. 77, 88, 90.

<sup>10</sup> L. O. Mink, *History and Fiction as modes of comprehension*, « New Literary History », I, 1970, pp. 541-558. This article, which makes no reference to Russian Formalism, argues forcefully for regarding a story as a configuration of elements without regard to time.

fact that MSS not uncommonly offer variant readings on these points<sup>11</sup>.

In the second place, the term « audience time » also requires analysis. The actual time taken in reading/hearing is not metered at a constant rate of so much per motif or event but is varied by the author in such a way that, characteristically, a longer time is spent by the audience over passages which, for the characters, represent a short period of time or even no time at all (e.g. descriptions) while conversely what for the characters represents a long period of time may be passed over for the audience in a single sentence (e.g. seven years elapsing). This is the *tempo* of the narrative, which may be defined as the rate at which the story is mapped onto the narrative realising the plot. Secondly, the audience's awareness of the timing of the text must be viewed, as it were, from the outside. The audience, that is, will be led (or misled) to form conjectures about the extent of the story, or about the point in it which has been reached at a given moment in the plot. They will, in particular, either be given cues as to when the narrative will come to an end, or be frustrated in the search for such cues. The manner in which a text conveys, or obfuscates, its overall organisation I will call its *pacing*.

It will now be apparent that narrative time and audience time are by no means inseparable. The *tempo* of a narrative involves audience perception of the passage of time in reading or hearing, but equally it is dependent on implicit or explicit indications of the internal temporal make-up of a text. Explicit pacing devices also overlap with techniques of plot: if the plot makes use of prophecy, for instance, this will inform the audience of the future development of the story, and so lead them to await the fulfilment of that development; conversely, if the plot introduces delays and digressions, this will frustrate audience expectation of a prompt outcome to the story. Devices of introduction and conclusion, which also belong to the domain of plot, will likewise inform the audience of where they stand in relation to the extent of the text.

These remarks provide, then, four interconnected ways of studying the use of time in *Jaufre* and *Flamenca*: 1) explicit

<sup>11</sup> An example occurs in *Jaufre* at l. 5458: see below, p. 46.

chronological indications (belonging to the domain of plot); 2) the adaptation of story to plot (notably deviations from so-called « chronological order »); 3) tempo; and 4) pacing.

1) *Explicit chronological indications.*

*Flamenca* covers a period of four years<sup>12</sup>. Its precision of temporal indication, justly famous, is not so much realistic as real, the events in the text being recognisably situated between the Spring of 1231 and that of 1235: the period from the octave of Easter (Guilhem's arrival in Bourbon) to Thursday August 3rd (the second meeting in the baths) is pointed with a meticulousness of chronological reference which has permitted Révillout to identify the year in question as 1234<sup>13</sup>. The author enumerates all the major festivals in the church calendar falling between these dates (Ascension [June 1st], 4793<sup>14</sup>; Whitsunday, 4965; St. Barnabas [June 18th]<sup>15</sup>, 5085; St. John the Baptist [June 24th], 5150; St. Peter and St. Paul [June 29th], 5273-6; St. Mary Magdalen [July 22nd], 5464; St. James of Compostella [July 25th], 5486; St. Peter [August 1st], 5694). He further notes each Sunday that passes, and frequently gives the day of the week of the festivals referred to: thus the Ascension and the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul fall on Thursdays, St. John's day and the feast of St. Mary Magdalen are on Saturdays, and the feast of St. James and St. Peter are on Tuesdays. Outside this central section of the romance deal-

<sup>12</sup> Lavaud and Nelli are at fault (see fn. 1 (c)) in placing the 1st year of the action in 1232. Archambaut's court ends in June; Guilhem arrives in late April, i.e. either 1 year 10 months or 2 years 10 months later. Since the year of Guilhem's courtship is said to be *ben dos ans* (1456) after *Flamenca's* imprisonment, and this was certainly not effected immediately after the end of the court at Bourbon, the period of 2 years 10 months is indicated, and the opening year of the romance is 1231.

<sup>13</sup> See above, p. 37, fn. 1 (a).

<sup>14</sup> All references to *Jaufre* as well as *Flamenca*, are taken from the Lavaud, Nelli edition (fn. 1 (c)).

<sup>15</sup> The feast of St. Barnabas should be celebrated on June 11th, but Révillout explains that as a result of its coincidence with Pentecost in 1234 it was postponed to the following Sunday.

ing with the courtship of Guilhem and Flamenca a similar chronological exactitude is observed.

It is perhaps not unique for a medieval fictional text to be demonstrably based on the calendar of a particular year<sup>16</sup>. Certainly it is normal practice for medieval authors to give at least some of their chronological indications by reference to the church calendar. But no fictional work in my reading draws on anything like the same range of festivals as *Flamenca*; Pentecost, Easter, Christmas and perhaps Ascension exhaust the repertoire of most writers. For a range comparable with *Flamenca* one must turn to the historians: Villehardouin's *Conquête de Constantinople* would be an example<sup>17</sup>. The chronological references in *Flamenca* may therefore be interpreted as evidence of an attempt at completeness and objectivity on the part of the author in the presentation of the framework of his narrative — a feature of his technique which is also attested by the apparent accuracy of his geographical settings, his detailed material descriptions, etc., and which is wittily opposed to the fantasy-idyll, inspired by the lyric tradition and expressed in an elaborate rhetoric, which makes up so much of his story.

