'Cuer me rendés…'

THE EMOTIONAL INVOLVEMENT OF THE CONTEMPORARY

AUDIENCE IN THE *YVAIN*-CORPUS

Master thesis RMA Medieval Studies

by Chloé Vondenhoff

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

'Cuer me rendés…'

['Lend me your hearts….']

This request is made by one of Chrétien de Troyes's leading characters in the story of *Yvain or the Knight with the Lion*. Calogrenant, one of Arthur's knights, is about to commence his tale of shame. In an attempt to guide his audience in their listening experience, Calogrenant is asking them to lend him their hearts, "for words that are not understood by the heart are lost completely" (150–3). These lines support the little evidence we have today to underline the importance of emotions in medieval romance. Calogrenant's emphasis on the use of the heart when interpreting a story, suggests the importance, recognised at least by Chrétien, of emotions in medieval literature.

Like the above–mentioned example of *narratorial intrusion*, Chrétien deploys many narrative techniques to guide his audience in their reception of *Yvain*. Although Chrétien's mastery of these techniques is evident in all his romances, their exploitation in *Yvain* mainly serves to emphasise the emotional experience of the story. He uses many of these narrative techniques to appeal to the readers'/listeners' emotions and to guide them in their emotional response. Therefore, the aim of this study is to examine these narrative techniques and investigate how they brought about the emotional involvement of the contemporary audience.

Although many different interpretations of *Yvain* have been presented over the years, few contain an emotional reading of the text. This investigation, however, will focus on such an emotional reading. What is more, the emotional reading presented in this thesis will be comparative. *Yvain* has many translations. The story has been adapted into Middle High

German, Old Norse, Old Swedish and Middle English. Although research comparing the narrative configurations of the individual translations with their French source has been carried out, these mostly concern either the German or the English rewriting. None of these studies has extended this comparison by discussing all the versions involved.[1] However, since these adaptations show remarkable fidelity to their French source, the narrative techniques deployed in these adaptations and the emotions emphasised by them, are also of importance to this study. By investigating these narrative techniques for *Yvain*'s rewritings, we can gather information on the adaptors' reception of (the emotions in) Chretien's text and on the way they themselves involved their audience emotionally. For this reason, I will be exploring and comparing the narrative techniques deployed to bring about the emotional involvement of the contemporary audience in all the texts of the *Yvain*–corpus.

This thesis will firstly present a chapter on emotion research. In this chapter, I will address the history of emotion research and its current developments. My investigation will also be assigned a place in this vast field of study. Secondly, the methodology for this investigation will be discussed. In this discussion, I will elaborate on my approach and on the methodological difficulties that are inherent to this study. Moreover, I will give the tradition of the transmission of the *Yvain*-texts and a summary of the texts involved. This introductory exposition will be followed by three analytic chapters. In these chapters, I will interpret and compare the narrative techniques deployed by Chrétien and his adaptors to bring about the audience's emotional involvement. Lastly, I will present the conclusion, in which I will give the findings for my main research question. This conclusion will also present additional findings which contribute to this study as well.

---

[1] Sif Rickhardsdottir's recent publication on "The narrative transformations in the Old Norse and Middle English Versions of *Le Chevalier au Lion* (or *Yvain*)", however, does discuss three of the five texts involved in the *Yvain*–corpus. See Rikhardsdottir (2012).

Next to providing Arthurian Studies with an intertextual study on all the versions of the *Yvain*–story, this investigation aims to contribute to the rapidly growing field of emotion research.

1.1 Emotion research

Within the last thirty years, emotions have become a popular research topic in disciplines as diverse as anthropology, (neuro)biology, sociology, philosophy and even the arts. These fields of research have focused on questions like whether emotions are culturally determined, natural and/or universal. Each discipline adheres to different theories on and definitions of the emotions. It will be too time–consuming to list all these theories and definitions. I will, however, give insight into the development of emotion research in general. Moreover, I will ascribe my thesis a place in the vast field of studies on emotions.

1.1.1 Development of emotion research

Since time immemorial, the (nature of) emotions have been food for thought. Ancient and medieval texts on this topic that have survived until today mostly belonged to philosophical thinkers or Church fathers. One of the first to write about emotions was Aristotle. He discussed the nature of emotions in his works *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Ars Rhetorica*.[2] The Roman philosopher Seneca, a follower of Stoicism, is also an important source on the emotions. Both Aristotle and Seneca were particularly interested in the voluntary nature of the emotions. In *The City of God* (Book 9.4–5 and throughout Book 14), Augustine also offered a lengthy discussion of the emotions. He built on Aristotle's and Seneca's thoughts, but at the same time broke with the classical tradition. His discussion was directed against Stoicism and,

---

[2] See: Stephen Leighton, *Aristotle and the Emotions*. *Phronesis*: 27.2 (1982), 144–73.

in its place, Augustine advocated an eclectic mix of ancient theories of the emotions. Medieval scholars who have followed in their footsteps were Anselm and Abelard, Jean de la Rochelle and Thomas Aquinas. They continued the discussion on the emotions' nature of volition and spoke of emotions as a motivational force. [3]

The first modern studies of emotions date from the end of the nineteenth century. Darwin's *Expression of Emotion in Man and Animals* (1872) and William James' *What Is an Emotion* (1884) describe emotions as the result of stimuli of the nervous system.[4] Next to Freud's psychoanalysis, these studies were the first to provide modern science with a framework for the study of emotions. Emotions have thereafter mostly been researched in the natural sciences. Emotion research in the natural sciences is empirical and is based on cognitive interests, for instance in their mechanisms of operation.

Only exceptionally were the emotions subject to research in other fields of study. Like gender studies, emotion research is a domain that scholars of other disciplines have often showed reservations against, considering it, as Rosenwein calls it, a 'soft' topic. For one, because it is not a traditional field of study. For a long time scholars failed to answer the question 'why' emotions should be studied. Secondly, there was a lack in guidelines on how to study emotions.[5] As described above, the study of emotions was thus for a long time restricted to psychology and later on anthropology. Other disciplines, however, have only recently started to catch on.

Historical science, for instance, has mostly ignored emotion research in the past. Emotions, being the opposite of ratio, did not conform into the traditional study of history, which is concerned with facts. When in the eighties, however, the social constructivists' take[6]

---

[3] See Peter King's chapter on "Emotions in Medieval Thought", in: *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Emotions*, ed. by Peter Goldie, Oxford/New York: Oxford U.P., 2010, pp. 167–80.
[4] van der Wijden (2011), 8.
[5] Rosenwein (2001), 230.
[6] Rosenwein (2001). Social–constructivists belief that emotions and the way they are expressed are shaped and controlled by the society in which they function.

on emotions started to win ground, the social, cultural and communicative aspects of emotions began to be explored. The Humanities thus developed the need to obtain knowledge about the history of emotions, about its expression and its function in a communicative context. Publications such as *Emoties in de Middeleeuwen*, a compilation of essays by a group of scientists from Utrecht University, instigated the study of the emotional life of the Middle Ages, depicted in word, image and sound.[7] From this point onwards, the prevailing question in emotion research changed from 'why' emotions should be studied, to 'how' they were to be studied.[8] To be able to answer this 'how–question' for my study, I will first be looking at previous examples of emotion research carried out in the field of medieval studies.

1.1.2   Emotion research and medieval studies

The first medievalist to write about emotions was Johan Huizinga. Nearly every scholar that has written about medieval emotions in the past, adhered to his in 1919 published *Herfsttij der middeleeuwen*. Huizinga marks the late medieval emotional life as very explicit, almost childlike, opposed to an introvert modern emotional life. He expresses critique against the "shameless and immature nature of their emotions", a nature that clashed with conventional etiquette of the twentieth century.[9] By comparing late medieval emotions to contemporary conventional emotions, Huizinga interpreted medieval emotions along the lines of his twentieth-century personal views. Although this work has been very influential, later medievalists have marked his research as an example of an anachronistic approach to the study of medieval emotions.

Nowadays, scholars ask for a historical approach when studying emotions. An important work for the medievalist in discovering how emotions should be studied historically

---

[7] R.E.V Stuip and C. Vellekoop (eds.), *Emoties in de Middeleeuwen*, Verloren: Hilversum, 1998.
[8] Rosenwein (2001), 231.
[9] van der Wijden (2011), 7.

was Norbert Elias's *The Civilizing Process*.[10] It repeats the developments described by Huizinga, but approaches them from a historical perspective, by demonstrating how the centralisation of power and the formation of states changed the etiquette of Western Europe in the late Middle Ages. With this book Elias has, as it were, created a Great Narrative on how to study emotions in the Middle Ages. Research within this academic field therefore was to be based on historical investigation of the emotions.

French historians Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre decided to study emotions structurally. In 1941, Lucien Febvre made an appeal to his fellow researchers. In this appeal he joins Elias in his belief that emotions from earlier periods should be examined historically. The only way to reconstruct emotions from the past was to follow Elias in investigating contemporary works on etiquette. The investigation should, however, "be extended to the study of other medieval texts, such as books on code (law books), art and literary documents."[11]

1.1.3   Emotion research and literary studies

Many literary scholars have followed both Elias's and Febvre's example. One of them is J.A. Burrow, who combined historical research with literary studies when investigating the (emotional) meaning behind gestures and looks in medieval texts.[12] In *Gestures and Looks in Medieval Narrative*, Burrow makes sure to interpret the non–verbal communication present in medieval narratives from a historical perspective by investigating medieval texts on the subject. Another example of the successful combination of historical evidence supporting

---

[10] Norbert Elias, *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation*. Basel: Verlag Haus zum Falken, 1939. Published in English as *The Civilizing Process, Vol.I. The History of Manners*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1969, and *The Civilizing Process, Vol.II. State Formation and Civilization*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1982.

[11] See: Lucien Febvre, "Sensibility and History: How to Reconstitute the Emotional Life of the Past", in: *A New Kind of History: From the Writings of Febvre*, ed. by Peter Burke, transl. by K. Folca. New York: Harper and Row, pp. 1973, 12–26.

[12] Burrow (2002).

literary investigation is Laura van der Wijden's study of the function and meaning of 'envy' and 'jealousy' in Middle Dutch texts.[13] To be able to grasp the meaning of these two emotions in Middle Dutch, van der Wijden reverts to classical and medieval texts on these emotions, supported by texts that contain such emotions.

Literary–historical studies such as Burrow's and Van der Wijden's, provide us with an answer to the question of 'how' emotions are to be studied in the discipline of medieval literary studies. The methodologies of these studies are exemplary for my own investigation.

This is, in particular, the case with Brandsma's research on *mirror characters*.[14] His 2005 publication, in which he is able to come to new insights regarding the emotional involvement of the contemporary audience in medieval romance by borrowing results from neuropsychological research, served as a great starting point for this thesis.

"Luisteren naar de Spiegel" refers to a study carried out by Keysers et al. on the human ability to experience 'kinetic empathy'.[15] In this investigation, the ability of feeling empathy is tested on subjects, whose brain activity were scanned while someone touched their leg with a cloth. After this, they were scanned while they watched a film of someone being touched upon the leg with a cloth. There proved to be a remarkable correspondence between the test subjects' reaction to the touch of their own legs and their reaction to someone else's leg being touched. Based on Keysers et al.'s study, it was concluded that the kinetic empathy that is evoked when seeing a person being touched on the leg by a wet cloth felt so real, that they experienced it as if it was happening to them. It is important to realise that the test subjects have not only identified themselves with the person on film, but seemed to actually experience it themselves. The example of shivering while watching a movie scene of a tarantula crawling on James Bond's shoulder is another illustration of kinetic empathy posed

---

[13] van der Wijden (2011).
[14] Brandsma (2000), (2005) and (2006).
[15] Keysers et al., "A Touching Sight: SII/PV Activation during the Observation and Experience of Touch." *Neuron*: 42.2 (april 2004), pp. 335–346.

by Keysers et al.[16] The physical involvement of the viewer in this example or the test subject in the previous example, is caused by so–called 'mirror neurons'.

In "Luisteren naar de Spiegel", Brandsma takes Keysers et al.'s research to the next level, by applying their theories to the study of emotions. He wonders whether, like physical reactions, emotional reactions can also be subject to kinetic empathy. Watching someone else experience shame, for instance people being rejected in dating shows or talent shows on TV, can make you experience shame yourself. This feeling can be so bad that it becomes impossible to watch. Seeing someone cry, especially people that are close to you, can cause a similar reaction with the observer, even though he/she may not even know what that person is crying about.

Another example, Brandsma argues, is the mirroring function of texts. Some people find themselves laughing out loud when reading something humorous in a book. Similarly, when reading something sad, some readers manage to produce actual tears. Like the subjects to Keysers et al.'s test, the reactions of the people in these examples are based on more than mere identification. This becomes clear when Brandsma applies the 'emotional side' of Keysers et al.'s study to medieval texts. According to him, the emotional involvement of the audience in the text is established by the author, who, by assigning characters certain reactions, is holding up a mirror to his audience. Although this mirror still works for the contemporary reader, it was probably even more effective on the medieval audience. Apart from private reading, texts were often recited, sometimes even played out. The medieval audience therefore was not restricted to only the imagined, but also enjoyed the visible, like the test subject in the experiment. Therefore, like the neurons discussed in Keysers et al.'s investigation, the characters in medieval narrative have a mirroring function, hence the term *mirror characters*. Brandsma argues that such characters were deployed by medieval authors

---

[16] Keysers et al (2004), 336.

in order to bring about the emotional engagement of the contemporary audience.

Since, like Brandsma, I lack the support of medieval reception documents on emotions, my investigation will mainly focus on the medieval narratives that contain these emotions. By looking at a narrative's configuration, I will investigate the emotional involvement of the audience in medieval romance.

This study not only builds on Brandsma's theory, but also on Jenefer Robinson's work, who has also touched upon the role of emotions in literature. *In Deeper than Reason. Emotions and its Role in Literature, Music, and Art*, Robinson investigates the relationship between the arts and the emotions in the so-called 'reader–response theory'.[17] In Part two of the book, she explains how emotions help the reader to understand a novel. Among other things, she wonders what the role of the author is in invoking emotional responses among readers. According to Robinson, the author can achieve emotional engagement by "impressing upon us facts or events that are important to the novel, to establish character, to mark significant developments in the plot, or to drive home the theme or moral of the story".[18] In doing so, authors make use of 'formal devices', which enable them to control the reader's emotional response. These formal devices, Robinson explains, "direct the sequence of appraisals and reappraisals that we engage in as we read".[19] The author is thus able to guide the reader in the direction of his/her intent. One way to direct or guide the reader, for example, is the intrusion of the author in the text. Another is the use of mirror characters, as has been shown by Brandsma. Both examples are narrative devices that control a narrative's content and the reader's (emotional) response to it.

---

[17] Robinson (2005), 106.
[18] Robinson (2005), 108.
[19] Robinson (20050, 196.

1.2   Research question

Like Robinson, the aim of my study is to investigate the emotional involvement of the audience in the text by looking at 'formal devices'. In my thesis, however, I will refer to these 'formal devices' as 'narrative techniques'. Both Robinson's and Brandsma's work have shown that empathy is essential in order for the author to bring about this involvement. In order to reach a certain level of empathy, emotions are vital. Like them, I believe that these emotions are emphasised by the author's deployment of narrative techniques. In order to play around with this emphasis, authors today have developed certain techniques or 'tropes', which they apply to their narratives. Medieval authors used similar techniques. Where Brandsma has focused on one specific techniques, namely *mirror characters*, to investigate the emotional involvement of the audience in medieval texts, I will investigate multiple techniques in a specific corpus of texts; the *Yvain*–corpus. My starting point for this investigation is Chrétien de Troyes' *Yvain*, a text with an intense emotional charge. As this thesis also aims at being comparative, I will also investigate the narrative techniques deployed by Chrétien's adaptors in the adaptations of *Yvain*.

The *Yvain*–adaptations are interesting, because they are known for their close resemblance to the French source. They follow their source so closely that the word adaptation is in fact interchangeably used with translation. Unlike most studies that have focused on the investigation of the narrative techniques in these texts, this study will not serve to draw a comparison based on the judgement of literary quality.[20] In the past, literary critics have taken on the assertion that the texts evaluated by them are *only* translations. These adaptations should instead be treated as individual works, which express the meaning of the poem in a different vehicle than Chrétien. The adaptors will therefore serve as a 'control

---

[20] An example of studies that have judged these works by the literary competence of their authors, is: Friedman & Harrington (1964). It compares the English poem with the French according to its 'regressions' and its 'improvements'.

group' and will help me to investigate any correspondences and deviations in narrative techniques. My research question is therefore:

> *How do Chrétien de Troyes and his adaptors deploy narrative techniques to bring*
>
> *about the emotional involvement of the contemporary audience in the Yvain–story?*

Deviations in the use of narrative techniques might assign a deviation in the emotional treatment of the text. Comparing the use of narrative techniques intertextually may therefore also tell us something about the preferences of these authors for certain narrative techniques. Moreover, since the narrative techniques I will be investigating are deployed to bring about the emotional involvement of the audience, any correspondences or differences in the use of these techniques may lead to conclusions on the emotional predilections of the contemporary audience.

2 Methodology

2.1 Approach

This study aims at investigating the emotional involvement of the audience in medieval romance, by looking at the narrative configurations of *Yvain* and its adaptations. Given the limited nature of this thesis, I will not be able to discuss the entire story. I have therefore chosen to focus on three episodes. The episodes I have chosen are I. the prelude, IV. the transformation of Yvain in the knight with the lion, and VII. the ending. These episodes were chosen because of their intense emotional charge. What is more, these episodes show much (emotional) variety in the rewritings. In order to select these episodes, I have divided up the storyline whose structure is the same for each narrative. Some adaptors have added lines or scenes and others have left scenes out or cut them short. The sequence of events described by Chrétien, however, remains intact. This division of episodes can be found in the summary of the story below, in which each episode is numbered. The three episodes will be discussed in separate chapters. These chapters will be marked by its corresponding episode–number. This way, the episodes can easily be placed in their proper chronological context.

The next step will be to make an inventory of the narrative techniques used by the different authors to give expression to the emotions involved in the text. Deviations, as well as correspondences will be discussed in this investigation. I have chosen to present my results per episode instead of per narrative technique. Since I will not be analysing the whole story, the latter option will give an incomplete picture of the narrative techniques used in the *Yvain–corpus*. What is more, the advantage of a discussion per episode is that it allows me to keep the storyline intact. The chronology of the story will thus not be lost. Another option is to present my findings per text. This, however, will take away from the comparative nature of this investigation.

In order to avoid any distraction from my main argument, I have chosen to leave out any definitions or large descriptions of the narrative techniques discussed. Instead, these will be addressed in an appendix. The techniques included in the appendix will be presented in *italics* in the main text, to enable the reader to consult these definitions for clarification. Note, however, that some techniques will appear in the appendix under a common header. When this is the case, the narrative technique in the main text will be followed by '∎ *name of header*'. For instance,

> *gestures* (∎ *non–verbal signifiers*)
>
> *question passage* (∎ *mirror character*)

Since this study involves as much as five medieval narratives, the comparison that is drawn in each chapter will be summarised in chapter conclusions. These conclusions will be connected in the final conclusion, which will present my main findings.

Lastly, I would like to note that, when discussing the emotional involvement of the audience brought about by narrative techniques, the term 'emotional involvement' refers to both a sensitive and a cognitive process. It refers to feelings in the sense of sensations or emotional effects experienced by the audience, but it also incorporates thought processes, which evoke feelings. Many scholars have emphasised this cognitive content of emotions. Robinson, for instance, explains that "emotions are mental states identified by means of the particular structures of beliefs and desires that cause them."[21] By expressing this belief she is following in the footsteps of Robert Gordon. In *The Structure of Emotions,* he describes how emotions can be 'factive'.[22] Repeating Gordon's argument, Robinson regards this factive quality as evidence that emotions are preceded by a mental process: "A 'factive' emotion",

---

[21] Robinson (2005), 9.
[22] Gordon (1987), 45–64.

she states, " ⎯ such as your delight, anger, or resentment that Jones [an exemplary figure] has insulted you ⎯ is based on your knowledge that Jones has insulted you."[23] This cognitive aspect is even stronger for readers of a book and/or listeners to a story. Robinson explains: "In novels or stories, where nothing is presented before our eyes, our responses are always to what we are thinking about rather than to anything directly perceived. What we perceive are words; what we respond to are their content, the thoughts and images they provoke."[24] The cognitive aspect of emotions will therefore also be part of this investigation. This aspect is important in understanding the function of certain narrative techniques, such as *question passages* (■ *mirror character*).

Before submitting the texts of the *Yvain*–corpus to a close reading, I will first give the methodological challenges to which this type of research is inherent. After that, I will present the corpus itself. I will discuss the particulars of the manuscript tradition per text and will provide an overall summary.

2.2   Methodological comments

The investigation of emotions of a former time period induces many methodological problems. In order to point out the difficulties that come with this investigation, I will be using insights gained from J.A. Burrow's publications on analytic methods for interpreting a past problem from a modern view. In *Medieval Writers and their Work*, first published in 1982,[25] Burrow lays out what can be considered a methodology on how to interpret medieval (English) literature. In this work, he underlines the importance of the appreciation of the medieval norm over a modern one. The main thread of the book is formed by an overview of differences between the modern reception of medieval literature and the medieval reception of

---

[23] Robinson (2005), 9.
[24] Robinson (2005), 15.
[25] For this study I used the second edition published in 2008.

its contemporary literature.

In *Gestures and Looks in Medieval Narrative*, Burrow again focuses on addressing anachronisms, this time in the field of emotion research.[26] Next to Burrow, many scholars have pointed out the dangers of exploring emotions from a modern perspective. Freud, a leading scholar when it comes to emotion research, also referred to emotions as "an uncomfortable subject for scientific investigation".[27] What makes it such an "uncomfortable subject"?

Firstly, the discrepancy between emotions in the Middle Ages and the present is caused by a difference in concept and terminology. In *Medieval Writers and their Work*, Burrow explains how our modern view on things does not correspond to the medieval view of the same concept. The modern concept of literature, for instance, did not exist in the Middle Ages. At least, this term was not applied back then. The question of which texts count as 'literature' and thus belong to the literary canon was not under discussion then. The label is, however, important to the modern reader. It allows us to make a distinction between certain genres, such as fiction and non–fiction, sometimes leading to a division between works of importance and works of lesser importance. Medieval audiences, however, admired texts not for their relevance, but for their articulateness. The idea of a poetic function of language was familiar to grammarians and rhetoricians, but under a different name: "*ars eloquentiae*".[28] This makes the concept of medieval literature problematic.

The same goes for the term emotion. This is a modern term. Like literature, 'emotions' is not a fixed concept in time. Historian Barbara H. Rosenwein states that the term 'emotion' is, in fact, "a relatively late category of mind".[29] 'Emotion', in its current meaning, has been argued to have entered the world as late as the seventeenth century, deriving from Descartes

---

[26] Burrow (2002).
[27] Jaeger & Kasten, (2003), vii.
[28] Burrow (2008), 15.
[29] Rosenwein (2010), 832.

and supposedly meaning 'disturbance'.[30] That emotions are not a fixed concept in time, is illustrated by Rosenwein through the examination of Classical texts. She examined lists of words from the classical period that categorised that what comes close to our modern concept of 'emotions'. For one, Aristotle presents a list of *pathê*, a term, according to Rosenwein, "equivalent to our term 'emotions'" in his *Ars Rhetorica*. Moreover, Cicero made a list based on Aristotle's *pathê*, using the term *perturbationes* instead, a term later adopted by Augustine.[31] Being careful not to regard emotions as a fixed concept in time, Rosenwein makes sure to put emotions in their historical context.

In "The study of emotions in early medieval history", Garrison proposes a solution to avoid anachronisms, to which Rosenwein's approach corresponds:

"[s]ince we do not have unmediated access to our informants, we will have to read the texts which contain information about emotions with care, accepting the need for a hermeneutics of empathy while guarding against the distortions of projecting our own notions of what people must have thought or felt into their words."[32]

As Garrison already insinuates with "we do not have unmediated access to our informants" is that until we find a way to travel back in time, we won't be able to interrogate medieval people on this topic and will thus never know for certain whether our assumptions of medieval emotions are true. This is also true for this research. However, Garrison also points out that there is a way to gather testimonies and that is by examining medieval texts on emotions and medieval narratives that contain them.

Thus far, I have discussed the discrepancy between emotions in the Middle Ages and today, caused by a difference in concept and terminology. However, another discrepancy is

---

[30] Frijda (1998), 9.
[31] Rosenwein (2010), 832.
[32] Garrison (2001), 244.

lurking around the corner. Even when the terminology has remained the same throughout the centuries, there might be a possible difference in both meaning and expression.

The meaning of words that contain emotions may have changed since the Middle Ages. Although some words still have fairly the same meaning, others have quite radically changed. The modern reader should therefore be careful not to take the meaning of certain words for granted. Laura van der Wijden shows, for instance, how the emotion 'jealousy' carried a different connotation in the medieval period. Next to the negative connotation that we ascribe to this feeling, medieval people also recognised a positive meaning. "This good form of jealousy should be experienced, according to a number of Middle Dutch authors, when evil is spoken of God, the Christian faith or of our friends. This type of jealousy must be regarded in the sense of not being able to bear evil or as righteous anger, since negative expressions about God, the Christian faith or friends are objectionable."[33]

Ingrid Kasten not only points towards a discrepancy in meaning, but also towards a difference in the expression of emotions present in medieval literary texts. She presents 'mourning' as an example to show how "die Codierung von Ausdruckmustern elementarer Emotionen sich von heute geläufigen Formen underscheidet" ["the encoding of expression patterns of elementary emotions differs from common, contemporary form."][34] Mourning the death of a lost one, she writes, manifests itself in medieval sources in the psychical and the public. Women would cry out in pain, violently pulling their hair and their clothes, theatrically attacking their own bodies. Such behaviour is demonstrated by Laudine in *Yvain* when she learns of the death of her husband. Mourning today (at least in western culture) however, is not so much a public display, but has become internalised. There is no mutilation of the self as much as there is an internal struggle.[35]

The meaning and expression of gestures may also have changed over time. What may

---

[33] Van der Wijden (2011), 175.
[34] Jaeger & Kasten (2003), xiii–xiv.
[35] Jaeger & Kasten (2003), xiv.

seem familiar to the modern reader can be easily misread, because the conventions governing their use has changed. Certain medieval customs that demonstrate emotions are no longer common in our society and may not exist anymore. For example, modern readers (at least in the West) are no longer familiar with some of the more formal medieval gestures such as kneeling and bowing. Such gestures often appear in the *Yvain*–corpus and should therefore be interpreted according to medieval standards. The modern reader may, for instance, underestimate the significance of these gestures, unaware of the subtleties that attend their performance. Of course, this also works the other way around. Emotional expressions, such as facial– expressions or gestures, may over time have acquired new meaning. The meaning of certain gestures should, therefore, not be taken for granted by the modern reader. Medieval kisses, for instance, did not have the same range of meaning as modern ones. The significance appointed to kissing today is rather clear–cut. Kissing someone is an expression of romantic interest. It is a sign of love, or at least affection. In the Middle Ages, however, kisses had a wider range of meanings. This can be extracted from *De Spirituali Amicitia*, a medieval text on friendship, written by the twelfth–century English monk Aelred of Rievaulx. This text distinguishes four types of kisses when addressing the "kiss of the flesh", or in other words, a physical kiss:

> a) a kiss as a "sign of reconciliation, when two people who had been enemies become friends"; b) a kiss as "a sign of peace, as when those who are to partake of communion in church show their inner peace by means of an external kiss"; c) a kiss as a "sign of affection, such as is permitted to happen between men and wife, or such as is offered and excepted by friends who have long been apart"; d) a kiss as a "sign of catholic unity, such as when a guest is received".[36]

---

[36] Aelred of Rievaulx in: Williams (1994), 47.

Aelred's text shows that many types of kisses were distinguished in the Middle Ages. Many of these types, such as a) and b) are no longer familiar to the modern reader. It is therefore important to leave out your own frame of reference and consider that of the medieval audience. C) "kissing as a sign of affection", comes closest to our modern interpretation of kissing. Aelred discusses the possibility of the exchange of kisses between men and women, but also between two people of the same gender. In today's society, same–sex kissing would indicate homosexuality. Thus, the kiss between Ywain and Gawain in the English version of *Yvain*, could signify homosexuality to the modern reader. In medieval society, however, kissing could also function as "a sign of reconciliation, when two people who had been enemies become friends", as Aelred has put it. Ywain and Gawain's kiss should thus be explained as 'a kiss and make up' after having fought each other. According to Burrow, a mouth–to–mouth kiss would seal the 'fidelitas' between men.[37] Therefore, to assume that the exchange of kisses between men is an act of homosexuality is a modern and thus an anachronistic interpretation.

As is described above, emotions are not always universal. It is therefore important, when interpreting medieval texts, to leave out your own frame of reference and consider that of the medieval audience. It is "important to avoid the a priorism that would be implied by telling our sources 'I know how you feel'".[38] Emotional stimuli designed by a medieval author may no longer be recognisable for us today. The focus of this thesis therefore needs to be on the medieval audience.

For one, because modern and medieval audiences differ in the way they receive a story. Stories are nowadays handed down in book form encouraging individual reading. The medieval society, on the other hand, was mostly illiterate. Private reading was only set aside for a select few. Most stories were therefore transmitted aurally, in recitals or sometimes even

[37] Burrow (2002), 52.
[38] Garrison (2001), 244.

plays. When discussing the medieval audience we thus not only speak of readers, but also of listeners or even spectators.

Secondly, although this thesis investigates the medieval audience's emotional involvement in a story, it should not be assumed that the reception of emotions in the Middle Ages was uniform. Medieval people, like the modern reader today, experienced emotions differently. Their emotional experience depended on factors such as culture, time (early–or–late medieval) and social background. Beyond individual feelings, emotions, however, also have social significance. In "Thinking Historically about Medieval Emotions", Rosenwein speaks of 'emotional communities', whose members show a similar reception to emotions. She links this correspondence in reception to a group feeling, which is brought about by the expectations and predilections of its members. She explains how emotional communities can be similar to social communities, like families, monasteries and guilds. Most importantly, however, they demonstrate a "system of feeling", namely "what these communities define and assess as valuable or harmful to them".[39] A high–class woman and husband listening to their daughter read aloud a romance (like the maiden and her parents in *Yvain*) thus form an emotional community. So does the audience to a recital at court. Although they may not portray the exact same emotions in everyday life, they do so as an audience joined by their corresponding expectations, which are created by their sociocultural background. I will therefore treat each text to be examined as individual works, written for different emotional communities. For this reason, they should be analysed on the basis of their own internal coherence.

In order to avoid the anachronisms described above, any assumptions made in this study regarding the emotional meaning of a text or the emotional involvement of the audience in the text, are based on the interpretation of the text itself and will be supported by text

---

[39] Rosenwein (2010), 832.

passages. Seeking out narrative techniques which give expression to emotions, described in the context of the passage in which they occur, can tell us something about the intended emotional function of the texts. This investigation, however, cannot determine the actual emotional experience by the medieval audience. No matter how much information has been gathered on the author or the audience, the effect of medieval texts on the contemporary audience remains indemonstrable. Medieval documents on emotions are scarce, let alone documents on the reception of the texts that contain them. If they exist, they have yet to be discovered. Since we have no reception documents concerning Chrétien's work, or any medieval romance for that matter, we have no evidence of the actual reaction of the audience. Although it is very unlikely that medieval authors put great effort into applying complex narrative techniques without them leading to a desired effect, there is no certain way of knowing if they were in fact effective or not. This study, however, is not investigating the audience's reaction, but the audience's intended reaction, controlled by the author through narrative techniques. Instead of analysing the meaning of medieval emotions compared to modern day emotions, its purpose is to analyse the meaning of these emotions in the text. The question of anachronism is thus not at issue. Conclusions are based on the investigation of narrative techniques, which describe behaviour, actions or events, that take place within the story, to which the medieval audience mirrors itself. They do not, however, give a direct interpretation of the medieval reader/listener.

2.3 Yvain–corpus

2.3.1 The Arthurian Legend

The *Yvain*–corpus belongs to the romance tradition of the Arthurian legend. This tradition is multifaceted. Several historians, romancers and poets in Europe added to the legend of King

Arthur and his knights from the early to the late Middle Ages. Although its essential creation is medieval, modern writers have also added to its legend and continue to do so today.

The literary genesis of King Arthur was set about by the Welsh cleric Geoffrey of Monmouth in the first half of the twelfth century. In his *Historia Regum Britanniae,* Monmouth creates Arthur's 'biography'. He presents Arthur as a king, whose reign marks the climax of his *History of the Kings of Britain*. The Arthurian legend came to France via the Norman poet Wace, whose *Roman de Brut* builds on Monmouth's example. These early historiographies present Arthur as an historical figure. What should be remembered when discussing these 'histories of Britain', is that the medieval concept of history as presented in these works is different from what we would expect. History books today are known for their report of historical facts. The historical narratives of Monmouth and Wace, however, are a mixture of true events, legend and myth. According to Treharne, "one is as likely to encounter a fairy as an historical figure" in medieval historiography.[40]

The transition from historiography to romance is thus a small one. The Arthurian romance became prolific throughout the later medieval period, from the twelfth century onwards. It was Chrétien who took the framework of Arthur and his knights brought to France by Wace, and composed a number of innovative tales. Chrétien's romances were considered innovative for two main reasons. Firstly, the Arthur of his romances differs from the warrior–monarch presented by the chroniclers. Instead, Chrétien's romances focus on the individual knights. Secondly, the French poet presents these leading knights as paragons of chivalry and courtliness. For this reason, his romances have often been referred to as 'Chivalric romances'. The knights presented by Chrétien live according to an ethical code of chivalry, which is held high by virtue, prowess and courtly love.

Chrétien's romances were very popular and enjoyed huge success almost immediately

---

[40] Treharne (2006), 359.

after being written.[41] His influence was immense. For one, his stories were copied and imitated in French–speaking domains. *Le Conte du Graal* and *Le Chevalier de la Charrette*, for instance, were used extensively in the French Arthurian prose cycles. The latter was also transposed into the prose *Lancelot*. What is more, Chrétien's fame spread outside of France. Quite early on, his work was translated in different countries. German, Dutch, Norse, Swedish and English translations and/or adaptations were composed before and during the first half of the fourteenth century. Notably, the international interest only concerned three of his romances: *Erec*, *Yvain* and *Perceval*, the middle one being the most popular.[42]

Yvain was adapted into German, Norse, Swedish and English and possibly into Welsh. The question whether *Owain*, the Welsh version of *Yvain*, should also be treated as an adaptation is a problematic one and will be discussed here. The origins of *Yvain* are uncertain. Commentators fall into two groups. The first group believes that Chrétien constructed the narrative independently, based on his knowledge of folk–motives. W. Foerster may be considered as the group's chief spokesman. He derived Chrétien's themes from widely known folk–motives.[43] The second group of scholars, however, have suggested that the major themes and episodes derive from Celtic mythology. This theory has been sustained most elaborately by A.C.L. Brown who in "Iwain: a study of the Origins of Arthurian Romance" points towards the Irish sagas *Serglige Conculaind* and *Tochmarc Emere* as a source.[44] R.S. Loomis was another important researcher who reinforced Brown's investigations some forty–six years later. He ascribed Chrétien's inspiration to Irish as well as Welsh tradition, in particular referring to the Middle Welsh prose tale *Owain*. Later scholars have delivered contributions to both groups of thought. Whether the French story is based on a Celtic source or the other way

---

[41] Szkilnik (2005), 199.
[42] Szkilnik (2005), 199.
[43] Wendelin, Foerster, Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes' sämtlichen Werken. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1973 (first published in 1914).

[44] Brown (1903).

around has not yet been established. I have therefore chosen not to include *Owain* into my comparison of the different adaptations, and will use Chrétien's text as my starting point.

2.3.2 Summary of the story

The *Yvain*–story narrates how a knight wins the favour of a lady, but loses it again by choosing tournaments over marriage. The story seeks to harmonise the fundamental dichotomy between the codes of knighthood and courtly love. Next to love, themes such as chivalry, magic and friendship are underlined in the story.

The story can be divided into two main parts. The first part is what Friedman and Harrington have called a "preliminary episode". The preliminary episode sets the stage and introduces the hero. It contains a binary structure, since it describes how Yvain wins Laudine only to lose her again. The second part has been called a "self–contained episode"[45] and displays a much less coherent narrative design. Instead, it functions as a display of the hero's prowess and as a discussion of his chivalric nature in order to rebuild the knight's reputation. This part of the narrative is structured by kaleidoscopic episodes, which are adventures in themselves. A summary will be given per episode.