There is an obvious, and similarly witty interconnection between this manner of indicating chronology and the method of Guilhem's courtship. Sundays and feast days mark not only the passage of time but also the successive stages in the relationship between Guilhem and Flamenca; Alis, one of Flamenca's attendants, wishes there were more of them (4794-4804). This chronology therefore reinforces the author's sophisticated rapprochement of love and religion, which is elsewhere discernible

<sup>16</sup> Similar cases have been made for *Yvain* by Ménard (see above, p. 38, fn. 1 (m)) and by Pinkernell for *Jaufré* (fn. 1 (f), p. 362, fn. 12, and also in his article *Zur Datierung des provenzalischen « Jaufré »-Romans*, « Z.R.P. », 88, 1972, pp. 105-10).

<sup>17</sup> Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. E. Faral, Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Âge, Paris, 1938: a l'entree des avenz [3], a l'entree de la Quaresme, le jor que om prent cendres [8], la première semaine de quaresme [14], saint Joan [30], Pasque, Pentecoste [47], as octaves de la feste Saint Remi [76], la veille de la sain Martin [71], le jor de la Sain Martin [78, cf. 80], l'endemain de la Pasque [108], la veille de Pentecoste [119], Sain Johan [132], etc.



in the juxtaposition of erotic titillation and liturgy<sup>18</sup>, in the analogy, underpinning Guilhem's courtship, between service of God and love-service<sup>19</sup>, and in the quasi-divine omnipotence attributed to Amor at various points in the text<sup>20</sup>.

Furthermore, and, from the point of view of the study of time in the context I have outlined, most importantly, the basing of the text's chronology on something so objective as the calendar means that the future (as perceived by the characters and thus by the audience as well) always possesses a determinable shape. It is neither dependent on contingency nor obscured in a mist of vagueness. The audience would probably be familiar with the general succession of festivals; they could hardly be unaware of the regular recurrence of Sundays; but even supposing ignorance on both these points, the author, through his characters, keeps their future constantly in mind. At the very beginning, Archambaut can scarcely wait for the Sunday (elsewhere identified as Pentecost, l. 187) on which his marriage to Flamenca is to take place (178-83). Later, Flamenca and her maids plan and even rehearse the words she will say to Guilhem at their next meeting (4302-18, 4562-78, 4912-8, and so on). For his part, Guilhem wonders desperately what his first words to her should be (3841 ff.). The time of their first meeting in the baths is prearranged between them (5497-9, 5720-2); and when Guilhem leaves Bourbon, it is known that he will return next Easter for Archambaut's tournament, fixed for that season l. 6706 before his departure, and his attendance confirmed by Archambaut's formal invitation ll. 7023-32. Throughout the middle section of the romance, this awareness of the future is further conveyed by a psychology of anxious waiting, most marked in the case of Flamenca and her attendants, but also experienced by Guilhem.

*Jaufre* presents a complete contrast to *Flamenca*. In place of a precise and detailed chronology there is considerable vagueness,

<sup>18</sup> E.g. ll. 2994-7; 2524-45; and 2604-8 where Guilhem's reaction to *Ite, missa est* (*fort li pezet*) is opposed to the implied but unwritten response *Deo gratias*. Cf. also R. Nelli, *Le roman de « Flamenca », un art d'aimer occitanien du XIIIe siècle*, Institut d'Etudes Occitanes, Toulouse, 1966, pp. 95-6.

<sup>19</sup> E.g. in particular ll. 3750-61, 3811-8 and 4366-8.

<sup>20</sup> E.g. in particular ll. 3324-32, 3712-8 and 3806-10.

compounded by cases of downright internal contradiction. Such cases are, however, relatively unimportant since time in this romance is subjective rather than objective, operating through cycles of experience<sup>21</sup>. There is, indeed, an interrelation between chronological structure and thematic preoccupations, but these are of a quite different nature from those in *Flamenca*. The characters' future does contain certain fixed points, but even when it does (and more so when it does not) this future is accompanied not by a consciousness of waiting but rather by a feeling of urgency.

The poet<sup>22</sup> begins his tale at Pentecost (l. 91) and notes the Monday and Tuesday which follow it (1567, 1646; 2081, 2158). The only other day named is St. John the Baptist's day (5037) which marks the anniversary of Taulat's defeat of Melian. It is not so clear to me as to G. Pinkernell that this St. John's day and the day « D'ui en uit jorns » (5082, when Taulat will return to torment his victim) are identical<sup>23</sup>; the indication that something is going to happen in a week's time is one of the author's chronological formulae (see below), and by no means always to be taken literally.

One such chronological formula is the seven-year span. This is used to refer to time outside the actual period covered by the romance, which is not fully determinable, but which is less than two months. The seven-year motif is principally associated with Taulat's torture of the wounded knight (3152, 4846, 5036, 5853, 6195, 6438), but it is also the period it would take Jaufre to learn to make his own clothes (knight of the lance episode, l. 1464),

<sup>21</sup> This distinction between subjective and objective time is echoed in the lexical opposition *jorn* — *di* in Old French: cf. Glasser (fn. 1 (n)), pp. 38-45. The terms *jorn* and *di/dia* exist likewise in Provençal, though whether they are so clearly semantically opposed as in O.F. I do not know.

<sup>22</sup> I refer to « the poet » of *Jaufre* for the sake of convenience rather than as a sign of commitment to the theory of its single (as opposed to dual) authorship: for divergent opinions on this question see A. Stimmung, *Über den Verfasser des Jaufre-roman*, « Z.R.P. », 12, 1888, pp. 323-47; K. Lewent, *Zum Jaufreroman*, « Z.R.P. », 48, 1928, pp. 581-650; M. de Riquer, *Los Problemas del « Roman » provenzal de « Jaufrè »*, *Recueil de Travaux offerts à M. Clovis Brunel par ses amis, collègues et élèves*, Paris, 1955; and G. Pinkernell, op. cit. (fn. 1 (f)).