I. At Arthur's court, during Pentecost, Calogrenant (Kalogreant, Kalebrant, Kalegrevanz, Colgrevance) unfolds the tale of his failed adventure of the Fountain. He relates how some years ago, he set out in search of a testing adventure in the forest of Brocéliande. After spending the night at a vavasour's castle, he encountered a herdsman. This strange creature directed him to a magic fountain, where he was shamefully defeated by a knight defending the Fountain. On hearing about Calogrenant's defeat, Yvain (Iwein, Íven, Ivan, Ywain) vows to avenge his cousin's shame by undertaking the adventure of the Fountain himself.

---

[45] Friedman & Harrington (1964), xiii.

II. Like Calogrenant, Yvain encounters the vavasour and the herdsman and ultimately arrives at the Fountain. After defeating its defender, he chases the mortally wounded knight back to his castle, where he becomes trapped inside. He falls in love with the defeated knight's widow Laudine (Alundyne). With the help of her servant Lunette (Lunet, Luneta) he is able to remain safe from the grieving nobles set on revenge, but also to win Laudine's hand. He now in turn becomes the defender of the Fountain and has to fight Keu (Key, Kæi, Kæye, Kay) for it, when Arthur and his knights appear at the site. The party is invited back to the castle, where Gawain persuades Yvain to accompany him on a sequence of tournaments. Laudine gives in to Yvain's request, provided that he returns no later than a year from that date. The knight, however, fails to honour this term and in consequence loses his lady. Mad with grief, he retreats into the forest.

III. Yvain is cured from his madness by a passing Lady and her maidens. In return, he helps her to defeat her enemy, the count of Alier. From this point onwards, the narrative des] describes a series of adventures, which can be seen as a test of Yvain's chivalry.

IV. Wandering around in the forest, Yvain rescues a lion from a mortal combat with a dragon. After its rescue, the lion does not leave his side and becomes his companion. More and more, Yvain starts taking on the role of a champion. Arriving by chance at the Fountain, he finds out that Lunete has been accused of treason against her Lady and has been imprisoned. She is to die for her treason. Yvain promises to return to the girl's rescue the following day. However, in search for the night's lodging, the knight arrives at a strongly fortified castle that has been plagued by a giant named Harpin. Taking pity on the chatelain's family, he promises to rescue them as well. Having defeated the giant in battle, Yvain arrives just in time to defend Lunete's honour against her accusers. Too ashamed to face his former lady, he introduces himself as the Knight of the Lion. Unaware of his true identity, Laudine honours him as the victor.

V. After having rescued Lunete from the pyre, Yvain is sought by a girl who needs his help in an inheritance dispute. The girl is deprived of her share of the inheritance by her elder sister. This dispute is to be settled by a fight between their champions. Because of a sudden illness, however, the search for the Knight with the Lion is left to another damsel. The damsel meets up with the knight on his way to the Pesme Castle, the Castle of Infinite Misfortune, where Yvain kills two demons and thereby rescues three hundred women from having to weave cloth night and day.

VI. His selfless acts of charity do not end here, however. He thereafter takes on the inheritance dispute and thus we come to the climax of the work – a combat between the hero of the romance and the paragon of all chivalry, Sir Gauvain (Gawein, Valven, Gavian, Gawain), who agreed to be the elder sister's champion. When the two friends, however, realise that they are fighting each other, they are reconciled, favouring the younger sister in the dispute.

VII. Still grieving over the loss of Laudine, Yvain returns to the fountain. With the aid of Lunete he is able to win back the favour of his lady and they are reunited.

2.3.3   Text tradition

Yvain ou le Chevalier au Lion (c. 1170)

The first romance on Yvain, son of King Urien, was written by Chrétien de Troyes in the second half of the twelfth century. Apart from *Yvain*, this French poet wrote four other Arthurian romances (*Érec et Énide*, *Cligès*, *Lancelot ou le Chevalier de la Charrette*, and *Perceval ou Le Conte del Graal*). Moreover, he wrote two lyric poems on Arthurian subjects and is also generally considered the author of the non–Arthurian romance entitled *Guillaume d'Angleterre.* Apart from the works that can be ascribed to him, we know little of Chrétien himself. No archival records mention him. The little information that we do have has mostly

been inferred from his own writings. In his romances, Chrétien refers to himself as *Crestiiens* and only in one occasion by the full name *Crestiiens de Troyes*. The surname implies that the author was native to Troyes, a city in the region of Champagne. This notion seems to be confirmed by his association with the court of Marie de Champagne, wife of count Henry II of Champagne and daughter of Eleanor of Aquitaine by her first husband, King Louis VII of France. Evidence for the linking of Chrétien with the court of Champagne is given in *Lancelot* where the poet himself states that he writes at the behest of Marie de Champagne who provided the *matière* (subject matter) and *san* (orientation or the treatment of the matter) for the poem. Chrétien later claimed Phillipe de Flandre as patron, for whom he supposedly wrote *Perceval*. Some scholars have linked Chrétien to the prominent troubadours of his time, Rigaut de Barbezilh and Bernart de Ventadorn, who were known to work at the court of Eleanor.[46] Other scholars have argued for his sojourn in Britain at the Plantagenet court.[47] The poet's social status is uncertain, although different scholars have identified him as an ecclesiastic, a low–level cleric, a *trouvère*, and a minstrel or *jongleur*.[48]

Chrétien probably composed *Yvain* in the 1170s. Although critics remain speculative, the general tendency is to place the composition of the poem around this date.[49] Following two romances (*Erec et Enide*, *Cligès*) and preceding two (*Lancelot*, *Perceval*), it is the central piece in Chrétien's literary career on the Knights of the Round Table.[50] The poem is written in octosyllabic lines of rhymed verse. *Yvain* has been preserved in fourteen manuscripts,

---

[46] L. Rossi, "Chrétien de Troyes e i trovatori: Tristan, Linhaura, Carestia", *VR*: 46 (1987), 26–62.

[47] Carroll, C.W., "Quelques observations sur les reflets de la cour d'Henri II dans l'oeuvre de Chrétien de Troyes", *CCM*: 37 (1994), 33–9.

[48] Kelly (2006), 137.

[49] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 81. Studies which support this dating are: Anthime Fourrier,"Encore la chronologie des oeuvres de Chrétien de Troyes", *Bulletin bibliographique de la Sociéte international Arthurienne* 2 (1950), 69–88 and Jean Frappier, *Etude sur Yvain ou le Chevalier au Lion de Chrétien de Troyes*, Paris: Sedes, 1969. Tony Hunt's "Redating Chrestien de Troyes" in *Bulletin bibliographique de la Sociéte international Arthurienne* 30 (1978), 209–37, argues however, for the date of composition to be in the 1180s, while Douglas Kelly believes that the dating can be no more specific than between 1160 and 1190 (*The Arthur of the French*). This range is narrowed by Wendelin Foerster to between 1164 and 1173, who published an early edition of the poem in 1902 (Kristian von Troyes, *Yvain (Der löwenritter),* Halle: Verlag von Max Niemeyer, ix).

[50] This is the generally accepted order of composition for Chrétien's romances. However, some speculation still remains on the time of composition of *Lancelot*. The poems *Guillaume d'Angleterre* and *Philomena* are also attributed to Chrétien de Troyes.

fragments and excerpts.[51] Unfortunately, however, the original autograph manuscript is lost.

The poem has been preserved in two basic contexts. For one, it appears in large 'author and genre collections', which either contained works by the same author or which were thematically organised (Annonay, fr. 794, fr. 1450, and Chantilly 472). Secondly, it can be found in manuscripts paired up with *Lancelot* (fr. 12560, Garrett 125 and Reg. Lat. 1725).[52] [53] Other manuscripts, those of a later date, were of a portable size and contained only the single work of *Yvain*.[54]

Iwein, der Ritter mit dem Löwen (c. 1204)

Iwein is the Middle High German adaptation of *Yvain*. In this thesis I have used the words adaptation and translation interchangeably. However, because of the free interpretation of its example's material, the latter is not applicable to *Iwein*. For one, because of its many additions, which mostly consist of clarifications or explanations of the text, the German version of the story runs up to an impressive 8000 lines. It exceeds Chrétien's original by almost 1200 lines. Moreover, the author made it his duty to address moral issues quite elaborately, which often predominate in his work.

---

[51] Bruges, carnet scolaire, SA, AAJS 224, fragments;
Chantilly, Musée Condé 472 (A), (C–Jonin);
Lyon, BM 743, excerpt;
Modena, AS, Archivio d'Este, Ministero Affari Esteri, Atti segreti F. 6 Miscellenea, fragment;
Montpellier, BI, Sect. Méd. H 252 (M);
Paris, BN, fr. 794 (h) (the so–called Guiot manuscript), (A–Jonin);
Paris, BN, fr. 1433 (P);
Paris, BN, fr. 1450 (F),
Paris, BN, fr. 12560 (G);
Paris, BN, fr. 12603 (S);
Princeton, UL, Garrett 125;
Vatican City, BAV, Reg. Lat. 1725 (V);
Private collection, Annonay fragments.
[52] Busby (2005), 69.
[53] The fact that the story of Yvain is often found paired up with Lancelot can be explained by their parallel narrative action.
[54] Busby, Nixon, Stones & Lori Walters (1993), 18.

Iwein was written by the Swabian knight, Hartmann von Aue. Like Chrétien, Hartmann van Aue is absent in the historical records. Any information on the poet comes from what he himself tells us in his works or what other poets have written about him. These informants tell us that Hartmann lived in the duchy of Swabia, which corresponds to modern day Eastern Switzerland and areas of the Alsace. From his prologues, we are further to believe that Hartmann was a *ritter* ('knight') and a *dienstman* ('servitor') of the house of Aue. It has been suggested that Hartmann wrote in patronage, possibly of one of the dukes of Zähringen, for which there is little evidence.[55]

Iwein has a rather rich manuscript tradition. The text is transmitted in the Ambraser Heldenbuch, plus fifteen other complete manuscripts and seventeen fragments. None of these manuscripts or fragments have any external basis for dating, thus several have been discussed as being the oldest. The manuscripts and fragments that have mostly been adhered to are: the Kremsmünster fragment V (Stiftbibliothek Kremsmünster, CC VI\275), which dates from the first quarter of the thirteenth century and is of Bavarian origin. Of a similar date and origin are the Prague fragments H (Prague, State and University Library, Fragm. Germ. 4 and Fragm. Germ. 16). Manuscript A (Heidelberg, University Library cpg 397) has been dated in the beginning of the second quarter of the thirteenth century and is allotted to western central Germany. *Iwein* B (Grießen, University Library Nr. 97, formerly Bibl. Senck. Nr. 39), is also ascribed to the second quarter of the thirteenth century. Its provenance is either Bavarian or 'Alemannic'.[56] Unfortunately, *Iwein*'s autograph is lost. Although the evidence which has been put forward for the dating of the original text is rather weak, scholars generally assume that the poem was written before 1204, approximately thirty–five years after Chrétien.[57]

---

[55] Edwards (2007), ix.
[56] which corresponds today to the Southwest German borderland: the southern part of Baden–Württemberg, Voralberg, Eastern Switzerland and areas of the Alsace.
[57] x–xi.

Next to *Yvain*, Chrétien's *Erec* was also adapted by Hartmann. Together with Wolfram von Eschenbach and Gottfried von Straßburg who followed in his footsteps, Hartmann brought Arthurian romance to Germany. Furthermore, Hartmann wrote two other narrative poems, *Gregorius* and *Der arme Heinrich,* and eighteen 'Minnesänge'or lyrics. Although it is not acknowledged in Hartmann's adaptation, it is evident from its close translation that *Yvain* served as its source. In *Erec*, however, Hartmann does acknowledge the French example as his source. In one of the Wolffenbüttel fragments, Hartmann specifically refers to Chrétien:*'alse uns Chrestiens saget'* ['as Chrétien tells us'; l. 4629].[58]

Ívens saga (middle of the thirteenth century)

Ívens saga is the Old Norse, somewhat shortened, translation of Chrétien's *Yvain*–story. Unlike the other adaptations, *Ívens saga* is rendered in prose.[59] The text has solely been preserved in later Icelandic manuscripts. It exists in fifteen manuscript copies, three of which are of textual significance.[60] The first is Stockholm 6 4to which derives from the early fifteenth century. The second is AM 489 4too from circa 1450. The third preserved manuscript was written in 1690, which is now known as Stockholm 46 fol. Other manuscripts preserving the text all derive from these three.[61] Unfortunately, none of these manuscripts

---

[58] xiv.

[59] The poet employs an "amplificatory rhythmical prose" or "court prose" characterised by means of alliteration, syntactic parallelism, synonymous as well as anthithetic, and tautological collocations. For more information on 'court prose', see: *Ívens saga,* Kalinke (1999), 35.

[60] For a discussion on the order of copying, see: Rikhardsdottir (2012), 82–83.

[61] AM 179 fol.;
AM 181a fol.;
Brit. Mus. Add. 4857;
Brit. Mus. Add. 4859;
Brit Mus. Add. 11.158;
AM 588a 4to;
AM 395 fol;
Trin. L. 2.30;
Nks. 1144 fol;
Nks. 1691 4to;
Nks. 3310 4to;
Lbs. 3128 4to.

hand down the complete text. The section that recounts the inheritance dispute between two sisters, which is the cause for Íven and Valven's fight, is missing.

King Hákon Hákonarson assigned the commission for the translation towards the middle of the thirteenth century. This information can be derived from the text itself, which clearly states in its concluding sentence: "Ok lykr hér sögu herra Íven er Hákon kóngr gamli lét snúa ór franzeisu í norrænu" (99) ["And the saga of Sir Íven ends here, which King Hákon the Old had ordered translated from French into Norse"]. The author's parting words refer to Hákon Hákonarson 'the Old', distinguishing the king from his son, who ruled Norway from 1217 to 1263. *Ívens saga* was to be part of a collection of French courtly literature translated into Old Norse, which, according to Rikhardsdottir, "constituted a royal agenda of literary and ideological inauguration".[62] As C. Stephen Jaeger explains in *The Origins of Courtliness*, French courtly literature was a direct result from the social movement of courtesy aimed at the European feudal nobility. French romance, therefore, infused the ruling class with etiquette, which was beneficial to courtly life.[63] Therefore, by the time the Nordic translators were working, Chrétien's work had an established reputation as "the epitome of courtly romance" and thus served as an example for courtly and chivalrous life in a setting of feudal relations. Next to other examples of French courtly literature, such as the *Lais* of Marie de France and Thomas's *Tristan*, two other works of Chrétien (that we know of today) were preserved in Norse translations. These are *Erec et Enide* (*Erex saga*) and *Li Contes de Graal* (*Parcevals saga*).

Hærra Ivan (1303)

---

[62] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 83.
[63] Jaeger (1985), 3.

Hærra Ivan (or *Herr Ivan Lejonriddaren)* is the Swedish verse translation of the romance. The poem belongs to the *Eufemiavisor* or *Eufemia's Lays*. It was, with two other poems,[64] translated from French into Old Swedish at the behest of Queen Eufemia of Norway as a means of introducing courtly literature to Sweden.

The story is transmitted in four Swedish manuscripts. Three of these manuscripts are preserved in Kungliga Biblioteket in Stockholm. MS Holmiensis D 4 was probably written in the cloisters of Vadstena by at least five hands, the earliest hand dating from the first quarter of the fifteenth century, the latest around 1450. MS Holmiensis D 4a can be dated around the same period, around 1448. MS Holmiensis D 3 is dated 1488 and its provenance can be ascribed to southern Scandinavia. MS Skokloster 156 is preserved in the Riksarkivet in Stockholm. It contains both Old Swedish and Norwegian. It was written in the 1450s by Johannes, a friar in Bergen. The story is, moreover, transmitted in translation in two Danish manuscripts.[65]

Like Norway, Sweden only much later developed a feudal society, with the help of its neighbour. Not until the 1280s did Sweden lay down its first laws to regulate the existence of a noble class. The civilised customs that belong to a feudal society and that are characteristic of the noble class were introduced to Sweden by a royal marriage. In 1302, Ingiborg of Norway was betrothed to Erik, Duke of Sweden and brother to the King. Ingiborg was a daughter of King Hákon Magnússon (son of the earlier–mentioned Hákon Hákonarson) and the German princess Eufemia, who commissioned the translation of the poem probably as a wedding present to the Duke.[66]

The translator is unknown. However, the text offers indications that a cleric may have been responsible. It is believed that the poems of the *Eufemia's Lays* were translated by one

---

[64] *Hærtogher Fredrik* and *Flores ok Blanzaflor.*
[65] MS Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Holmiensis K 4;
  MS Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Holmiensis K 47.
[66] Szkilnik (2005), 206.

and the same person. This translation brought courtly literature to medieval Sweden and "launched a new metrical type, extended narrative in *Knittelvers*", a new kind of verse imported from Germany.[67]

The Swedish poet is considered to have borrowed from three sources. For one, the translation bears the influence of Germanic literature, although the translator was probably unfamiliar with Hartmann's *Iwein*. He/she, however, seemed familiar with *Ívens saga* and very likely borrowed from it, as is suggested by a similar comparison between Arthur and Charlemagne in both narratives. The general fact that the commission for the translation came from the Norwegian court, also suggests influence of the Norwegian source. Lastly, *Hærra Ivan* is largely based on Chrétien's *Yvain*.

Ywain and Gawain (first half of the fourteenth century)

Ywain and Gawain is the English adaptation of Chrétien's *Yvain*. It survives in a single copy dating from the early fifteenth century. This unique copy of the Middle English poem is preserved in Cotton Galba E.ix., in the British Library in London. The text survives in a composite manuscript along with Middle English religious and historical texts. Like *Ívens saga* and *Hærra Ivan,* the poem is anonymous. It is written in octosyllabic rhymed couplets, in a northern dialect, which implies that it has a northern provenance. Since the text betrays certain North–East Midland forms reflected in the rhyme, it is assumed that the language is that of the original author, who is believed to have written the tale in the first half of the fourteenth century.[68]

Although *YG* was written some one hundred–and–fifty years later and is some two thousand eight hundred lines shorter, it has been established beyond doubt that the English poet worked directly from a manuscript of *Yvain*. For one, the structures of both narratives are

---

[67] *Hærra Ivan*, Kalinke (1999), 3.
[68] Braswell (1995), 77.

almost identical, as are some of the descriptive details. Moreover, many passages contain word–for–word translations. What is more, although Chrétien is not directly mentioned by name, the poet does occasionally refer to 'the book': "als sayes the buke" (9), "as it telles in the boke" (3209), "so sais the boke" (3671), "Of tham na mare have I herd tell / Nowther in rumance ne in spell" (4027–8).[69] However, the English poem is not at all times a slavish translation of its French example. While the poet for the most part retains the narrative structure and chronology of episodes of its source, there are also several instances where the text deviates from the French. For one, *YG* is the streamlined version of *Le Chevalier au Lion*. Some episodes are summarised into a few lines, whereas others are left out altogether. Although it retains the structure of the narrative, it eliminates most of Chrétien's psychologising. Moreover, the text leaves out courtly elements and is mostly devoid of descriptive details and character nuances.[70] Unlike its Scandinavian counterparts, the adaptation of *Ywain and Gawain* does not seem to have been part of a civilising movement.

2.3.4   Editions used

This study can be conducted thanks to the efforts of various scholars who took on the laborious task of translating the adaptations into English. Some of the adaptations were not translated up until recently. No substantial portion of *Hærra Ivan*, for instance, was translated before 1999. Moreover, the first translation of *Iwein* B into English appeared no earlier than 2007. These translations encourage studies of these texts outside Germany and Sweden. Thanks to these translations it is now possible to develop a better understanding of the transmission of the *Yvain*–corpus.

I have taken all the quotations of Chrétien de Troyes's text from David F. Hult's 1994

---

[69] Friedman & Harrington (1964), xvi.
[70] Braswell (1995), 78.

edition *Le Chevalier au Lion ou Le Roman d' Yvain* belonging to the *Lettres Gothiques*
collection. Contrary to many of the previous editions, which are based solely on the Guiot
manuscript, Hult has based his edition on several manuscripts. For the English translations of
the Old–French text, I have used William W. Kibler's 1991 translation *Chrétien de Troyes's
Arthurian Romances*, which contains *Yvain*. This translation is the prose modification of
Kibler's 1985 edition, which was published in the Garland Library of Medieval Literature.

For the Middle High German, Old Norse and Old Swedish text quotations, I have
turned to the *Arthurian Archives* collection. The Middle High German text was edited and
translated by Cyril Edwards in the 'German Romance' series in 2007. Next to the Gießen
manuscript, Handschrift B served as a main text for this translation. This edition moreover
gives the different endings to *Iwein* from the different manuscripts.

Both the Old Norse and Old Swedish texts were published by Marianne E. Kalinke
under the *Norse Romance* series in 1999. This edition of *Ívens saga* was edited and translated
by Kalinke herself. The text of her edition is that of Stockholm 6 4to, but also AM 489, AM
179 and Add. 4857, whenever the first proved illegible. Her edition is, moreover, based on the
1979 critical edition by Foster W. Blaisdell. Since *Ívens saga* was written in prose, text
quotations given in this thesis refer to page numbers.

The Arthurian Archives edition of *Hærra Ivan* was edited and translated by Henrik
Williams and Karin Palmgren in 1999. It is based on a previous edition of the text by Erik
Noreen (1931) and contains some minor alterations. The text is presented in normalised Old
Swedish. This is the first scale attempt to do so with an Old Swedish text. Codex Holmiensis
D 4 was used as the main text for this translation.

Each of the Arthurian Archives editions is accompanied with facing English
translations, which I have used as a supporting guide to the original.

For the Middle English reading and text quotations, I have turned to Mary Flowers

Braswell's edition. *Sir Perceval of Galles and Ywain and Gawain* was published for *TEAMS* in 1995. The *Ywain and Gawain* translation is edited from Cotton MS Galba E IX, the sole surviving manuscript containing the text. Since this study often relies on a close reading of the texts involved, I have also provided some of the more difficult Middle English text quotations with modern English translations. These were taken from *"Harken To Me": Middle English Romances in Translation,* which features an online translation of *Ywain and Gawain*, hosted by the English Department, San Francisco State and edited by George W. Tuma, and Dinah Hazell.

When citing text passages, I have adhered to the spellings as presented in these editions. This explains why the Scandinavian text quotations in this paper do include Germanic letters, such as þ and ð, but the English quotations do not. Braswell simply does not reproduce them. In the remainder of this thesis, I will be referring to these works in an abbreviated form:

HI = Hærra Ivan

Ís = Ívens saga

Iwein = Iwein, der Ritter mit dem Löwen

YG = Ywain and Gawain

Yvain = Yvain, Le Chevalier au Lion

Abbreviations will also be used when referring to the languages they were written in:

OF= Old French

MHG = Middle High German

ON= Old Norse

OS= Old Swedish

ME= Middle English

3 Episode I: The Prelude

3.1 Prologue

In order to bring about the audience's involvement in the text, medieval poets introduced their works with prologues. Such prologues serve to establish a relationship between author and audience. Like most medieval romances, all versions of the *Yvain*–story are preceded by a prologue. However, the emotional charge of the prologues to the different Yvain–stories alternate, giving each version a different purpose and meaning.

Chrétien de Troyes's prologue to *Yvain* is far from customary. Where medieval narrative works were usually introduced by traditional *topoi* of a discursive manner,[71] Chrétien's *Yvain* begins with surprising abruptness. The introduction scene, placing Arthur at court in Wales, has barely a chance to unfold or Chrétien introduces the romance's prevailing emotion. Among the groups of knights and ladies that gathered in the hall, one conversation topic emerges as dominant: Love. Without making use of any of the traditional *topoi* to bring about the author–audience relationship — there is, for instance, no direct request for attention, no humility formula or statement *ex persona poetae* — Chrétien is able to immediately direct the attention of the listener to love. Thus focussing on this one emotion, Chrétien's first objective is to introduce the *leitmotiv* of his romance. As on the courtiers', this topic should also be on the audience's mind. In order to achieve this, Chrétien presents love as a problematic issue. He draws a critical comparison between love in the past and in the presence. In Arthur's days, he notes, love was "riches et boens" (17) ["sweet and flourishing"], but today:

molt poi des siens,

---

[71] Kratins (1982), 1.

Qui a bien pres l'ont tuit laissie,

S'en est Amours mout abaissie;

Car chil qui soloient amer

Se faisoient courtois clamer

Et preu et largue et honnorable;

Or est Amours tournee fable

Pour chou que chil qui riens n'en sentient

Dïent qu'il ayment, mes il mentent;

Et chil fable et menchongne en font

Qui s'en vantent et droit n'i ont.   (18–28)

[very few serve love: nearly everyone has abandoned it; and love is greatly abased, because those who love in bygone days were known to be courtly and valiant and generous and honourable. Now love is reduced to empty pleasantries, since those who know nothing about it claim that they love, but they lie, and those who boast of loving and have no right to do so make a lie and a mockery of it.]

With these words, Chrétien claims that the contemporary lover is a liar. He is, moreover, qualitatively different from lovers in former days, whom he describes as having been known to be 'courtly', 'valiant', 'generous' and 'honourable'. The drawing of this, rather unflattering, comparison invites the contemporary listener to reflect on love in their own society. By passing judgement, under the guise of a narrator, on love's current manifestation, the poet directs the audience's thoughts towards this strong emotion and opens it up for debate. He calls his readers/listeners to order again, by directly addressing the extradiegetic

audience:

> 'Mais pour de chix qui furent
>
> Laissons chix qui en vie durent'   (29–30)

> ['But let us look beyond those who are present among us and speak now of those
>
> who were'.]

Here, Chrétien is deploying *narratorial intrusion* (■ *authorial comments*), which serves as a clever technique to create awareness of the presence of both author and audience. Ollier describes how,

> from the very beginning the author's presence in the text is made progressively
>
> more strongly felt, by means of a 'nous' that establishes the author/audience
>
> community around the Arthurian model.[72]

The *narratorial intrusion* reinforces the artificial creation of, what Uitti has called, a 'communitarian we'.[73] Unlike today's books, the medieval romance was not usually read in private. Because of a largely illiterate aristocracy, romances were mainly transmitted aurally. They were read aloud or recited as entertainment.[74] Romances were thus often enjoyed in groups or intimate circles. Imagine, therefore, the prologue being recited in such a group: the narrator (in this case the jongleur; the reciter), by referring to 'those who are present among us', seems to be literally asking his audience (the listeners at the recital; the extradiegetic audience) to look around among their neighbours and see the lovers of the present. By

---

[72] Ollier (1974), 35

[73] Uitti (1979), 164.

[74] Kelly (2006), 162–3.

inviting the listeners to leave the present and, instead, focus on the past, the poet is instructing the audience to take example from the ideal love present in Arthur's days, i.e. the love depicted in his romance.

Although *Yvain*'s English adaptation for the most part closely follows its source, the prologue completely deviates. The English poet does not seem to have agreed with Chrétien's abrupt opening. Instead he/she does make use of a traditional romance *topos* to establish the author–audience relationship. The poet takes the time to call upon Almighty God to shield His servants from sin and maintain them with strength. Sonnemans classifies this *topos* as 'het prolooggebed' ['the prologue prayer'].[75] By extending the prologue with this *topos*, the immediacy of the introduction to the romance's main emotion is lost. In fact, Chrétien's *leitmotiv* is no longer present, but replaced by a different theme. The company of knights and ladies in *YG* speak, not of lovers, but of:

> dedes of armes and of veneri
>
> And of gude knightes that lyfed then,
>
> And how men might tham kyndeli ken
>
> By doghtines of thaire gude dede
>
> On ilka syde, wharesum thai yede –
>
> For thai war stif in ilka stowre.
>
> And tharfore gat thai grete honowre.   (24–32)

> [deeds of arms and hunting, and of good knights who lived before and how they might be known by the bravery of their deeds wherever they went, for they were unrelenting in battle and earned great honor.]

---

[75] Sonnemans (1995), 75–106.

Although the English poet sets a similar didactic tone by comparing the contemporary situation to a former, more glorious one, he/she replaces 'romance' with 'bromance' as the narrative's main theme. The focus of the English version of the *Yvain*–story is not on the sensibilities of love, but on the 'trowth' between knights. Rikhardsdottir has noted that this motif is referred to an impressive five times in the opening lines.

> Thai told of more *trewth* tham bitwene
>
> Than now omang men here es sene,
>
> For *trowth* and luf es al bylaft;
>
> Men uses now another craft.
>
> With worde men makes it *trew* and stabil,
>
> Bot in thaire faith es noght bot fabil;
>
> With the mowth men makes it hale,
>
> Bot *trew trowth* es nane in the tale.   (33–40)

> [They told how there was more *truth* between them [the knights] than is now seen among men, for *truth* and love are lost, and men practice another craft. They use words to make things seem *true* and stable, but it is a fable; there is no *real truth* in their tales.]

'Trowth' has many meanings and in its most general form signifies "fidelity to one's country, kin, friends". In this context, however, it stands for "loyalty, allegiance," but also "genuine friendship" in particular.[76]

The MHG version imparts a moral motif on the story. Like the English poet,

---

[76] Kurath (1952), 1071.

Hartmann chose a more traditional prologue for introducing his story. He opens the poem with a *sententia* (■ *topoi*) to draw in his audience:

> Swer an rehte güete
>
> wendet sîn gemüete,
>
> Dem volget sælde und êre.   (1–3)
>
> [If a man applies his mind
>
> to true kindness,
>
> Heavenly bliss and honour will accrue to him.]

As the first three lines of the poem signify, the main occupation of the story is to provide a moral lesson. The story will be an example of true knighthood, such as King Artûs gave true teaching of and Iwein will give teaching of in the story to come. Although Artûs and Iwein are the exempla illustrating the *sententia*, they serve as models to the contemporary audience. The audience is invited to measure up to their example. To further establish the author–audience relationship, Hartmann provides the reader/listener with 'autobiographical' information.[77] He introduces himself as the author of *Iwein* by stating his station and qualifications. Only after having established a discourse that addresses both the author and the audience, does Hartmann proceed with the story. He repeats Chrétien's lament for the Golden Age, however, as Kratins explains, "he gives it a different basis and considerably diminishes its forcefulness."[78] Instead of focusing on the deterioration of one main emotion, like love in *Yvain*, or brotherly love in *YG*, Hartmann laments the joy of a perfect way of life in every respect. He thus presents his audience with an ideal, model life of knighthood. Like

---

[77] Sonnemans (1995) classifies such information under the 'autobiography' *topos*, 107–34.
[78] Kratins (1982), 11.

Chrétien's, his words promote self–reflection. The notion of courtly love, however, is strikingly absent in *Iwein*. The reason for this absence becomes clear towards the end of the poem. Kratins notes how,

> "The marked de–emphasising of the topic of love among the courtly pastimes, however, is but the visible tip of an iceberg, the dimensions of which shall become increasingly clearer towards the ending."[79]

The reason for this de–emphasis lies in the changed ending of the story, which underscores a different nature of love between Iwein and Laudine.

The Old Swedish translation administers the most elaborate discursive prologue of all. The poet combines several customary *topoi*. Like the English poet, he/she deploys 'the prologue prayer' by invoking the Holy Spirit. Not only does the translator invest many lines on the invocation of his muse, but he also discusses both the giving and the receiving party of the narrative.[80] Moreover, the poet highlights the key aspects of the story by giving the reader/listener a short synopsis of the *narratio*.[81] For one, the poet makes a didactic comparison similar to the previous examples. It is, however, not love that is a let-down in contemporary society, but chivalry and honour. Unlike the English poet, who seems to be addressing a male audience, the Swedish translator underlines that this decrease in chivalrous display is at the expense of the ladies. Secondly, the love–talking courtiers are referred to in the lines that follow. The knights and ladies joke about what happens when promises are made in love which are not kept. The poet is here lifting a tip of the veil referring to the separation of Ivan and his lady. Lastly, the poet demarcates the text with indications of

---

[79] Kratins (1982), 12.
[80] For the traditional topoi of 'referring to the audience', see Sonnemans (1995), 135–70.
[81] For the 'introduction of the *narratio*', see Sonnemans, 209–234.

genre.[82] Line 57 reveals that the story will focus on adventure. Moreover, the adventure is placed in a historical setting.

The Norse rewriting is also much more concerned with factual information. The prologue to *Ís* mainly serves to set the story's scene. The first line simply states "Hér byrjar upp sögu hins ágæta Ívens, er var einn af Artús köppum" (39), ["Here begins the tale of the excellent Íven who was one of Arthur's champions"] and thus the story begins with the description of the Pentecost festivities. The image of courtly splendour, such as displayed in *Yvain*, is completely absent in *Ís*. There is no mention of the love–talking knights and ladies or of love itself. The reader/ listener is, however, presented with an elaborate description of King Arthur's power and status and the state of his kingdom. The Norse translation thus favours giving facts over emotions. What is more, there is no didactic function to the story. Instead, the Norse adaptor seems most concerned with the progress of the story itself, as Rikhardsdottir explains in *Medieval Translations:*

> "The entire elaboration on love is omitted, which shifts the thematic foundation of the story from the dilemma of knightly duties of love and honour to that of the adventure and hence the narrative process itself. This minor omission of a few lines therefore drastically alters the underlying thematic orientation and destabilises the entire framework of meaning if the text itself."[83]

The Norse translator thus seems to prefer the eventful above the emotional.

---

[82] Sonnemans (1995), 225–8.
[83] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 92.

3.2   Calogrenant's Tale

As the previous passage shows, Chrétien makes use of *narratorial intrusion* to bring about the emotional involvement of his audience. Such interpolations of the story assemble under the header of *authorial comment* when discussing narrative techniques. The *authorial comment* serves as a way for the author to intrude the narrative and influence the reader/listener. Since Chrétien has signed his work, we know that it is Chrétien who is behind the narrative. However, when describing the voice behind such *authorial comments* we should speak of the narrator, who is not to be confused with the author of the text. The narrator is created by the author. It is the author's "respectable puppet".[84] By manipulating the narrative, the author can make the narrator speak for him. Such is the case in *Yvain*, when Chrétien creates a hypodiegesis with one of his characters as the narrator. Calogrenant proposes his fellow knights to tell them a tale of one of his adventures that ended in shame. This story–within a story (Calogrenant's tale within the story of Yvain's adventure) is a clever narrative technique by which the poet can distance himself from the audience, in order to guide the audience in their emotions. By using the character of Calogrenant as a 'mouthpiece', Chrétien is able to dissociate himself from his conventional role as a narrator.[85] This becomes evident in the following passage. Although the narrative shows Calogrenant relating his story to an intradiegetic audience (his fellow knights and the queen), this may well be Chrétien addressing the extradiegetic audience (the contemporary audience), asking them for their attention:

> 'Cuer et oreilles me rendés,
>
> Car parole oïe est perdue
>
> S'ele n'est de cuer entendue.

---

[84] Grisby (1979), 265.
[85] Green (1970), 56.

Or y a tix que che qu'il oent

N'entendent pas, et si le loent;

Et chil n'en ont fors que l'oïe,

Puis que li cuers n'i entent mie.

As oreilles vient le parole,

Aussi comme li vens qui vole,

Mais n'i arreste ne demore,

Ains s'en part en mout petit d'ore,

Se li cuers n'est si estilliés

C'a prendre soit appareilliés;

Que chil le puet en son venir

Prendre et enclorre et retenir.

Les oreilles sont voie et dois

Ou par ent y entre la vois;

Et li cuers prent dedens le ventre

Le vois qui par l'oreille y entre.

Et qui or me vaurra entendre,

Cuer et oreilles me doit render,

Car ne veul pas server de songe,

Dont maint autre vous ont servi,

Ains conterai che que je vi.   (150–74)

['Lend me your hearts and ears, for words that are not understood by the heart are lost

completely. There are those who hear something without understanding it, yet praise

it; they have only the faculty of hearing, since the heart does not comprehend it. The

word comes to the ears like whistling wind, but doesn't stop or linger there; instead it quickly leaves if the heart is not alert enough to be ready to grasp it. If the heart can take and enclose and retain the word when it hears it, then the ears are the path and channel through which the voice reaches the heart; and the voice, which enters through the ears, is received within the breast by the heart. So he who would hear me now must surrender heart and ears to me, for I do not wish to speak of a dream, or a fable, or a lie, which many others have served you; instead I shall tell what I have seen myself.']