<sup>23</sup> Op. cit. (fn. 1 (f)), p. 362, fn. 12.

the length of time his victims have been held prisoner by the *sirven* (2135), and the possible duration of Jaufre's stay with Brunissen (7354). Augier d'Essart says it is seven years since he received a guest into his home (4468-9), and claims to have been the companion of Jaufre's father for *be .vij. ans* (4542)<sup>24</sup>.

The recurrence of the seven-year motif invites scepticism towards the likewise reiterated span of eight days, about whose literal accuracy I have already expressed doubts in relation to l. 5082. Arthur's plan for Jaufre to marry Brunissen in a week's time (9652-3) is not open to contestation; but the week taken by Taulat to reach Arthur's court after his defeat by Jaufre (6292) is suspect, because it conflicts with the account of the movements of Brunissen's seneschal. The latter is said to have met Taulat at Arthur's court (6927), yet he encounters Jaufre the day after Jaufre has left Augier's house (6803 ff.). Since the text is insistent that Jaufre only spent one night there (cf. 6811-8), this meeting between him and the seneschal cannot be later than two days after the fight with Taulat. The week, in this case, is clearly an overestimate. The week's time limit set by the fairy Gibel when she first appears at Arthur's court (6303) is equally clearly an underestimate, since it is over a week later that Jaufre fights the Felon in her defence.

The week also figures in retrospective estimates of duration, again with little accuracy. MS B. gives l. 5458 as *Si ai ben qist .viii. jornt o plus* (MS A. has *E ai qist ben u mes e plus*). All editors amend to give the « accurate » *.vi.* Jaufre is said to have spent eight days with the hermit (5640-2), but if he had done so, he would have been late for his meeting with Taulat, since that was projected to take place eight days after the day *before* Jaufre first met the hermit<sup>25</sup>. Finally, we are told that Jaufre's horse is collapsing from not having eaten wheat for eight days (9063), although it seems to be only the fourth day since he set out from

<sup>24</sup> This 7-year span is attested elsewhere as a formula, e.g. *The Song of Roland* l. 2, or *Raoul de Cambrai* (ed. P. Meyer and A. Longnon, S.A.T.F., Paris, 1882), ll. 3788-9.

<sup>25</sup> G. Pinkernell (see fn. 1 (f)) attributes this « inaccuracy » to a confusion on the part of the first poet (p. 363 fn. 17); later « inaccuracies », however, are evidence in his view that the latter part of the text is the work of a second author.

Brunissen's castle (8359). The week, then, serves as an estimated interval of time (most characteristically an interval of repose between days of action — cf. below, p. 53), but it need not fit in with the author's basic unit of chronology, which is the individual day.

The progress of time through the day is sometimes marked by reference to the canonical hours (e.g. *ora nona* 161, *tercia* 2193), but most often by the cycle from day to night and from night to day<sup>26</sup>. The expression *tota nueg, tot (lo) jorn* alternate throughout the text (984, 1029, 4594, 7672; 4356, 4807, 4885, 10339, 10692), and the cycle is given formulaic expression in such recurring lines as *E la nuet venc (fon) bela e serena* (1569, 3038), *Ans (E) a tot lo jorn cavalcat* (4356, 10339, 10692), and *E.l matin, tantost con (co.l) jor par* (6803, 7673; *Cant venc al matin que.l jorn par*, 9427, 10249; *E l'endeman, can lu jor par*, 10878).

Time structure in *Jaufre* is therefore linked not to objective calendar time but to the daily experienced cycle of light and darkness, heat and cold. This makes it possible for the author at once to invest the passage of time with symbolic or emblematic association and to relate these to Jaufre's developing experience of knighthood.

A major theme of Jaufre's adventures is the overthrowing of Pride. Jaufre's first adversary bears the allegorical name of Estout and is further reproached for his pride (875). The encounter takes place literally at night, while the powers of darkness are briefly invoked by Jaufre to punish whoever made Estout's invincible armour (1110-2). The association between pride, nighttime and devilry is repeated in the encounter with the *sirven* and with the Black Knight who is interpreted as being the Evil One (5478)<sup>27</sup>. The motif of heat is not viewed in theological terms, but it does serve to intensify Jaufre's suffering on his quest (1340-1, 2194-5), and is subsequently reinterpreted metaphorically as an

<sup>26</sup> Cf P. Ménard (n. 1 (m)) p. 387: « Mais le rythme le plus constant [in Chrétien] se fonde sur l'alternance du jour et de la nuit ».

<sup>27</sup> On the importance on this latter encounter, see H.R. Jauss, *Die Defigurierung des Wunderbaren und der Sinn der Aventure im « Jaufre »*, « Romanistisches Jahrbuch », 6, 1953-4, pp. 60-75, esp. pp. 73-4.

image of love (3706-7, 4020), thus linking Jaufre's amorous to his more strictly knightly experiences.

This subjective and moralistic treatment of time in the romance derives added strength from its association with food and rest. Starting on his quest, Jaufre abjures both in his eagerness to catch up with Taulat. As a result he grows weaker and weaker (e.g. 3025-30). Food has become linked with knightly achievement in the first scene, where the king's court is unable to dine until some adventure has taken place; so in refusing food, Jaufre is not only imposing physical hardship on himself but also testing his knightly capacity. Sleep, like heat, has a double set of association in the narrative; on the one hand, Jaufre voluntarily refuses sleep in order to pursue his knightly course, and on the other both he and Brunissen are involuntarily deprived of sleep by the power of love<sup>28</sup>.