By using the *audite–topos* (■ *topoi*),[86] Chrétien is strengthening the author–audience relationship by a direct request for attention.[87] In "Spiegelpersonages", Brandsma explains how in this passage, the extradiegetic audience is equivalent to the intradiegetic audience, who serve as a mirror.[88] He shows that Calogrenant's request is directed at both the intra–and the extra–diegetic audience. Without having to intrude as an author, Chrétien is able to stress the importance of the emotional experience of the story. Calogrenant not only asks for their ears, but more importantly for their hearts, "for words that are not understood by the heart are lost completely." With these words, Calogrenant distinguishes between two types of hearing: hearing with your ears and hearing with your heart. The first is necessary in order to literally listen to the events and development of the story. The second, he states, is necessary in order to understand these events and developments; "in order to grasp the word's meaning". This emphasis on the use of the heart when interpreting a story, suggests the importance, recognised at least by Chrétien, of the audience's emotional involvement in a story.

Although this passage also features in the English adaptation, the scene's mirroring

---

[86] Hunt (1970), 4.
[87] This is the first traditional *topos* used by Chrétien to strengthen the author–audience relationship. Many have therefore argued that Chrétien has created an extended prologue for *Yvain*.
[88] Brandsma (2000), 39. See *mirror character/passage* in the appendix.

function does not come to a full development in *YG*. Colgrevance seems to be addressing just the intradiegetic party; the Queen and his fellow knights. This *audite–topos* in fact seems to stem from Colgrevance's conversation this intradiegetic party, which is mainly directed at the Queen. In *Yvain*, Calogrenant is also still in dialogue with the Queen when there is talk of the knight starting his tale. Chrétien, however, seems to demarcate the two scenes by explicitly ending the dialogue, announcing the beginning of his tale and asking the Queen to listen. Subsequently, he again asks for his audience's attention:

> 'Chertes, dame, che m'est mout grief,
>
> Que vous me quemandés a faire.
>
> Ains me laissaisse .i. des iex traire
>
> Que hui mais nule riens contaisse,
>
> Se courouchier ne vous doutaisse;
>
> Mais je ferai che qu'i vous siet,
>
> Comment que la chose me griet.
>
> Puis qu'i vous plaist, or entendés!'
>
> 'Cuer et oreilles me rendés,
>
> Car parole oïe est perdue
>
> S'ele n'est de cuer entendue.   (142–52)

> ['Indeed, my lady, what you order me to do is very difficult. Except for my fear of your anger, I'd rather let one of my eyes be put out than to tell them anything more this day; but though it pains me, I'll do what pleases you. Since it suits you listen to me now!'

'Lend me your hearts and ears, for words that are not understood by the heart are lost

completely.']

Since this repetition is somewhat redundant, Calogrenant's second request for attention seems

to be meant for the extradiegetic audience in general.

Hartmann has applied this *audite–topos* to the same end as Chrétien. Although

Kalogreant is at first addressing the Queen and his fellow knights when asking for their

attention, the switch to addressing a more general audience is clearly assignable.

The English poet, however, does not close off Calogrenant's and the Queen's

dialogue, but melts the two scenes together into one:

'Sertes, madame, that es me lath

Bot for I wil noght mak *yow* wrath,

Yowre cumandment I sal fulfill,

If *ye* wil listen me until,

With hertes and eres understandes;

And I sal tel *yow* swilk tithandes,

That *ye* herd never none slike.   (135–41)

['I am loathe to do so, Madam, but I will fulfil your commandment so that I don't

anger you. If you will listen to me with understanding hearts and ears, I will tell you

tidings such as you have never heard in any king's realm.']

Since the *Ywain–*poet does not differentiate between dialogues, it seems that Colgrevance is

still addressing the intradiegetic party and it seems the Queen specifically. The use of the

pronoun *ye* seems to support this. Although Old English *ye* was originally associated with the second–person plural, this plural form was gradually extended to singular use somewhere in the thirteenth century. Moreover, *ye* began to be used as a polite form to signify status. "*Ye* is the language of a servant to a lord, and of compliment, and further expresses honour, submission and entreaty. *Thou* on the other hand was used to signify people equal or inferior in status."[89] The English poet thus seems to take advantage of the social discriminations present in the variants of Middle English *you*. An examination of all '*you*– forms' throughout the poem supports this statement. It shows that the general form used to designate the second person in *YG* is *thou*. *Ye* solely occurs in reference to royalty. It is used by both Lunet and Ywain when addressing Laudine. It also occurs in the altercation between Colgrevance, Kay and Guinevere. *Ye* is consistently used by both knights to address the Queen. This textual evidence seems to suggest that the English poet is referring to the Queen explicitly when asking for "your hearts and ears". Note, however, that the poet does repeat the plural form 'hearts' as presented in *Yvain*. The reader/listener is thus reminded of the rest of Colgrevance's audience, Kay and his fellow knights, who were mentioned earlier on in the story. Since there is no clear demarcation of the two scenes, 'hearts' seems to refer back to the intradiegetic party. Unlike Calogrenant who seems to be addressing both the intra–and the extradiegetic audience, the English Colgrevance addresses only the first. This takes away from the mirroring function of the scene.

The same is true for the Old Swedish version. When Kalegrevanz bids 'alla þær til lyþa' (153) ['all of you to listen'], he specifies his addressees three lines later: 'riddara ok fruor ok stolta qvinna' (155) ['knights, ladies, and noble queen']. The *audite–topos* is thus exclusively directed at the intradiegetic party and has no mirroring function.

---

[89] Blake (1992), 536–7.

Likewise, the Old Norse text also restricts the *audite–topos* to Kalebrant's dialogue with the queen. This is, however, not the only alteration he makes. Instead of naming the heart as the appropriate instrument for understanding the tale, the Norse poet underlines the importance of the mind in grasping the full intent of the story. Strikingly, he quite literally copies Calogreant's words, except for the knight's reference to the heart, which he replaces with "hugr" ["mind"].

'Verið vel skiljandi ok eyru til leggjandi, þvíat heyrð orð eru þegar tynd, nema *hugr* hirði þat er eyra við tekr. Þeir verða margir optliga er þat lofa er þeir eigi gá at skilja ok hafa eigi meira af, en þeir heyra meðan *hugr* gleymir at skilja þvílíkt sem vind<r> fljúgandi ok nemr hvergi staðar. Svá fara þau orð er heyrð eru, nema *hugr* vaki við at taka.' (39)

['Listen well and lend me your ears, for words heard are lost at once unless the *mind* preserves what the ears receive. Many often end up praising what they are unable to understand and from which they do not profit, and they hear while the *mind* forgets to comprehend just like the wind's breezes that do not come to rest. That is what happens to words that are heard if the *mind* is not awake to receive them.']

It seems that, according to the Norse poet, understanding is something that is done with the mind, not the heart. Strangely enough, he is not very consistent in his adjustment. Calogrenant's last reference to the heart ís copied:

'þvíat þeir er mín orð vilja skilja, leggi bæði til eyru ok *hjarta*, þvíat ek vil eigi tyna þeim draum né hégóma, né þat sem efan er í at trúa, heldr þat sem ek reynda ok sá.'

(39)

['let those who want to understand my words apply both their ears and *hearts*, because I do not want to tell them a dream or a fiction nor anything that is subject to doubt, but rather what I experienced and saw.']

Was this done deliberately, or was it inadvertence that made the translator copy this last reference to the heart?

3.3 The Wicked Seneschal

A second passage in the story in which the poet presents the audience with a mirror is the altercation between Keu, Calogrenant and the Queen. This scene takes up a large part of the story (lines 71 to 174). Especially Keu's role in this 'trinity' is confusing. Because of the indirect questions raised by Keu, the following passage fulfils a mirroring function.

Calogrenant is about to start his tale, when the Queen unexpectedly accompanies them. Calogrenant is the only knight to rise and pay his respect. This *gesture* (■ *non–verbal signifiers*) stirs up feelings of jealousy and shame with Keu, since he neglected to show the same respect. Out of defence, Keu starts mocking Calogrenant:

'Par Dieu, Calogrenant,

Mout vous voi or preu et saillant,

Et encore mout m'est bel que vous

Estes li plus courtois de nous …'   (71–74).

['By God, Calogrenant, I see how gallant and sharp you are, and of course I'm

delighted that you're the most courteous among us' …]

At first Keu seems to be praising Calogrenant. He continues, however, posing the opposite:

'…Et bien sai que vous le quidiés,

Tant estes vous de sens widiés;

S'est drois que ma dame l'otrit,

Que vous aiés plus que nous tuit

De courtoisie et de proeche.

Ja laissames or pour pereche,

Espoir, que nous ne nous levames

Ou pour che que nous ne deignames.

Et nom Dieu, sire, non feïmes,

Mais pour che que nous ne veïmes

Ma dame ains fustes vos levés'   (75–85)

[… 'And I'm sure you think you are — you're so lacking in good sense! It's only

natural my lady should believe you are more gallant and courteous than all the rest of

us": perhaps it appears that it was out of laziness that we neglected to rise, or because

we didn't deign to do so? But by God, sir, that wasn't it; rather it was because we

didn't see my lady until after you'd risen']

In this scene, Chrétien employs what Aussems has called *een vraagpassage [a question passage]* (■ *mirror character*) in order to control the audience emotions. A *question passage* is:

"een passage waarin een personage zich verwondert over een gebeurtenis of over een ander verhaalelement en daarover een vraag stelt."[90]

["a passage in which a character shows amazement or confusion about a certain event or about another element in the story.]

In a *question passage*, a character's astonishment is verbalised into a question. The extradiegetic audience, the contemporary reader/listener, is invited to share these feelings of astonishment with the character, who functions as a mirror to the audience. In the passage related above, Chrétien therefore addresses the questions also apparent in the audience's minds. It would have been appropriate for the other knights to rise as well, since rising to your superiors is considered an act of courtesy. It serves as a means of honouring someone. In *Gestures and Looks*, Burrow explains how in medieval hierarchical exchanges "it is the party of lower status that does the moving."[91] The Queen is superior in nobility to Keu. Why, therefore, didn't Keu rise? Chrétien provides the audience with two possible answers, posed, ironically, by Keu himself: 'perhaps it appears that it was out of laziness that we neglected to rise, or because we didn't deign to do so' (80–82). The audience is now left to wonder; was it truly neglect that prevented the seneschal from rising or even worse, a deliberate affront, not considering the Queen worthy of such a gesture?

---

[90] Aussems (2007), 25–26.
[91] Aussems (2007), 28.

The carelessness of Keu is a peculiar variant on a *question passage*, uncommon in medieval romance.[92] Not only does Keu's carelessness raise questions, these questions are at the same time provided with solutions, namely neglect or condescend. Who is providing the answers in this apparent dialogue? Surely, Keu would not bring about his own humiliation. I believe it is the narrator, who by posing negative suggestions to the question why Keu did not rise, is taking the first step in influencing his audience's feelings about the seneschal.

The whole scene must have been rather confusing for the medieval audience, as it still is for the reader today. Chrétien lets Keu hide behind *sarcasm* and feigned courtesy in order to create confusion about his true disposition. Elucidation is, however, provided by Guinevere, who, in this scene, functions as a mirror character: [93]

'Chertes , Kés, ja fussiés crevés,

Fait la royne, au mien quidier,

Se ne vous peüssiés widier

Du venin don't vous estes plains.

Enuieus estes et vilains

De ramporner vos compagnons.'   (87–91)

['Indeed, Kay,' said the queen, ' I do think that you'd soon burst if you couldn't pour out the venom that fills you. You are tiresome and base to reproach your companions like this.]

---

[92] A similar example of this variant may be found in: Aussems, 26.

By labelling the seneschal's behaviour as "tiresome" and "base", Guinevere discloses Keu's quarrelsome disposition to the audience. Guinevere thus fulfils the role of referee between Keu and Calogrenant, and judges the latter to be the victor in the battle of courtesy.

The mirroring function of the scene is lost in the rewritings. Although the Old Swedish version closely resembles its source by its deployment of *sarcasm* in the character of Kæye, this does not lead to a *question passage*. Neither is the queen ascribed a mirroring function. Her words are less punitive and the judgement is passed by the narrator introducing the seneschal:

ok hærre Kæyæ, qvaþsprak,

þær æ talær illa a hvars manz bak.   (73–74)

[and Sir Kay, the slanderer,

who always speaks ill behind every man's back.]

The Swedish translator chose a descriptive passage over a mirroring passage to disclose Kæye's true nature.

In *Ywain and Gawain*, Kay's disposition is surrounded by less confusion. There is less use of *sarcasm* and no signs of feigned courtesy. Although Kay is rude in his conduct, it does not necessarily serve the purpose of slandering Calogrenant, like it does in *Yvain*. Rather, it serves to defend himself from having shown neglect. Feelings of longing for elucidation are therefore not evoked in the audience. This results in Guinevere's judgement being less harsh. Instead of holding a tirade on how 'tiresome' and 'base' Kay is, the Queen simply remarks:

'And it war gude thou left swilk sawes

And noght despise so thi felawes'   (83–84)

['It would be good if you left off such words and not despise your fellows'.]

Guinevere's mirroring function is thus lost in the English adaptation.

In the German rewriting, the altercation also loses much of its sharpness. The speeches are lengthened and contain a "certain rhetorical courtliness".[94] Although Key tries to put Kalogreant in his place, he does so in a surprisingly polite way. Unlike Keu, Key's courtesy is not feigned in favour of *sarcasm*, but it seem to be genuine. What is more, Key's wickedness is less apparent, since his disposition is somewhat ameliorated. Although he does not agree with the Queen's harsh verdict, he claims to "accept her discipline and guidance willingly, as he ought" (164–5). Moreover, Kratins observes how Kay even admits to being slightly in the wrong, for which he is willing to make amends. While Keu ignores Calogrenant's counterattack, Keii answers Kalogreant personally and with considerable sensitivity and politeness:

'Mîn frouwe sol iuch niht erlân

irn saget iuwer mære,

wan ez niht reht wære,

engultens alle sament mîn.'   (226–9)

['My lady should not spare you from telling your tale, for it would not be right if all were to pay for my fault.'][95]

---

[94] Kratins (1982), 12.
[95] Kratins (1982), 13.

Above–mentioned fragments show how Hartmann has retouched Key's behaviour somewhat. Key's rhetorical courtliness almost makes him exemplary. Similarly, Kalogreant's courtliness is exaggerated by Hartmann. When the queen joins the knights' company, Kalogreant does not simply stand up, but moreover is described bowing to her and welcoming her.

While Chrétien uses the squabble between Calogrenant and Kay to outline the latter's character, the adaptors have ignored their source's deployment of his complex mirroring technique. In fact, the Norse adaptor has cut the scene altogether, speeding forward to Kalebrant's tale.

A similar scene plays out in the romance's second episode. Although this study will not cover this episode, this scene is inextricably linked to the passage described above. The scene resembles the dispute between Keu, Calogrenant and the Queen. Yvain, however, takes the place of Calogrenant. When Calogrenant has finished his tale, Yvain proclaims he will avenge his cousin's shame. Like Calogrenant before him, Yvain is now subject to Keu's rudeness.

This wickedness serves a similar function in the French, Scandinavian and English versions of the story. Keu ascribes Yvain's promise to a boast made after too much wine. By portraying Yvain as a boasting coward, who, like a woman, needs an escort when travelling and is subject to bad dreams, Keu is making the audience doubt Yvain's capabilities. It is, in fact, very possible that the contemporary listener would be sceptical about Yvain's knightly abilities, since *Le Chevalier au Lion* is Yvain's 'grande debut' as a knight.[96] Is the audience to expect some truth in Keu's words? The opposite is true. Although the audience may not be familiar with Yvain, it is familiar with the character of Keu as a troublemaker. If not through other narratives, then through the discourtesy earlier displayed against Calogrenant. His

---

[96] Yvain does not feature in any of the adventures described in Chrétien's other romances. He is but shortly mentioned in *Erec et Enide*.

sarcasm will therefore not be taken seriously by the contemporary audience; his discourtesy will accomplish the opposite and make Yvain look ever more courteous. The character of Kay therefore serves as a *foil* (▪ *mirror character*), or in terms of *mirror characters* as a *false mirror character*, first to Calogrenant and finally to Yvain.[97] Chrétien employs the character of Keu as a *foil* against the courteous nature of his hero.

Although the English and Scandinavian adaptations adhere to their source, such is not the case for *Iwein*. The German Key is not ascribed the function of *foil*. As explained above, Hartmann tones down Key's wicked disposition. The distinction between the two knights is thus less clear cut. Although Key slanders Yvain when the latter decides to avenge his kinsman's honour, he does so in a courteous manner, advising him "to sleep a little" on his decision (824).

3.4   The Wild Herdsman

As we have seen, deploying mirroring passages, such as a *question passage,* is an important narrative technique for Chrétien to guide his audience's emotions. Another example of a *question passage* is the scene featuring, what scholars have called, "the Wild Herdsman".

When Calogrenant leaves the vavasour's court to search for adventure, he encounters a herdsman guarding bulls. Calogrenant does not know what to make of this creature. He marvels at the herdsman's ugly appearance, "grans et hideus a desmesure" (287) ["ugly and hideous in the extreme"]. The herdsman is so ugly that, according to the narrator, there is no description for it.

Calogrenant's description of the herdsman corresponds to the traditional depiction of ugliness in medieval literature. The herdsman is described as hairy and dishevelled and having a black skin, like a Moor. What is more, the herdsman shows distinctive traits that are

---

[97] Gowans (1988), 66.

supported by animal imagery.[98] Such descriptions on a character's outward appearance had an important function in medieval texts. Specht explains that, "[t]he primary function of hideousness in the literature of the Middle Ages may be summed up as that of arising emotions, such as aesthetic disgust and moral aversion against the person (or being) who is described as physically repulsive."[99] Because of the herdman's guise, Calogrenant thinks the worst of him. This reaction corresponds to the traditional medieval school of thought. In medieval literature, ugliness often represents evil. In such representations, a person's spiritual beauty is linked to his/her psychical beauty or in other words moral character. The practice of drawing conclusions about the spiritual beauty of a human being on the basis of that person's outward appearance is part of the medieval " 'formal portrait' tradition". The roots of this tradition are embedded in the works of late classical writers like Sidonuis Apollinaris and Maximanus.[100] By the twelfth century, this principle of beauty being tied up with moral character became part of the school instruction in the trivium.[101] Chrétien's audience must thus have been familiar with this symbolism.