In this way, time becomes one of a range of symbolic or emblematic structures in the narrative<sup>29</sup>. From the point of view of the audience, it serves to reinforce moralistic themes and to increase the stature of the hero. From the point of view of Jaufre himself, the passage of time invests his quest with intense urgency. At first he has to contend with his growing weakness, sleeping for the first time at Monbrun (Tuesday night) and breaking his fast on the Wednesday morning with the *boer*. In the first six days in particular he is almost ceaselessly active. During this period he does not know who Taulat is nor when he may see him. His feeling of urgency thus creates an atmosphere of suspense, which is relaxed temporarily over the following week in which he waits at the hermit's house to prepare for the fight with Taulat. After this fight, the pressure of time builds up again with Jaufre's urgent desire to see Brunissen. As in his pursuit of Taulat, he is resolved not to waste any time in sleep (6812-5); and although of course he knows Brunissen's identity, he is altogether uncertain what reception he will get from her. Once again, then, suspense is

<sup>28</sup> It is also noted (l. 6689) that love makes Jaufre lose his appetite.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. the hills (*pueg*) which Jaufre frequently has to climb in order to perform his adventures, and which serve as emblems both of his increasing prowess and of the pride which it is his duty to bring low.

created. This too relaxes with the start of the apparently routine journey from Monbrun to Arthur's court where the wedding is to take place, and this time it is the urgent need for deliverance of the fairy Gibel which introduces the element of the unpredictable. Jaufre is whisked away into an unknown world, to be mourned as dead in the world above. This renews suspense over the proposed marriage, a suspense which is finally released at the end of the romance.

## 2) *The adaptation of story to plot.*

Both *Flamenca* and *Jaufre* present events in approximately chronological order, that is with the plot more or less mirroring the story, but where they deviate from it they do so in different ways for quite opposing literary effects.

In *Jaufre* the psychology of suspense is matched by the disposition of the plot which contains two important cases of delayed exposition. The author uses his principal character as a covert narrator throughout much of the romance, so that the audience is kept in ignorance of the reason for the extraordinary grief and violence which Jaufre experiences first at Monbrun, then with the *boer*, and later with Augier and his sons. The audience must thus wait from the first expression of this grief (3152 ff.) till the meeting with the tortured knight's attendant damsel (5018 ff.) for an adequate explanation of this mysterious behaviour, sharing Jaufre's bafflement as well as his enlightenment. The second case of delayed exposition occurs in the adventure of the fountain. An unnamed damsel first appears asking for help at Arthur's court at l. 6295; she later approaches Jaufre (8005 ff.); Jaufre is then snatched away through the toils of this mysterious figure into an « other world » adventure (8378 ff.); sufficient explanations are offered to him at this point to secure his aid against Felon (8756-99); but the identity of the lady is not revealed until l. 10654. A propos of this and other examples of delayed exposition M.J. Glencross has remarked that « it is on this time-gap between action and explanation that part of the dramatic effect of the work depends »<sup>30</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> M. J. Glencross, *Aspects of style and narrative technique in the old Pro-*

*Jaufre* also contains several examples of deviation from chronological ordering in the disposition of narrative episodes. The knights liberated by the hero, and his vanquished opponents, are severally dispatched to Arthur's court to bear witness there to Jaufre's achievements. Their arrival and reception there, though subsequent to Jaufre's next ensuing adventure, are nonetheless described *before* it: 1247-1331 (Estout and his victims), 1574-1657 (the dwarf of the knight of the lance), 2086-2179 (the *sirven's* victims), 2903-3016 (the damsel rescued from the lepers), and finally 6284-6684 (Taulat and the tortured knight). All these episodes serve the paradoxical aims of, on the one hand, emphasising the knightly stature of Jaufre by making it public in the ideological centre of the knightly world (Arthur's court), while, on the other hand, delaying the further retailing of his knightly deeds to the text's literary public.

The author of *Jaufre* makes use of yet another delaying tactic, digression. Having immured his hero in the leper's hut with no apparent possibility of escape, the poet treats us to a digression of nearly 60 lines (2565-2630), which seems designed to add to the suspense of the hero's predicament:

2562 ... Que puinar i pogra .i. mes,  
           O .ii. ans o .iii. totz cumplitz,  
           Q'encar no fora fors totz isitz.  
 2565 Ara.l vos laisarai estar,  
           Qe mo sein mi fai cambïar  
           Malsparliers e vilanas gens...

It is true that this passage concludes with an assurance that he will escape and that all will be well, but this seems to me rather to confirm the author's awareness of the literary effect of digression than to undermine this effect<sup>31</sup>. (The only other suggestion of authorial premonition in the text (3978-85) does not in fact provide any information which is new to the audience, it is only an ironical comment on the ignorance of Jaufre himself:

*vençal romance of «Jaufre»*, B. Litt. thesis, Oxford, 1973, p. 70; cf. his discussion of delayed exposition and unexpected narrative connections, p. 58 ff.

<sup>31</sup> In this I differ from Glencross, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

3978 Mas, si el saubes veramens  
 L'amor qe Brunissen li porta,  
 No.l pogrūn far passar la porta  
 Tota la jen d'aquel castel...)

Two other passages which could plausibly be regarded as digressions in *Jaufre* are the two court scenes involving the knight-magician, which have been characterised as « hors d'oeuvre »<sup>32</sup>. Discussion of these is, however, reserved till later (p. 20 ff.).

Returning to *Flamenca*, in which time structure was seen as related to a psychology of waiting and expectation, it emerges that this too is reinforced by the composition of the plot. The contrast with *Jaufre* is blatant: in place of retarded exposition, we find anticipation of future events by means of prophecy. A state of mind involving not suspense but expectation is thereby induced in the audience. Direct authorial comment informs us of the general outline of the story. Archambaut will be cured of his jealousy, but only when his suspicions have been realised (902-6); the imprisoned Flamenca would be deprived for ever of love if Amor did not decide to teach her her « game » (1410-5); if Flamenca knew of Guilhem's love, she would welcome it (2155-61, 2419-31). Amor, too, assures us of the successful outcome of Guilhem's undertaking. Regrettably some of her words are lost in a lacuna, but even as the text stands they are sufficiently explicit:

1795 « Us fo gelos clau e rescon  
 La plus bella dona del mon  
 E la meillor ad ops d'amar;  
 E tu sols deus la desliurar,  
 Car tu es cavalliers e clerics,  
 Per zo t'a obs ades encercs  
 . . . . .