When the herdsman leaps to his feet as Calogrenant approaches, the latter is unsure of his intentions and believes to be under attack:

Je ne soi s'il me vaut touchier,

Ne ne soi qu'il voloit emprendre,

Mais je me garni de deffendre   (314–6)

[I didn't know if he wanted to strike me, or what he intended to do, but I made ready

to defend myself.]

---

[98] For a list on the distinctive traits associated with ugliness in medieval characterisation, see Specht (1984), 138.
[99] Specht (1984), 134.
[100] Specht (1984),132.
[101] Specht (1984), 134.

The audience is led to believe that the herdsman is an approaching danger. When, however, it appears that he does not intend to move, and in fact is perfectly still, Calogrenant becomes even more confused:

Si m'esgarda et mot ne dist,

Nient plus c'une beste feïst;

Et je quidai quë il n'eüst

Raison, ne parler ne seüst.   (321–4)

[He looked down at me, without saying a word, no more than a beast would have; and I wondered whether he didn't know how to talk and was mute.]

Calogrenant at this point begins to question the herdsman's identity. In this passage, Calogrenant serves as a mirror to the extradiegetic audience, who share these feelings of insecurity with the character. But what is Calogrenant, and thus the audience, to be confused about? There seems to be a meaningful difference between what Chrétien, followed by Hartmann and the Swedish translator, imparts on his audiences to reflect upon and in what direction the English and Norse adaptors guide their audiences.

Chrétien does not voice Calogrenant's amazement, but converts the knight's astonishment about the herdsman's nature into a remarkable question: " 'Se tu es boine chose ou non?' " (327) [" ' are you a good creature or not?' "]. The herdsman answers him by merely stating that he is "a man". This somewhat strange answer leads readers/ listeners wondering whether Calogrenant has asked the right question. The poet's focus in describing the herdsman on his beastly qualities and his reference to him as 'creature' raises a different question, namely: What kind of being are you?

The English and the Norse adaptors seem to have interpreted Chrétien's question in this exact way and have therefore adjusted the questions in their translations. Instead of motivating whether the herdsman is good or not, they are concerned about the herdsman's human/non–human nature. According to the composer of *YG*, the right question to be asked is thus: "What ertow?" (278) ["what are you?"]. Chrétien's question of good and evil is of no importance to the English poet. By changing the question, the poet seems to be suggesting that something so ugly is neither human, nor good. This becomes evident from the fact that some aspects of Chrétien's elaborate description of the creature are cut. Where the poet decides to omit certain aspects of imagery in the description of the herdsman that suggest his noble nature,[102] he closely follows the animal imagery from the original. Moreover, the question of good and evil is of no importance, since, from the beginning, the herdsman is described as hostile:

'When he me sagh, he stode upright

I frayned him if he wolde fight

For tharto was I in gude will.'   (271–3)

['He stood up when he saw me, and I asked if he wanted to fight, for I was willing.']

Moreover, the fact that Calogrenant "ful hardily" (277) [boldly] asks him what his nature is, suggests that the herdsman is hostile and does not deserve to be treated civilly. The addition of "belamy" (278) [fair friend] to Calogrenant's question, therefore, seems ill suited. However, when recited this label might have received a distinct pronunciation, suggesting

---

[102] For a description of the imagery deployed by Chrétien to underline the noble nature of the herdsman, see p. 68 of this paper.

irony. This type of *irony* is recognised by Green as "the ironizing of courtly vocabulary".[103]

He describes how, in the romance tradition, knights encountering other knights often extend courtesy by addressing the other with 'friend'. Extending the herdsman the same courtesy does not correspond to Calogrenant's hostility towards the creature and may thus be explained as *irony* at the latter's expense. Going so far as to label him 'fair', a creature who is thirty lines prior described as 'the fowlest wight, that ever yit man saw in sight' (245–6) adds to the irony of the situation. Another example of his evil nature is line 301. Whereas *Yvain* speaks of the bulls' obedience to the herdsman "com pour merci crier" (349) ["*as if* crying out for mercy"], the *Ywain*–poet literally makes them[104] cry:

> 'When that I wil him fang
>
> With mi fingers that er strang
>
> I ger him cri on swilk manere,
>
> That al the bestes when thai him here,
>
> Obout me than cum thai all,
>
> And to mi fete fast thai fall,
>
> On thaire manere merci to cry.'   (299–305)

> ['And when I seize him with my strong fingers, I make him cry in such a manner that when all the beasts hear him, they come to me, and fall at my feet, to beg mercy in their way.]

By stressing the herdsman's malevolent nature, the *Ywain*–poet has already answered Chrétien's question for his audience. He/she is, instead, focusing their attention towards the

---

[103] Green (1970), 52.

[104] Instead of bulls, MS Galba, E.ix. relates of "Mani a wilde lebard/ Lions, beres, bath bule and bare" (239–40) ["Many wild leopards/ Lions, bears, bulls and boars"].

question of his human nature, suggesting that what is ugly must be evil and thus cannot be human. The English poet is thus working along the lines of the traditional 'formal portrait' tradition described above.

A similar suggestion is made by the Norse adaptor, who links up the herdsman's exterior with the supernatural. The question posed by the Norse Kalebrant suggests that the knight is dealing with another known evil in medieval Norse society; the supernatural:"Hvárt ert þú maðr eða andi eða önnur vættr?" (41) ["Are you a man or a ghost or some other being?"]. Like the English, the Norse herdsman is far from noble. He not only makes the animals he herds cry, but he "slít ek höfuð af þeim" ["cuts of their heads"] and makes them "þa skálfa öll dyrin af ógn ok hræzlu" ["tremble for terror and fear"] should they disobey. The Norse text thus also underlines the herdsman's evil nature.

Although the Norse and English *question passages* deviate from Chrétien's, it seems that Chrétien did not simply choose the wrong words to pose his question. Instead he is directing his audience's thought into a new direction, away from the conventional beliefs of the time. Like Specht, I believe that Chrétien "intended to create a character who went against the traditional equation between ugliness and turpitude."[105] He deliberately creates a scene in which confusion predominates. He is expecting the audience, just like the English and Norse adaptors seem to have done, to wonder about the human nature of the herdsman. However, instead of elaborating on this question, he poses another: is he good or evil? When the herdsman merely answers him that he is 'a man', Calogrenant replies by asking him what sort of man he is. He is now repeating the question he was after all along: is he a good man or an evil man? The fact that the herdsman is 'a man' does not give him any qualifications. Instead, Chrétien proposes that there are two sorts of men, the good and the evil, and he is simply

---

[105] Specht (1984), 138.

asking the herdsman to show his true colours. He is thus showing the audience not to make any assumptions based on the herdsman's appearance.

Ascribing this passage such a profound moral question may seem a little farfetched to some. It is, however, striking that other than the herdsman revealing the existence of the spring, the scene does not serve any purpose in the narrative. In fact, the scene could have been left out altogether, since Chrétien could have had Calogrenant ask for adventure at the vavasour's court. Sullivan, therefore, also explains Calogrenant's encounter with the herdsman as a parody on convention:

'A central component of Chrétien's counsel of the noble host convention is the hero's securing of information about the local adventure from a host who is also an aristocrat. With Calogrenant's request from a non–noble, that is, the herdsman, for counsel about a local adventure – a request necessitated by Calogrenant's earlier, inexcusable failure to ask his noble host for that information – Chrétien has completed his parody of the convention.'[106]

By choosing an ugly and wild herdsman over a noble vavasour (who represents all that is fair) as the 'quest–giver', Chrétien makes a statement against contemporary conventional beliefs. By using *imagery* with which the medieval audience must have been familiar, Chrétien is showing the audience that not everything is what it seems. When looking closely at Calogrenant's description of the herdsman, *imagery* may be found that portrays nobility. The herdsman is, for instance, described as being seated "seur une çouche" (290) ["on a stomp"], with a "machue en se main" (291) ["club in his hand"]. The stomp and the club could be imagery for a throne and scepter — "for medieval Europeans a frequent symbol of royal

---

[106] Sullivan (2006), 9.

power."[107] Raudszus's observations about the herdsman's clothing support this theory. In *Die Zeichensprache der Kleidung*, she notes how the herdsman's 'robe', his "deux cuirs de nouvel escorchiés" ["two pelts freshly skinned"] which are "a son col atachiés" ["attached at his neck"] communicate nobility (309–10).[108] Next to this imagery, Chrétien also makes use of *nonverbal signifiers* to underline the herdsman's good, or at least noble, nature. Moreover, as a reaction to the intrusion of Calogrenant, the herdsman rises. Calogrenant, perhaps erroneously, takes this as a gesture of hostility, however, this gesture can also serve as a means of honouring someone — as the listener has encountered earlier, recalling Calogrenant's courtly greeting of the Queen — and is therefore a gesture of nobility. By posing a question different from the expectations created, Chrétien thus seems to be consciously manipulating his reader/ listener's process of thought and emotions regarding the herdsman.

Chrétien's deviation from the conventional seems to have been picked up by both the German and Swedish adaptors, who repeat Chrétien's remarkable question. Despite ascribing him an ugly appearance, Hartmann gives a human portrayal of the herdsman. He is described as a "peasant", "a wild man of the woods" and an "uncouth man"; a man dishevelled by his solitary existence in the woods, but nonetheless a man. From the beginning, Hartmann makes it clear that he is talking about a human man:

> Sîn menschlîch gebilde
>
> was anders harte wilde.   (423–4)

> [His appearance, albeit human,

---

[107] Sullivan (2006), 7.
[108] Raudszus (1985) in: Sullivan, 7.

was otherwise extremely wild.]

What is more, the human nature of Hartmann's herdsman is underlined by the same visual imagery that symbolises nobility in *Yvain*. When Kalogreant nears him, the herdsman is rendered standing up in his freshly skinned pelts with a club in his hand. Moreover, in line 512, after having been assured protection from the fighting animals, the knight actually addresses him with the title "herre" ["sir"]. This single word breaks down any social differences between them. For Hartmann, however, the fact that the herdsman is human does not necessarily mean that there is no danger to him. Like Chrétien, he perceives humans as creatures of both God and the Devil, who are hence capable of good and evil. He therefore repeats Chrétien's question: "Bistû übel ode guot?" (481) ["Are you evil or good?"].

The Swedish translator is also guiding his/her audience away from conventional beliefs. Instead of complying with the traditional black–and–white–interpretation, linking one's nature to their appearance, he/she also differentiates between two kinds of men:

'Sigh hvat manne þær þu æst,

hvat þu goþer hælder ilder ær'   (304–5)

['Tell me what sort of man you are,

whether you are good or evil']

3.5   Conclusion Episode I

To summarise, medieval poets preceded their works with prologues in order to bring about the audience's involvement in the text. These prologues served the purpose of establishing an author–audience relationship. Although both Chrétien and the adaptors introduce their works

with such prologues, they have deployed different techniques to help bring about the author–audience relationship.

The adaptors use traditional *topoi* in taking steps to bring about the audience's involvement. Their main concern is claiming *auctoritas*. The English poet asks for the protection of God for him/herself and the audience. Hartmann opens with a *sententia*, followed by autobiographical information. The Swedish translator combines several *topoi*. Like the English poet, he/she deploys 'the prologue prayer' by invoking the Holy Spirit. This is followed by a synopsis of the story. Next to this, the poet demarcates the poem's genre. The Norse translator also makes use of this *narratio topos*.

None of the adaptors have followed Chrétien in his deviation from the conventional prologue. The French poet postpones establishing the relationship between author and audience. Instead of introducing himself, he makes it his first priority to familiarise the audience with the theme of the story. He introduces love as a *leitmotiv* to his work. The immediacy with which the main theme is laid out, shows that Chrétien's main concern is the emotional involvement of the audience. The subsequent projection of this *leitmotiv* on his audience brings about this emotional engagement. The narrator intrudes the story to debate the contemporary manifestation of love and to ask his audience for their thoughts and feelings on the subject. Chrétien thus establishes the author–audience relationship through his presentation of an emotional casus.

What is more, the adaptors all underline different *leitmotivs*. Unlike Chrétien, they do not present love as the main focus of the story. The English poet changes Chrétien's theme of romance into a theme of 'bromance' by focussing on the 'trowth' between knights. The German narrator laments 'rehte güete', an ideal image of knighthood, as present in Arthur's days. Both the Scandinavian rewritings refrain from introducing one main theme to the story. Notable is their focus on the historicity of the story. Especially the Old Norse translation

seems to prefer relating such facts to emotions.

This also becomes clear from the passage in which Calogrenant tells his tale. By using a *mirror passage*, Chrétien lets Calogrenant underline the importance of the audience's emotional experience of the story. He relates how the audience should not only listen with their ears, but also with their hearts. Kalebrant's similar request for attention, however, discusses the ears and the mind as the perfect listening tools.

In this scene, Chrétien employs *mirror characters* in order to bring about the emotional involvement of the audience. Calogrenant is not just addressing the intradiegetic listeners, but also the extradiegetic audience. The switch from addressing a select group of listeners to addressing a more general audience is also apparent in Hartmann. The scene's mirroring function has, however, not been repeated by all the adaptors. In *YG,* Colgrevance seems to be addressing just the Queen and his fellow knights when asking them to listen with both 'hearts and ears.' The same is true for the Scandinavian rewritings.

Chrétien deploys two more scenes in episode I as *mirror passages* in order to stimulate the emotional involvement of the audience. The first example is the altercation between Keu, Calogrenant and the Queen. In this scene, Keu's confusing behaviour leads to what Aussems has called a *question passage*. This narrative technique helps the audience to ask the right questions. The queen, whose opinionated tirade provides an answer to these questions, can in turn be considered as a *mirror character*. Keu himself serves as a *foil*, first against Calogrenant and later against Yvain.

Again, the mirroring function of Chrétien's scene is mostly absent in the rewritings. In the Old Swedish version, judgement on Kæye's disposition is passed by the narrator in a descriptive passage, instead of direct speech. In both the English and German rewriting, the argument loses its sharpness. The Queen's judgement on the knight's wicked tongue is less pronounced. Moreover, Hartman ameliorates Key's disposition by making his behaviour more

submissive and his language more courteous. The Norse translation eliminates the altercation altogether.

A second example of Chrétien's deployment of a *question passage* as a means to guide the audience in their emotions may be found in the scene of the Wild Herdsman. Unlike the first example, all the translators have adopted the second *question passage*. The question posed by the adaptors, however, differs. Whereas the German and the Swedish poets follow Chrétien's example, the other translators impart a different question on their audiences to reflect upon. This passage on the herdsman presents the audience with what can be considered a case study on the nature of the ugly. The deviating *question passages* disclose the different views and emotions inherent to the texts' contemporary societies. There seem to be two camps regarding this issue. Whereas the Norse and English adaptors have a conventional take on the matter, the French, German and Swedish authors support a more progressive view.

4   Episode IV: Becoming the Knight with the Lion.

4.1   A Lion as a Companion

The first emotional discrepancy between the different versions of *Yvain* in episode IV,

appears in the narratives' representations of the lion. On his way back from defending the

Lady Noroison's castle, Yvain encounters a lion and a serpent in a death struggle. He decides

to take the lion's side and kills the serpent. Half–expecting having to do battle with the lion as

well, he awaits its reaction.

In *Yvain*, Chrétien seems to deliberately play around with the audience's expectations.

This has already become evident from his representation of the herdsman. The herdsman is,

however, not the only example of something being different from what it looks. The ideology

carried out by Chrétien in the example of the herdsman is pursued further in the

representation of the lion. Although his beastly appearance does not show it, the lion, as the

companion and protector of Yvain, is of a good nature. Chrétien anthropomorphises the lion

in order to underline his goodness.

For one, he uses human *imagery* in his description of the lion's submission to Yvain.

The poet interprets the animal in human terms, by ascribing the lion human traits. By

intruding the narrative and addressing his readers/listeners directly, Chrétien is bringing these

human traits to their attention. In line 3392, he makes it clear whereupon their attention

should focus in the coming scene: "Oyés que fist li leons donques:/ Il fist que frans et

deboinaire" ["Listen to how *nobly* and *splendidly* the lion acted"].

Secondly, Chrétien describes how the animal performs a series of *gestures* that reflect

human nature and emotions. The lion is portrayed as standing on his hind legs and bowing his

head while holding out his front paws. According to Burrow, the gesture of bowing should be

interpreted as an act of gratitude in Chrétien's time.[109] The lion is thus thanking the knight for saving his life. The bow is then followed by two more *gestures*. The lion kneels down while he is weeping. This *facial expression* (■ *non–verbal signifiers*) functions to underline the lion's gratitude towards Yvain. One of the chief functions of kneeling within medieval society, however, "was to seek or acknowledge a benefit."[110] This *gesture* thus recalls the submission of a vassal to his lord, as has been pointed out by G. Barnes: " Chrétien's lion is […] feudalized, its human body language extending to a ritualistic display of homage to Yvain".[111] The lion can therefore be seen as offering his services to the knight.

The third demonstrable personification of the lion is, like the first, preceded by a *narratorial intrusion*, in which the narrator directly addresses the audience. When Yvain returns to the Fountain, he faints as he remembers all that he has lost. In his fall his sword slips from its scabbard and cuts Yvain. When the lion sees the knight's blood, he is under the assumption that Yvain has committed suicide. The grief displayed by the lion exceeds any animalistic behaviour and is of human proportions. Chrétien calls this into mind by directly addressing the audience:

> 'Ains de riens nule duel gregneur
>
> N'oïstes conter ne retraire
>
> Quë il encommencha a faire.'   (3504–6)

> ['You have never heard told or described any greater grief than it began to show at this'.]

---

[109] Burrow (2002), 25.
[110] Burrow (2002), 23.
[111] Barnes (1994), 388.

None of the rewritings have followed Chrétien's human *imagery*. Instead, the translators chose to stress the animalistic features of the lion. Like the herdsman, the lion is judged on his outward appearance only. The adaptors do not mention his nobility or his splendidness. The anthropomorphised *gestures* described by Chrétien also lose their meaning in the rewritings. Instead of bowing and kneeling down, *Ís*, *HI*, *Iwein* and *YG* all display the lion as simply fawning submissively on the ground, as a dog would before his master. Where the Norse lion is turning its belly up, the English lion is licking the knight's feet. These canine representations are less ritualistically feudal and instead portray an image of subservience.

Not only have the adaptors ignored the human *imagery* present in *Yvain*, they also explicitly deny the existence of any human characteristics in the lion. Where Chrétien informs his audience that the lion submitted to Yvain and thanked him, the translators give their audiences the additional information that this was done "without actually speaking" (MHG: "unsprechenden" (3864)/ ON: "sem hann vildi biðja sér friðar með tárum (72)/ OS: "ræt sum hon vilde sighia sva" (2728)/ ME: "al if he might noght speke with mowth" (2006)).