It is clear from these anticipations that Guilhem will court Flamenca, that she will respond favorably to his suit, that he will succeed by virtue of his dual training in knightly and clerical accomplish-

<sup>32</sup> A. Jeanroy, *Le Roman de « Jaufré »*, « Annales du Midi », 3, 1941, pp. 363-390, pp. 378 and 367 fn. 6.



ments, and that after their love has been consummated, Archambaut will be cured of his jealousy.

The material details of this courtship are also known in advance to the audience as a result of Guilhem's dream (2804-2959), in which Flamenca suggests to him both the use of the church as a setting for courtship and that of the baths as one for consummation. This dream also promises Flamenca's eventual consent.

Because the romance of *Flamenca* is so preoccupied with the power of love and the *domna's* responsibility to reward her lover, the author's frequent interpolations into his narrative should not properly be regarded as digressions but rather as commentary and explanation which, if anything, serve to reinforce expectations, about behaviour. An example is furnished by the author's disquisition ll. 3005-55. One of the themes which runs right through the romance is that of illness, pretexted, metaphorical or real. In this passage, the author raises the question as to why love's fever should be worse than any other disease, and takes it upon himself to enlighten us: *E dirai vos rason per que* (3005). Firstly, love attacks the heart and holds the soul prisoner, allowing it no respite, so that whereas other illnesses have periods of relative relief the pressure of love is constant. Nature, which can heal other diseases, is powerless in the case of love and so makes no attempt to alleviate it. Love is a wound in the spirit, whose proximity to the heart intensifies the suffering experienced by the lover. Not even Apollo, source of the science of medicine, could find a cure for love; and so

3054 Per so no.m meravil eu ges  
Si Guillems era fort laisatz.

This concluding Q.E.D. provides not only an account of Guilhem's current indisposition but a rule by which the characters' future sufferings may be predicted. In the same way the author leads up to and comments on Flamenca's according of her *merce*, and her consequent satisfaction in mutual love.

### 3) *Tempo*.

A major cause of the different handling of narrative tempo

in *Jaufre* and *Flamenca* is that the former is concerned to produce a balance between what has been called « inner » and « outer » action<sup>33</sup>, whereas *Flamenca* shows little interest in « outer » action, ofte nreplacing the dealing of physical events by generalising description, and concentrating almost exclusively on psychological analysis and commentary. As a result of its dual concern, *Jaufre* juxtaposes passages of relatively rapid tempo (dealing with Jaufre's knightly exploits) with slower passages which are more lyrical in character: principally ll. 3020-4167 (Jaufre's first stay at Monbrun) and ll. 6899-8326 (Jaufre's courtship of Brunissen and their engagement, this passage being interrupted ll. 8005-142 by the appeals for help of the fairy Gibel); a further lyric passage, containing the laments of Brunissen, Melian and Augier on the supposed death of Jaufre, is interpolated into the adventure of the fountain (8447-8742). In *Flamenca*, monologue or the description of psychological reaction is found throughout, with the result that the tempo of the romance is both slower and more even. Not all the differences between the tempi of the two texts, however, can be ascribed simply to differences of subject matter.

The tempo of *Jaufre* is organised according to a very simple schema whereby series of days of action alternate with periods of inaction. This schema is repeated three times. The first active period occupies days 1-6 of the romance from Jaufre's departure on the evening of Whitsunday to his taking lodging with the hermit (711-5639). Then eight days pass (the period of eight days being, as was pointed out earlier, an authorial formula which is not necessarily precise) (5640-42). Then three days pass in which Jaufre frees Augier's daughter, fights Taulat, returns to Augier, and then goes off to find and win Brunissen (5643-8326). There ensues a second period of waiting (8327-62) before Jaufre is enticed away by the fairy Gibel for the adventure of the fountain. This adventure, and the return to Arthur's court following it, occupy a further two days (8363-9674). Arthur arranges for the marriage to take place eight days later when his court has assembled, and this assembly is described in ll. 9675-84. The romance concludes

<sup>33</sup> I. Nolting-Hauff, *Die Stellung der Liebeskasuistik im höfischen Roman*, Heidelberger Forschungen 6. Heft, Heidelberg, 1959, e.g. pp. 94-96.

with the marriage of Jaufre and Brunissen, the adventure of Arthur with the knight-magician, the explanations of the fairy Gibel and the return of the married couple to Monbrun (a further two days). This simple foreground/background technique in the presentation of material provides full narrative coverage of Jaufre's activities and a very bald sketching-in of the periods of waiting between them (2 lines in the first case, 35 in the second, 9 in the third). This alternation between foreground and background is characteristic of most 12th century romance writers; the indeterminacy of lengths of periods of repose is something which has been pointed out in the works of Chrétien<sup>34</sup>.

*Jaufre*, like Chrétien's *Charrette*<sup>35</sup>, also shows a relatively high concentration of action in the first part of the romance. The tempo is relatively faster in the first six days (up to l. 5639) than in the other seven days of action interspersed with inactivity: it is here that all the fighting takes place apart from the combats with the giant, Taulat, the Felon and Kay. This relative rapidity of tempo seems to be associated with a period in which Jaufre's knightly capacity is tested and proved; his subsequent encounters mark the fruition of this apprenticeship. The same period, it was shown earlier, is also marked particularly strongly by a psychology of urgency and uncertainty, and first serves to establish the symbolic association of time with food, rest, heat and darkness.