What is more, except for the German text, none of the other versions of *Yvain* have adapted the human *imagery* underlined in the suicide scene. Neither the Norse, nor the Swedish translator considered it appropriate for the lion to kill himself with a sword. Instead the lion is described as disposing of the sword and expressing its grief in a more animalistic manner by howling, trembling and pacing or running around consumed by madness. The English version does tell of the lion's attempt at suicide, but any human imagery evoked is immediately negated by the image of the lion licking Ywain's feet when the latter recovers.

The only animal *imagery* used by Chrétien occurs in line 4008, where the poet remarks how the lion slept beside his master "as would a lamb". According to Kratins, this remark "has symbolic connotations that go beyond a mere simile for docileness."[112] J. Harris

---

[112] Kratins (1982), 132.

was the first to suggest that the lion is symbolic for Christ.[113] She argued that neither the adaptors nor the contemporary audience could have overlooked this symbolic association. This religious association therefore seems to be deliberately avoided by Hartmann, since he substitutes lamb with "schâf" in Chrétien's simile. However, "schâf" is not attested in the sense of "Lamb of God". According to Kratins, it rather "carries associations of dependence, need for care, which would assign the active role in the companionship to Iwein and emphasise his independence of, rather than dependence upon, the animal."[114] The Swedish rewriting also seems to prefer this imagery of dependency, an animalistic trait, to Chrétien's symbol for independency, a human representation. Like Hartmann, the translator has replaced lamb with the Old Swedish "far" (3258) ["sheep"]. In *Ís* and *YG,* the imagery has been omitted.

4.2 Lunete's Captivity

Lunete's captivity is another passage in episode IV where the emotional focus of the rewritings differs from Chrétien's. When, by chance, Yvain and the lion arrive at the Fountain again, the knight is reminded of his loss. As he laments his sorrowful fate, a damsel imprisoned in a nearby chapel overhears his words. Although Yvain does not know it, this damsel is in fact Lunete, who has been accused of treason against her lady.

In Chrétien's *Yvain*, the knight and the girl, as Kratins has put it so accurately, "begin an argument which *hyperbolically* elevates the lover's grief by contrasting it to the anxieties of the prisoner [Lunete]."[115] In this dispute, Yvain and Lunete advocate their own case. What, however, is the use of this competition of 'the sorest loser'?

By comparing Yvain's fate to Lunete's troubles and by moreover arguing for it

---

[113] Harris (1949).
[114] Kratins (1982), 146.
[115] Kratins (1982), 128.

surpassing the girl's, Chrétien is making the reader/listener understand the gravity of Yvain's suffering. The comparison serves to appeal to the audience's compassion. Yvain argues that Lunete's grief is joy and her suffering bliss compared to his. Unlike Lunete, he has gone from one extreme to the other. He has experienced an abrupt change from joy to grief, and who is more miserable than the man who receives his heart's desire only to lose it again? Lunete counter argues that her misery must be greater, since at least the knight is free, whereas her fate is sealed. The audience's compassion will initially concern Lunete. Unlike Yvain, who, despite everything, at least has his freedom, she is imprisoned. What is more, she faces death. Apart from these facts, it is the notion that she has to suffer due to false accusations that make her more miserable than Yvain, whose suffering is due to his own doing. Ironically, Chrétien uses the girl's innocence to turn the audience's compassion towards the protagonist. It is exactly this innocence that makes Yvain win his place as the 'sorest loser'. He rests his case by stating that since the girl is innocent, her innocence can surely be proven in a trial by combat. He, however, is neither innocent, nor can he champion his own cause against the lady and can thus never be saved from his own guilt. At least, so he believes. Later in the story, Lunete, who is freed by Yvain from her imprisonment, returns the favour. She frees the knight from the bonds of his guilt by bringing about the reconciliation with his lady. Yvain's piteous state is mostly caused by his realisation of his guilt. In this scene, Yvain is coming to terms with the fact that he brought about his own downfall.

By presenting Yvain as a sinner in search of atonement, Chrétien enables the audience to admit to feelings of compassion for the knight. Although he was wrong, Yvain is now ready to admit to his mistakes. This scene is therefore important for Yvain's growth as a knight. By admitting his faults, he is taking the first step towards becoming the paragon of chivalry and thus towards winning back the audience's sympathy. Yvain's later promise to rescue Lunete adds to Yvain's symphathy factor, as from this point on he more and more

starts behaving like an unselfish champion, like the knight of the Lion. It seems that Chrétien set this maturation process of the knight into motion with the ending of the story in mind. Only when Yvain is worthy again of Laudine's love will the reconciliation take place.

The Scandinavian adaptors seem to have recognised Chrétien's attempt to evoke pity for Yvain's case. Both the Norse and Swedish translators closely follow the contrast drawn between Yvain and the maiden in the hyperbolic argument devised by Chrétien. In the end, Yvain comes out as the winner of the argument. However, the reason for his 'victory' is less explicitly stated in the Scandinavian adaptations. Although the Norse adaptation does explain that Luneta is killed unless she can defend herself, the translator omits the lines wherein Chrétien explains how her rescue is brought about by her innocence:

'Nú hit fyrsta," sagði hann, "má ek kenna at ek hefi meira harm en þu, þvíat þu mátt frjálsaz, en ek eigi' (74)

['Now first of all," he said, " I can prove that I have greater sorrow than you since you can be freed but I cannot']

Again, the fact that Lunete is innocent will save her from harm. Yvain, however, will not find absolution. It is Lunete's innocence that triggers Yvain to acknowledge guilt, since Lunete's innocence serves as a *foil* against Yvain's guilt. Although the Swedish version does explain that he is not to be helped, since "his grief will end slowly", it does not mention that this is due to his guilt. Therefore, although Yvain's piteous state is stressed, the Scandinavian adaptors do not ask for the audience's sympathy, neither for their forgiveness, since Yvain does not profess his guilt.

In Hartmann, Iwein also takes on the argument with Lunet. Unlike Chrétien's Yvain,

he is, however, quick to admit his defeat. According to line 4068, not he, but Lunet "sît angesthafter" ["is in a more perilous position"]. Iwein's fault in the matter of his misery is not as explicitly addressed by Hartmann. In fact, the opposite is posed by Lunet, who states that:

> Ouch ist ez nicht von den schulden sîn
>
> ez ist von den unsælden mîn."   (459–60)

> ["And yet it is not his fault
>
> it is because of my own ill fortune"].

According to J.M. Sullivan, unlike Chrétien's Lunete,

> Hartmann's Lunet makes it perfectly clear that she is responsible for the failure of the queen's marriage. She remarks that whatever happens to her, "'I do not deny that it was because of my advice and counsel'" ["*sône lougen ich des niht / ezn vuocte mîn rât und mîn bête*"] (4120–1) that Laudine took Iwein as husband."

He argues that it is, thus, "not Iwein's action that has proved most instrumental in the failure of the marriage" but, rather, "the fact that Lunet was "premature" ["*alze gâch*"] (4180) in finding Iwein acceptable as a mate for her lady."[116] Since Iwein does not admit his wrongdoings, there is no sign of him having undergone a maturation process. This discrepancy with Chrétien's text can be explained by Hartmann's altered ending. In his reconciliation scene, it is not Iwein, but Laudine begging for forgiveness. Hartmann does not question Iwein's knightly status, since in his version of the story Laudine is just as much at fault for breaking up the marriage.

Moreover, *Iwein* employs suspense in order to evoke pathos. Although this is also apparent in *Yvain*, Hartmann exploits this narrative technique to its fullest extend. Where in

---

[116] Sullivan (2001), 349.

Yvain it takes the knight 75 lines to uncover the maiden's identity, Hartmann delays the moment even further. The scene takes up an impressive 202 lines until the moment of climax. Not only does he give a more complete account of Lunete's suffering in Yvain's absence, but he also provides the reason behind this suffering. When the moment of recognition seems undeniable, the knight's unwillingness to come to the obvious conclusion is postponed for another thirty lines, when he asks: "Welchen Îwein meint ir?" (4173) ["Which Iwein do you mean?"]. By delaying the moment of identification, Hartmann constructs a scene that heightens the dramatic *tension* (■ *suspense*) between the characters and evokes the maximum of pathos. The pathos evoked is however directed at the heroine, not the hero, of the story. Hartmann is thus steering the reader/listener's pity towards Lunet, instead of Yvain.

Where Hartmann only "minimises the hyperbolisation of a rejected lover's misery", the English translation shows no display of a hyperbolic treatment of Yvain's suffering at all. Although it initially seems to adhere to Chrétien's devised argument of the 'sorest loser', it abandons the sake of the argument along the way. No 'winner' is proclaimed. Instead the narrative 'fast-forwards' to the moment of recognition. The comparative function of the argument of the 'sorest loser' is thus lost, since, like the German adaptation, the scene focuses on Lunete's story and thus does not evoke sympathy for the protagonist.

4.3   The Battle with Harpin the Giant

Suspense is also an important narrative technique in the description of the subsequent adventure of episode IV. It is deployed by Chrétien to appeal to the audience's emotions. By presenting his reader/listener with two adventures that play out almost simultaneously, Chrétien creates a scene that appeals to the audience's fears and doubts.

After Yvain finds out that it is Lunete who is imprisoned in the chapel, he pledges to

come to her rescue the next day. It is through this pledge that Chrétien unifies the rescue of

Lunete and the battle with the giant into a consistent action. When Yvain leaves Lunete to

find lodging for the night, he arrives at a stronghold. Inside, he is told how the town is

pestered by a giant, who has laid waste to the land and has captured the chatelain's sons.

Yvain decides to help the chatelain and his family, but only on one condition. Since Yvain's

help is much needed, he constantly has to remind the chatelain and his family that he is bound

by his pledge to Lunete. No less than four times does Yvain repeat this statement. Initially, it

is the chatelain who asks for his help. After having heard the chatelain's desperate plea, Yvain

promises to fight the giant, provided he comes before noon. Subsequently, the chatelain's

wife and daughter beg for his assistance. Although he consents, he again stresses the

condition that his promise is under. This condition is repeated a third time by Chrétien in the

lines that follow:

> Ainsi ne les veut pas du tout
>
> Asseürer, car en redout
>
> Est que li gaians ne venist
>
> A tele eure quë il poïst
>
> Venir a tans a la puchele
>
> Qui est enclose en la capele.   (3995– 4000)

> [He did not want to give them absolute assurance, because he was afraid that the giant
>
> might not come early enough for him still to return in time to rescue the maiden who
>
> was imprisoned in the chapel.]

By repeatedly voicing this fear, Chrétien creates a foreboding atmosphere. The audience is

thus led to believe that Yvain might fail Lunete and that her life is in jeopardy. Any fears or

doubts expressed by the audience on Yvain's chivalric conduct are justified. After all, Yvain, by not fulfilling his promise to Laudine to return at her side after one year, proved to have "difficulty with holding deadlines."[117] The severe penalties of his earlier missed deadline foreshadow consequences of an equal size should this deadline be missed. This *tension* comes to a climax when the next day, at noon, the giant is still absent. When Yvain announces his departure, the anguished maiden begs Yvain, in the name of Gauvain her uncle and Yvain's faithful friend, to stay. Again the narrator relates how

> Sa vie avroit courte duree
>
> Ou il istroit tous vis du sens
>
> S'il n'I pooit venir a tens"   (4074–6)

[He would go mad if he could not arrive in time to save her [Lunete]].

However, the girl's kinship to Gauvain compels him to stay. At that moment, the giant appears.

Where the English poet, generally concerned with streamlining the narrative, would at any other point of the narrative omit repetitions, he/she does reiterate Chrétien's fourfold repetition of forbidding. The poet therefore seems to have wanted to repeat the foreboding atmosphere created by Chrétien.

So did Hartmann. As already became apparent in the discussion of Lunet's captivity scene, Hartmann is the master of *suspense*. He exploits the effects of this narrative technique to the fullest. Not only does he closely follow the ominous atmosphere created by the repetition of what might befall, but he also takes this feeling of forbidding to the next level.

---

[117] Hasty (1996), 88.

Iwein's quandary is voiced in a separate *monologue* in which the knight examines his obligations to both causes. He realises that whichever of the two he chooses, he shall in either case lose by it, since he "ne magich ir beider niht bestân" ["can't take on both tasks"]. D. Kelly has pointed out how the internal debate represented in Iwein's *monologue* would "particularly engage audiences during oral recitation".[118] In this s*oliloquy* (■ *monologue*), Hartmann is spelling Chrétien's disguised message out for his audience. He underlines the awful notion that Iwein will have to make a choice: it has to be one or the other. Just when this realisation starts to sink in, his *monologue* is cut short by the arrival of the giant.

Neither the Norse, nor the Swedish translations contain the ominous repetition apparent in *Yvain* and *Iwein*. No fear is expressed on account of Luneta's life, except for a streamlined *monologue* in *HI* when it appears the giant is late. Unlike Hartmann's *soliloquy*, the Swedish *monologue* shows little emotion on Ivan's part. Instead, the knight places his trust in providential guidance: "Iak varþer mik Guþi I vald at giva" (3321) ["I must leave myself in God's keeping"].

Suspense is also apparent in Chrétien's description of the castle's inhabitants. At Yvain's arrival, they seem to be torn between two emotions; the men and women rejoice and cry at the same time. The sudden emphasis on these marginal characters creates an ominous feeling. Their odd behaviour signifies that something is awry. This feeling is repeated when Yvain enters the battleground to fight the giant. Only for a split second does the narrative's focalisation shift back towards the castle's inhabitants, who are frantically praying:

> car ils ont grand–peur pour lui,

---

[118] Kelly (2005), 53.

que ce demon, ce diable,

qui avait tué beaucoup d'hommes nobles et vaillants

devant leurs yeux au milieu de cette place, ne lui fasse subir le meme sort."   (4166–9)

[for they were very afraid that the wicked devil, their enemy, who has slain many a

good man before their eyes in the square, would do the same].

This, however, is enough to put feelings of fear and doubt into the reader/listener's hearts.

The courtiers' frantic prayers underline the hopelessness of the situation. The pleading nature

of this dramatic *gesture* suggests a pour outcome for the knight. The castle inhabitants are

thus *mirror characters*, projecting their feelings of forbidding onto the audience. They inform

the audience that Harpin, who has killed many a knight, is a formidable adversary. Since they

have little hope for Yvain, all they can do is pray for him. When Yvain comes out as the

victor of the battle, the focalisation again switches to the courtiers, who rejoice and thank the

knight.

Although the Scandinavian rewritings and *YG* have adapted the focalisation of these

marginal characters, their purpose as *mirror characters* exemplifying the audience's feelings

is less explicit. This is due to the streamlining of the narratives. The motivation behind the

courtiers' prayers and thus the reason for their ominous feelings –namely the fact that the

giant has up until now defeated every adversary– is not elaborated on. Notably, the English

poet does spend an extra line on informing his/her audience that next to the ladies who laced

Yvain's armour, "mani sari murnand man" (2425) ["many a mourning man"] prayed for his

life. After battle, it is again only "mani a joyful man" (2490) who rejoices.

Remarkably, Hartmann, the 'master of suspense', omits the courtiers' focalisations on

the castle walls. *Iwein* contains no indications of an ominous atmosphere surrounding the

battle whatsoever. No fear is created regarding the battle's outcome, not even in the description of the giant. The audience is given a less horrific description of the giant. The image portrayed by Hartmann is that of an "insolent man"[119] rather than a malicious creature. Where all the other narratives speak of an "evil" giant, who has done many a "wicked" deed, Hartmann's chatelain refrains from presenting these negative adjectives. Moreover, the giant's obscene boast about the maiden's doomed fate is completely omitted. The giant is even called "rîter" (4969, 5008)[120] [knight] by Yvain. That the giant in *Iwein* at least knows his manners becomes apparent when he in return addresses Yvain with the respectful "ir".[121]

4.4 Lunete's Rescue

As we have seen, the deployment of marginal characters as 'emotional exempla', helps bring about the emotional involvement of the audience in *Yvain*. The use of *mirror characters* is very apparent in Chrétien. The adaptors, however, do not always follow him. They cut their lines short or simply leave the characters out altogether.

As Brandsma shows in "Luisteren naar de Spiegel", fighting is a category that especially seems to qualify for the use of *mirror characters*.[122] In the descriptions of tournaments, fights and battles, the spectator's perceptions are often described as well as those of the fighters. Brandsma's many examples of such focalisations show that the viewing party is either an important character in the story or a group of marginal characters, like the inhabitants of the chatelain's castle. The next instance where the depicted behaviour of marginal characters reflects the intended emotional response of the audience is indeed again a fighting scene. Although Yvain arrives at the chapel just in time, he is seized by great pity,

---

[119] Kratins (1982), 149.
[120] According to W.H. Jackson, the Middle High German 'rîter' signifies an upper level warrior in lordly retinues, see: "Aspects of Knighthood in Hartmann's Adaptations" in: Jones & Wisney (1993), 44–48.
[121] See: Kratins (1982), 149.
[122] Brandsma (2005), 288.

when he hears a group of damsels lamenting Lunete's imminent death. The damsels repeat the girl's sweet conduct, good council and above all her selflessness. The naming of Lunete's outstanding qualities serves to evoke compassion for her fate. The foreboding atmosphere regarding Lunete's fate, already tangible in the previous passage, is now repeated. Yvain's arrival, however, brings hope to Lunete's cause. Although the battle begins promising, Yvain, forced to fight alone, is no match against the three accusers. When they begin to overpower him, the focalisation switches to the damsels again. *Suspense* is now at its peak as the damsels, like the castle inhabitants in the previous passage, are portrayed praying for the Yvain and the girl's fate. As a last resort, they turn to God. The need for rescue becomes so essential that the damsels in their pious attempts seem to be inviting the audience to join in.

Iwein emphasises the need for prayer and divine intervention even more, for "er niemer kunde sô manigem süezzen munde betlichiu dinc versagen" (5359–61) [he [God] could never deny so many a sweet mouths' seemly requests]. Moreover, Hartmann remains true to the threefold recurrence of the perspective of the marginal characters as presented by Chrétien in his description of the battle with Harpin, where the courtiers are focalised before, during and after the battle.[123] He therefore returns once more to the damsels, who are portrayed thanking Yvain for his help after the fight. He thus completes the circle by extending the mirroring experience.