The suspense which is achieved in *Jaufre* by means of this feeling of urgency, combined with techniques of delayed exposition, displacement of episodes and digression, is at least partially realised also in variations of tempo. The events of the first six days of the romance are punctuated by the stay at Monbrun, which is by far the longest single episode in this period (c. 1000 lines). The events on either side of it form two groups of four; and while these groups do not show a completely consistent tendency towards the progressive lengthening of their constituent episodes, this is nonetheless the overall pattern they present. The first group is constructed as follows:

<sup>34</sup> Cf. H. J. Weigand (fn. 1 (j)), pp. 931-2, and J. Frappier, (fn. 1 (k)), pp. 75-6.

<sup>35</sup> E. Soudek (fn. 1 (i)), pp. 104-8.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) encounters with wounded knights<br>and Estout: | 714-1225 (500 lines)                     |
| 2) encounter with the knight of the lance:        | 1332-1573 (240 lines)                    |
| 3) encounter with the <i>sirven</i> :             | 1658-2085 (over 400 lines)               |
| 4) encounter with the lepers:                     | 2180 <sup>1</sup> -2900 (over 800 lines) |

The first episode occupies more narrative space than either the second or the third, and as a result stands outside this patterning of progressive lengthening; on the other hand, it involves not only Jaufre's confrontation with Estout but also his hurrying after the three wounded knights, so it does perhaps contain more narrative material than either (2) or (3). A similar case could be made out for the greater length of the second episode in the following group:

- |   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1) meeting with the <i>boer</i> :                                     | 4168-4343 (160 lines) |
| 2) meeting with Augier:   | 4344-4878 (530 lines) |
| 3) meeting with Melian's damsel:                                      | 4879-5177 (300 lines) |
| 4) meeting with Black Knight (Jaufre<br>accepts lodging with hermit): | 5178-5639 (350 lines) |

The first 100 lines or so of this second episode concern the meeting of Jaufre with Augier's sons (to l. 4457) and the last 200 (from l. 5648) the struggle with Augier and subsequent explanations.

These methods of calculating narrative tempo are admittedly crude, but the gradual lengthening of the incidents on either side of the Monbrun episode seems to produce a slowing down of tempo which reinforces the suspense already conveyed by other means, because it makes Jaufre's adventures appear progressively more time-consuming, and thus helps to defer the moment of their fulfilment: the meeting with Taulat.

The techniques adopted by the author of *Flamenca* are quite different. The romance falls into three chronological sections, the two series of court scenes at the beginning and end and the long account of Guilhem's courtship and the consummation of his love in the middle. The author shows considerable sophistication in not adopting the conventional foreground/background distribution of material: the periods of time elapsing between the various sections of narrative are not baldly passed over but are used instead for character description, and since in each case it is the develop-

ment of the character which is described, the passage of time is invested with a certain reality. Most striking is the passage ll. 993-1560 which covers a period of a little over two years from the last day of Archambaut's court to the introduction of Guilhem. A whole series of devices is used to disguise the difference in tempo between this period and the narrative events surrounding it, which are taken much more slowly. In the first place a blend with the immediately foregoing narrative is achieved by the relatively fast tempo of the latter: the last few days of Archambaut's court are passed over fairly rapidly. Furthermore the account of Archambaut's increasing jealousy is presented through generalising statements, exemplary incidents, and above all a cyclical disposition of the motifs of Archambaut's behaviour and reflections and his relationship with society, all of which devices have the effect of effacing as much as possible the distinction between narrative and description.

The second period, falling ll. 6929-6983, i.e. between Guilhem's departure from Bourbon and the start of the Lenten tournament at Brabant, is similarly filled with accounts of Guilhem's knightly excellence, chiefly conveyed in a representative speech of praise by Flamenca's father. In this case a blend is achieved with the narrative immediately following this interval, the days of the tournament at Brabant being sketched in relatively rapidly. The contrast between this manner of handling « background » and the technique adopted conventionally and by the *Jaufre* poet may be seen by comparing these two passages with the bald statement that four months have passed, *Flamenca* ll. 6656-9: this interval separates the first meetings of Flamenca and Guilhem in the baths from Archambaut's return to courtly ways and the consequent separation of the lovers, a period which seems to hold no psychological interest for the author.

« Foreground » material is handled with equal assurance. Instead of duly noting the passage of each day, the author selects certain days for full coverage and fills in the gaps between them with generalising description. In the initial series of court scenes, only four days are fully covered: the Saturday and Sunday of Pentecost, St. John's day and the last day of Archambaut's court. The concluding court scenes are presented in a similar way. It is

the tempo of the middle of the romance, however, which offers the greatest interest. This begins with a complete halt as Guilhem is extensively described (1561 - c. 1800). The courtship period starts very slowly, about 700 lines being devoted to Guilhem's first two days in Bourbon. Treated even more slowly are the two days when he and Flamenca meet in the baths (5755-6655 - 900 lines). These are probably the two most important days in the whole romance, both psychologically (from the point of view of the characters) and thematically (from the point of view of the text as an investigation of love). Leading up to this climax, we find a gradual quickening of tempo. This can be shown by examining the spacing of interchanges in the lovers' dialogue:

the 1st Sunday	<i>hai las!</i> ((3949)	
» 2nd »	<i>que plains?</i> (4344)	c. 400 lines
the 3rd Sunday	<i>mor mi</i> (4503)	c. 160 lines
» 4th »	<i>de que?</i> (4761)	c. 260 lines
Thursday following	<i>d'amor</i> (4878)	c. 120 lines
the 5th Sunday	<i>per cui?</i> (4940)	c. 70 lines
» 6th »	<i>per vos</i> (4968)	28 lines
Monday following	<i>qu'en pucs?</i> (5039)	c. 70 lines
the 7th Sunday	<i>garir</i> (5096)	c. 60 lines
Saturday following	<i>consi?</i> (5155)	c. 60 lines
the 8th Sunday	<i>per gein</i> (5204)	c. 60 lines
Thursday following	<i>pren l'i</i> (5279, from ll. 5217 & 5230)	c. 75 lines
the 9th Sunday	<i>pres l'ai</i> (5309)	30 lines
» 10th »	<i>e cal?</i> (5458)	c. 150 lines
» 11th »	<i>iretz</i> (5460)	2 lines
Saturday following	<i>es on?</i> (5465)	5 lines
the 12th Sunday	<i>als banz</i> (5467)	2 lines
Tuesday following	<i>cora?</i> (5487)	20 lines
the 13th Sunday	<i>jorn breu e gent</i> (5499)	c. 20 lines
Tuesday following	<i>plas mi</i> ((5721)	c. 220 lines

There is a progressive shortening of the narrative space between interchanges, the exceptions being between *pres l'ai* and *e cal?* and between the last two. In each case these intervals are extended by discussion between Flamenca and per maids, in which the arguments for her eventual acceptance of Guilhem's love are paraded. This overall pattern of acceleration presents a contrast to that of deceleration found in *Jaufre*; and just as the slowing down

of tempo there corresponded to and reinforced the suspense of the narrative, so in *Flamenca* its acceleration corresponds to and reinforces the sense of expectation, as events are felt to hasten towards their foregone conclusion.

#### 4) *Pacing.*

From the point of view an audience, the time taken in the performance of these two texts takes on a different character in each case. Listening to *Flamenca* the audience will know in advance both the general outline of the tale and the method by which Guilhem's courtship will succeed. For them as for the romance's characters, the future has a determinate shape; but unlike the characters (and notably unlike Archambaut and *Flamenca*) the audience will possess certain knowledge of what this future will bring, independently of the gradual unfolding of the narrative. An audience hearing *Jaufre* will, on the contrary, be unaware of the overall extent of the narrative, and thus, distracted by delaying tactics of various kinds, be kept in a state of suspense. In this section, aspects of the composition of these two texts other than their internal chronological make-up will be examined from the point of view of the time taken in recitation, and an attempt will be made to refine the notions « suspense » and « expectation » which have so far been used more as convenient labels than as adequately defined terms.

Two features of *Flamenca*'s composition are relevant here. The first is the virtual borrowing from a song by Peire Rogier of the earlier exchanges in the lovers' dialogue<sup>36</sup>. For those who knew the song the structure of this part of the dialogue, though spread over about 1000 lines, would nonetheless be predictable. The second feature is the symmetrical placing of the court scenes. In view of the loss of the beginning and end of the text, it would be rash to make strong assertions about the purpose of these scenes in the completed work. Judging by what has survived, how-

<sup>36</sup> *The Poems of the Troubadour Peire Rogier*, ed. D. Nicholson, Manchester Univ. Press, Manchester & New York, 1976, no. VI, ll. 41-5 (p. 89).

ever, the romance seems composed of two superimposed structures, both centring on the character of the heroine. The first is progressive, involving her developing relationship with Guilhem; the second is symmetrical, and concerns her relationship with Archambaut and his change from courtliness to jealousy and back again. Both these structures are fulfilled within the final court scene as it stands even in the truncated text. The case of Archambaut is obvious, and indeed predicted by the text itself (903-6). That of Guilhem is more complex. He courts and wins Flamenca in environments associated with the Church and the Bourgeoisie (or Commerce) respectively; and though by so doing he acquires greater renown, there is nonetheless a need for this love to be integrated into its proper setting, the Court, and for it to be placed among courtly values such as refinement, opulence, chivalry and rank. It seems to me to be important to recognise that Guilhem's departure from Bourbon, though it makes encounters between the lovers more difficult, does not really represent a loss for them. Both win social *éclat*, Guilhem at tournaments (e.g. 6934-6) and Flamenca in her husband's court (e.g. 7225 ff.), while Flamenca rejoices at Guilhem's success (6978-81). Indeed, part of the reason why she dismisses him is that he has become *reclus* (6780). Both the lovers thus gain in social involvement and reputation. But they are also enabled by their separation to progress emotionally. Their parting is marked by the exchange of hearts (6891-2), a token of emotional commitment which prepares the way for the important insight of ll. 8052-8 that confidence in each other's readiness, occasion permitting, to yield to the wishes of the other, is an adequate satisfaction in itself. Thus although their meetings are less frequent, more hurried, and furtive, their love seems to have passed to a higher level of emotional and intellectual security which is, in fact, more appropriate to the world of the court.

There are, then, grounds for supposing that the final court scene at Bourbon would have come very close to the end of the original romance. Certainly, in this text so well sign-posted with reference to future events, there are no clear allusions to anything taking place after the end of the text as it stands. Equally it is difficult to conceive what narrative material could have been pre-faced to the initial court scene. In any case, there is a very strong



probability that such part of the text as are lost would have been set in a court context<sup>37</sup>.

Assuming, then, that the original work shared the symmetrical composition of the present text, we may suppose that the return to a courtly setting after l. 6720 would serve as a signal that the poem was nearing its conclusion, and that this signal would be reinforced by the repetition of motifs from the opening court scenes such as the presence of the king, jousting, and an intrigue involving a lady's sleeve.

*Jaufre* also contains two parallel court scenes in which Arthur is subjected to indignities by the knight-magician. A connoisseur of Arthurian romance would probably conclude that the second of these scenes should mark the end of the romance just as the first marked its beginning. In *Jaufre*, however, this inference would be quite false. The second court scene, unlike that in *Flamenca*, has virtually nothing to do with the story; and though the parallel between it and the earlier court scene is far more marked than is the case in *Flamenca*, the romance continues afterwards with the submission of Felon to Arthur's will, the departure of Jaufre and Brunissen, the explanations of the fairy Gibel, and the couple's arrival at Monbrun. In other words this second court scene has been misleadingly placed; it serves not as a *dénouement* but as a distraction from the *dénouement*, and from the point of view of its content it is effectively a digression. The study of these

<sup>37</sup> It is not possible to infer from the MS. how much of the text has been lost at the end; as for the beginning, editors give rather vague indications. P. Meyer in his 2nd edition of *Flamenca* (Paris, 1901), draws attention to a fragment of a folio, bound in to the binding, which he calls the 1st folio, numbering from there on in his text (see p. 1 and note); the edition by M. J. Hubert and M. E. Porter (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1962) speaks of « the missing folio(s) at the beginning of the romance » (note 1, p. 435). The most recent editor, Ulrich Geschwind (*Le roman de Flamenca*, Romanica Helvetica, vol. 86A & B, Berne, 1976), is slightly more positive: « Il semble que le début du roman perdu n'ait pas embrassé plus de deux ou, si le prologue avait été d'une certaine prolixité caractéristique à notre poète, de trois feuillets » (vol. II, p. 63). Although Geschwind says nothing about the end of the MS., his analysis of the poem based on a comparison with *Erec et Enide* (vol. I, pp. 20-21) stresses the climactic importance of the final court scenes, and is therefore in harmony with my own conjectures about the extent and nature of the lost text.

court scenes serves once again to highlight the contrasting techniques of the authors of these two texts.

The discussion of the last few paragraphs has seen the intrusion of considerations which are not so much textual as generic. This marks a return to the points raised in the first paragraph of this paper and it also necessitates a reappraisal of the terms « suspense » and « expectation ». Suspense cannot be represented as a state of total ignorance about the outcome of events: the audience of *Jaufre* may be deprived of explicit indications of future events, but they can never be in any serious doubt that the hero will get his man — and his girl. The author is not so much concerned to exploit a state of ignorance in his public as to generate uncertainty about how and when his hero's quests will reach fulfilment. Some of his devices serve chiefly to create doubt about the « when? », notably digression, displaced episodes, and decelerating tempo. Others contribute to raise uncertainty about the « how? » as well, e.g. his insistence on the debilitating effect of the passage of time and his withholding of explanatory material.

*Jaufre* belongs unambiguously to the genre of Arthurian romance<sup>38</sup>, but *Flamenca*, though related to *fabliaux* showing the futility of jealousy<sup>39</sup>, is constructed on a far larger scale and incorporates a study of *fin' amors* conducted with a penetration and refinement of analysis which are quite beyond the scope (and indeed outside the interest) of these short *fabliaux*. Much of its thematic material derives more clearly from the lyric tradition than from any group of narrative texts. As a result, the romance

<sup>38</sup> For similarities between *Jaufre* and the works of Chrétien, see A. Jeanroy, *art cit.*, Martin de Riquér, *Los Problemas del « Roman » provenzal de « Jaufré »*, *loc. cit.*, and R. Lejeune, *A propos de la datation de « Jaufre »: le roman de « Jaufre » source de Chrétien de Troyes?* « RBPB », 31, 1953, pp. 717-47.

<sup>39</sup> See E. Müller, *Die altprovenzalische Versnovelle*, Romanistische Arbeiten ed. K. Voretzsch 14, Halle, 1930, pp. 33-70; A. Limentani, *Las novas de Guillem de Nivers (« Flamenca »)*. Introduzione, scelta e glossario, Padova, 1965, pp. xiii-xxiii; and, by the same author, *L'elaborazione delle fonti nelle « Novas de Guillem de Nivers » (« Flamenca »)*, in *Actele celui de-al XII-lea congres internațional de lingvistică și filologie romanică*, ed. A. Rosetti and S. Reinheimer-Rîpeanu, 2 vols, Ed. academiiei republicii socialiste România, București, 1970, vol. II, pp. 757-63.

is remarkable for its independence and originality; so that while it sets up its own patterns of expectation and fulfilment, these cannot truly be said to be informed or reinforced by generic conventions. Indeed, it is interesting to note that two of its major techniques of creating expectation — prophecy and the prophetic dream — are characteristic not of romance writing but of the *chansons de geste*<sup>40</sup>. Thus though *Flamenca* leads its audience to expect certain events to take place within the fiction, and also provides a considerable amount of information about how and when they will take place, the nature of these events is not, as it were, authenticated by a tradition external to the text: the story may be known in advance but it also needs to be told. (Indeed this would probably be true of any story, even one whose structure was reinforced by generic conventions). The terms « suspense » and « expectation » are therefore not antithetical, opposing absolute uncertainty on the one hand to absolute predictability on the other; rather they denote a different balance achieved between uncertainties and predictabilities which derive from different sources.

The study has tried to show how two medieval writers make very different use of the medium in which they are both writing, namely oral recitation through time. The author of *Jaufré*, while writing within a well-known generic mould, exploits the fact that his audience are unable to « look ahead » through the pages of his work to see what is coming next, and so creates an atmosphere of suspense; the author of *Flamenca*, on the other hand, conscious of the aesthetic unity of his work as an artefact, seeks to make its patterns always present to the minds of his hearers by reminding them of its structure, while at the same time producing a work of startling originality.

SARAH KAY  
University of Liverpool

<sup>40</sup> For an interesting study of the psychology of expectation as opposed to suspense in the *Song of Roland*, see the chapter *Esquemas narrativos en la «Chanson de Roland»*, in Cesare Segre's *Crítica bajo control* (first published in Italy as *I segni e la critica*), tr. by M. Arizmendi and M. Hernández-Esteban, Barcelona, 1970, pp. 273-84.