The Norse, the Swedish and the English rewritings do not copy the mirroring function of the damsels. They mention the damsels' pleas only once and leave out any repeated occurrence. What is more, their one–off performance is not so much concerned with the emotions behind the events as with the events themselves. They "laconically reproduce the

---

[123] Remarkably, Chrétien does not follow a threefold focalisation in the performance of the damsels, like he seems to do in other examples of such focalisations. In episode V, for example, a group of townspeople function as *mirror characters*, who, upon Yvain entering the castle, repeatedly share their concern for his life. The repetition of their focalisation, like that of the castle inhabitants', is also threefold.

damsels' lament only and do not particularise their obligations to Lunete."[124] The mirroring function of these characters is thus lost.

4.5   Conclusion Episode IV

Episode IV belongs to the middle part of the Yvain–story. Like episode I, it contains many passages that demonstrate a difference in the use of narrative techniques and in emotional focus between the texts.

For one, all the adaptations deviate from Chrétien's depiction of the lion. In his vassalic representation of the lion, Chrétien ascribes human traits to the animal. By doing so, he is able to show the emotions behind the lion's actions. He deploys different narrative techniques to anthropomorphise the lion. For one, he draws the audience's attention to its human nature by *narratorial intrusion*. Secondly, he uses human *imagery*. Symbolism and *non–verbal signifiers*, such as *gestures* and *facial expressions*, are deployed in order to give expression the lion's emotions.

None of the rewritings have followed Chrétien's human imagery. Contrary to *Yvain*, the adaptors stress the animalistic features of the lion. Although the adaptors have copied some of the narrative techniques used by Chrétien, they deploy them to 'canino–morphise' the lion. What is more, they explicitly deny the existence of any human characteristics in the lion.

Secondly, the scene of Lunete's captivity is also inherent to a difference in emotional focus. By presenting a hyperbolical argument in which he compares Yvain's suffering to Lunete's, Chrétien is appealing to the audience's compassion.

The Scandinavian translations also stress Iwein's piteous state, by repeating Chrétien argument of the 'sorest loser'. The pity that is evoked is, however, limited, since the hyperbolic comparison between the knight and the damsel is not carried all the way through.

---

[124] Friedman & Harrington (1964), xxiii.

The fact that Yvain is guilty of Laudine's charges is what makes him piteous. Both the Norse and the Swedish versions omit 'the innocence versus guilt'–part of the comparison. Because of this omission, there is no evidence of Íven's/ Ivan's maturation process, since the knight does not admit to his guilt.

The English rewriting does not evoke any feelings of sympathy or pity on Iwein's part at all. The poem does not follow Chrétien's argument and thus shows no hyperbolic treatment of Ywain's suffering.

The German poem also avoids addressing Iwein's fault in the matter of his misery. Unlike Chrétien, Hartmann does not question Iwein's knightly status. In chapter 5 it will become clear why Hartmann deviates on this point from his source. In episode VII, Laudine admits to being partly at fault for their separation. Since there is no indication of an apology on Iwein's part, and thus no sign of him having undergone a maturation process, no pity is evoked in the audience. Instead Hartmann directs the audience's pathos towards Lunet. Not Iwein, but Lunet wins the argument of having undergone the most hardship. By delaying the moment of identification, Hartmann constructs a scene that heightens the *suspense* and evokes the maximum of pathos.

Chrétien deploys *suspense* in two more scenes. In both his description of the battle between Yvain and Harpin and of the rescue of Lunete, Chrétien uses *tension* to appeal to the reader/listener's emotions. By unifying these two adventures into one consistent action, Chrétien is creating a foreboding atmosphere regarding Lunete's fate. Yvain repeatedly states that he can only help the chatelain and his family if the giant arrives early enough for the knight to defeat him.

The English poet, generally concerned with streamlining the narrative, remarkably reiterates Yvain's fourfold repetition of foreboding. *Suspense* is thus also present in *YG*.

Hartmann also copies the ominous atmosphere present in *Yvain*. What is more, he accentuates it by devising a *monologue* in which Iwein carefully weighs his options. The knight slowly comes to the realisation that he will have to choose one cause over the other.

Neither the Norse, nor the Swedish translations express any fear for Luneta's life. Both texts refrain from repeating Yvain's foreboding.

Chrétien continues to call upon emotions of fear and doubt, such as expressed by Yvain, in the rest of the scene. By employing *mirror characters*, he brings about the emotional involvement of the reader/listener. The ominous atmosphere, created earlier in the scene, is continued by the deployment of the castle's inhabitants, whose reactions on Yvain's fight with Harpin have a mirroring function. Their prayers for Yvain's life suggest a poor outcome for the knight and leave the audience expecting the worst.

Although *Ís, HI*, and *YG* also contain the focalisation of the courtiers and their prayers, their role as *mirror characters* is less explicit. The emotions behind their actions are not elaborated on. It is, however, remarkable, that the English poet, despite having streamlined most of the focalisation, does spend an extra line on describing the male courtiers' reactions in particular.

It is notable that Hartmann, who at other times in the story, follows Chrétien closely in his use of *suspense* and who may even be found to extend its use in many passages, omits the focalisation of the castle's inhabitants on the wall. Hartmann does not deploy them as mirror characters. What is also striking is that Hartmann gives his audience a less terrifying description of Harpin. In fact, Iwein refers to Harpin as a knight, who also counter addresses him in a manner reminiscent of knights. It therefore seems that Hartmann refrains from deploying *suspense* in the battle scene of *Iwein,* as to not undermine Harpin's knightly disposition.

Another instance where Chrétien makes use of *mirror characters* in order to give the emotional rendering of the events, is Lunete's rescue. As was the case with the castle inhabitants, the focalisation of this scene switches back and forth between the fight and the onlookers. This time the onlookers are a group of damsels, who lament Lunete's imminent death and pray for help. By creating *suspense*, Chrétien again conveys a feeling of forbidding.

Only Hartmann repeats the narrative technique constructed by Chrétien and, this time, he can even be said to have extended the mirroring function of the scene by returning to the damsel's focalisation an additional time.

The other rewritings confine the damsels' focalisation to one occurrence only. Since the emotions behind their prayers are not revealed, the characters do not have a mirroring function.

5   Episode VII: The Close

5.1   Reconciliation Scene

The ending of the *Yvain*–story is subject to much variation between the five texts. Whereas some adaptors have cropped this scene, others have extended it. The most obvious deviation may be found in *Iwein*. Its ending contains an additional passage which, next to Yvain's, foregrounds Laudine's emotions. However, although most critical editions of *Iwein* include this additional passage, there is as of yet no conclusive evidence that ascribes this additional passage to Hartmann's authorship. Although I will be discussing 'Handschrift' B's alternative ending in this chapter, we cannot be certain that this additional passage belongs to the original configuration of *Iwein*.

Two different versions exist regarding the end of *Iwein*. The first relates to the end of *Yvain* and the other rewritings. It is transmitted in manuscript A and describes how Iwein kneels before Laudine and asks for her mercy. It is through his submission that the reconciliation can be brought about. The second ending survives in manuscript B and narrates the opposite. After Iwein, Laudine repeats the *gesture*. She also sinks to her knees to submit to Iwein and ask for forgiveness. In this ending, the blame for the separation of the couple is shared.

Since the ending recorded in A is transmitted in most manuscripts, scholars have argued that the B–ending is either "eine andere Redaktion von des Dichters eigener Hand" ["a different redaction from the poet's own hand"], or part of "*zwei Iweine* von verschiedene Verfasser mit eigenem Zugang zu Chréstien" ["*two Iweins* from different authors with separate access to Chréstien"].[125] However, the B–ending "stimmt, wie B[enecke]

---

[125] Schröder (1997), 5. In this quotation Schröder summarises the different theories expressed by earlier scholars Henrici, Bumke and Benecke on the matter.

ausgesprochen hat, ganz zum Stil and zur geistigen Art Hartmanns"[126] ["fully corresponds, as B[enecke] has put forward, to the style and intellectual nature of Hartmann"]. This suggests that the B–ending is a different redaction, possibly a later addition, by the author himself. Moreover, the rest of Hartmann's text seems to provide different clues that are in line with the alternative B–ending, which could therefore quite possibly be Hartmann's original redaction. On multiple occasions, for instance, is Iwein's responsibility for the separation of the couple refuted in the MHG text, either by the protagonist himself or by other characters. Lunet's display of independent agency in the reconciliation scene also corresponds to the B–ending of the text, as will become clear in this chapter. This seems to indicate that Hartmann had the B–ending in mind when (re)writing the story. Moreover, the *suspense* that notably rises towards the moment of reconciliation also seems to correspond to the B–ending.

5.2 Maturation Process

Unlike its source, Hartmann deploys *suspense* to build up to the catharsis of the reconciliation scene. The cause for this *suspense* is the absence of a sense of guilt in Iwein. As we have seen earlier, Chrétien already mentions Yvain's sense of guilt in episode VI. Yvain's premature confession of guilt prepares the audience for a positive outcome for the knight. It foreshadows the reconciliation between the lovers. It is thus clear that Chrétien's Yvain goes through some kind of maturation process. In *Medieval Translations and Cultural Discourse*, Rikhardsdottir explains how the French poem "denotes a process of acknowledgement and recognition of previous errors".[127] The internal maturation that has occurred in Yvain is reflected in the final passage depicting the reconciliation between Yvain and Laudine:

---

[126] Schröder (1997), 3.
[127] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 104.

'Dame […]

Comperé aim on mal savoir

Et je le doi bien comperer.

Folie me fist demourer,

Si me rent coupable et fourfait.

Et mout grant hardement ai fait

Quant devant vous osai venir.

Mais s'oe me voles retenir.

Jammais ne vous fourferai rien.'   (6770–9)

['My Lady […] I have paid dearly for my foolishness and I am glad to have paid.

Folly caused me to stay away and I acknowledge my guilt and wrong. I've been very

bold to dare to come before you now, but if you will take me back, I'll never do you

wrong again.']

The sincere nature of Yvain's apology indicates that the knight has indeed atoned for his

errors. Having matured as a knight, he is now able to take full responsibility for their

separation.

The indications for such a maturation process are mostly absent in *Iwein*. Only at the

very end does Iwein show signs of having undergone this process. Different from the source

is "the implied feeling that his suffering is not fully justified," as Kratins explains.[128] Much

textual evidence may be found to support Kratins's statement. Hartmann allows this feeling

described by Kratins to be expressed on as much as four occasions. The first time that Iwein's

blame for 'his time of hardship' is played down, is in his conversation with Lunete when she

---

[128] Kratins (1982), 202.

is imprisoned in the Fountain chapel.[129] In *Yvain*, this conversation functions as the turning point for Yvain's conduct. The knight is after all confronted with the part he played in both his separation with Laudine and in the conviction of Lunete, and thus feels obliged to set this right. Iwein, however, does not profess his guilt. Hartmann, instead, describes part of the guilt to Lunet (459–60). The second time is after Lunet's rescue. Laudine does not recognise Iwein, who appears before her as the knight with the lion. The lady inquires after Yvain's grief, to which he replies:

> 'Ichn gewinne gemach nochn wirde frô
>
> niemer unz ûf den tac,
>
> daz ich wider gehaben mac,
>
> miner frouwen hulde.
>
> Der mangel ich âne schulde.'   (5465–70).

> ['I'll never win rest nor be happy
>
> until that day
>
> when I may regain
>
> my lady's favour.
>
> I lack that without blame.']

In these lines, Iwein quite literally states that he has lost his lady's love to no fault of his. Instead, he feels he was deprived of her love.

The third occasion marks the approach of the reconciliation scene. When Lunet rides out to find the knight with the lion in order to reconcile him with her lady, she remarks:

---

[129] See chapter 4.

‘Dâ habt ihr iuch geniet,

ein teil von iuwern schulden,

und von ihr unhulden,

von der iu diente diz lant,

und diu mich ûz hât gesant,

einer langer arbeit.’   (8028–33)

[‘You have had to put up with hardship for a long time,

it being partly your own fault,

and partly because of the displeasure of her

on whose account this land served you,

and who has sent me out.’]

At this point in the text, Hartmann is "working towards the dénouement where the responsibility for the separation of the couple and their suffering is shared."[130] However, unlike the other versions, Hartmann waits until the very last lines of the reconciliation scene to express Iwein's sense of guilt. Iwein does not seize his first opportunity to beg for forgiveness. Initially, he

viel ir ze fuozze,

und het doch beheine bet.   (8110–11)

[fell at her feet

---

130 Kratins (1982), 203.

and yet made no request.]

Although Iwein submits himself to Laudine by kneeling at her feet, it is explicitly stated that he does not make any request for forgiveness. His passive demeanour towards the lady in fact forestalls the possibility of reconciliation. As Rikhardsdottir rightly claims, "[t]he reconciliation and the successful resolution of the dilemma of Love are in fact contingent upon Yvain's penitence and promise not to violate the tenets of Love again."[131] In *Yvain*, the knight's atonement ensures appeasement. Hartmann, however, deliberately postpones Iwein's penitence. He does so in order to build up *tension* towards the ending. By repeatedly denying Iwein's part in the separation, Hartmann is keeping the suggestion of a negative outcome alive. Hartmann further taps into this foreboding, by having Lunet, in the slow disclosure of the knight with the lion's true identity, repeatedly remind the lady of her promise.

Lunet is ascribed an important part in bringing about the lover's reunion. Iwein's happiness is in her hands. With a clever ruse, she traps the lady into swearing an oath to do everything in her power to help the knight with the lion win back the favour of his lady. Chrétien uses this scene to create *tension* around the *dramatic irony* (■ *irony*) established some lines earlier. In the scene of Lunete's rescue, Yvain presents himself to Laudine as the Knight with the Lion. Laudine is thus in the dark about the Knight of the Lion's true identity. When she promises Lunete to help the Knight with the Lion win back his lady, she does not know that she is agreeing to a reunion with her former husband Yvain. The audience, however, was in on Lunete's secret all along. Hartmann also deploys these lines for building *tension*. Next to *dramatic irony*, he deploys different narrative techniques in order to bring about the audience's involvement.

---

[131] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 105.

Although *Yvain* and the other rewritings briefly mention Laudine's pledge, the oath is not further referred to. In *Iwein*, however, the oath is represented as an ominous factor that is hanging over her head. Lunet, when building towards disclosing the knight's true identity, repeatedly reminds the lady of her pledge. According to Meyer, this serves as a means "to curb Laudine's anticipated anger, when the truth is revealed to her that the Knight with the lion is Yvain, her husband".[132] Although this is also true for the ON and ME translations, in which the oath is referred to just once, it is not to the same extend as the MHG version. Only the German Laudine is reminded of her responsibility more than once. This repetition implies that Laudine might break her promise once she is told the truth.

Her subsequent tirade, when she is finally told the truth, supports this implication and adds to the audience's expectations of an unhappy ending. The anger displayed by Laudine is more evident in *Iwein* than in its source. Meyer explains how in each version of the story "Laudine's shock at the news manifests itself bodily, yet expresses different degrees of emotional intensity."[133] Where *Yvain* speaks of trembling, Hartmann describes Laudine as taking "trat vil gâhes hinter sich" (8144) ["a hasty step backwards"]. Although Meyer does not classify these *bodily reactions* (■ *non–verbal signifiers*) on the basis of their degree of intensity, I would like to take her comparison a step further and propose that the reaction of Hartmann's Laudine is more negatively charged. Trembling indicates shock, whereas Hartmann's description resembles recoiling. What is more, Laudine's reproach towards Lunet is much more serious in *Iwein*. Where the French Laudine only rebukes Lunete for playing a trick on her, the German Laudine speaks of "betrayal" on Lunet's part:

    'Hâstû mir wâr geseit,

    sô hât mich dîn karcheit

---

[132] Meyer (2011), 107.
[133] Meyer (2011), 109.

wunderlîche hin gegebn.   (8145–7)

['If what you have said is true,

then your cunning

 has strangely betrayed me.']

The lady has thus pledged an oath under false pretences, an argument that could make her judge the oath invalid. Since she refuses to offer him forgiveness, the audience is led to believe the worst. Like Lunet, the reader/listener anticipates the reconciliation with a good measure of *tension*. Indeed, it seems that Laudine wants to get out of her promise. Iwein's reluctance to take responsibility makes her believe that he has no "ahte" (8149) ["respect"] for her. However, at that moment Iwein finally steps up to the plate.

'Frouwe, ich hân missetân.
Zwâre daz riuwet mich.'   (8170–1)

['Lady, I have done wrong.
Truly, that grieves me.']

With these words Iwein finally takes the blame for wrecking their marriage. In the subsequent lines, he fully admits his guilt and confesses that he should live in a state of atonement. Instead of simply demanding forgiveness, Iwein admits he is a sinner, guilty of having trespassed against love.

As in the MHG text, the process of internal growth is less pronounced in the ME adaptation. Although Ywain admits to having made a mistake, Rikhardsdottir contends that

the English poet is focusing on an error of a different nature. She explains that "it is the mistake of going back on his word, not that of an immature misconception of his duties as a knight"[134] that matters in *YG*:

> 'Madame', he said, 'I have miswroght,
>
> And that I have ful dere boght.
>
> Grete foly I did, the soth to say,
>
> When that I past my terme–day.'   (3995–8)

> ['Madam', he said, 'I have done wrong
>
> and paid dearly for it, as I should have.
>
> Truly, it was great folly
>
> to stay away past my term day']

Although Ywain acknowledges his foolishness for overstepping the term, he does not acknowledge his "corpable et forfet" ["guilt and wrong"]. Going against his word is the true cause of his offence against the lady, rather than having forsaken her. Ywain is more concerned with his social obligations of 'trowthe', of keeping one's word. The narrative's concern with "trowthe" stressed in the prologue supports this statement.[135] By making Ywain's apology contingent upon social obligation instead of personal obligation, the English poem is emotionally more distant.

---

[134] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 105.
[135] See 'Prologue' Chapter 3.

5.3   Laudine's 'Kniefall': hierarchical love versus equal love

The *suspense* deployed by Hartmann builds towards the moment of catharsis; Laudine's 'Kniefall'. As has been explained above, in the B-ending it is not Iwein alone that is held accountable for their separation. When it becomes evident that Iwein is prepared to admit his fault in the matter, Laudine follows his example. This submissive *gesture* is partly a genuine response to Iwein's apology, and partly a compulsive response. Since the knight has finally shown his lady the respect she deserves, Laudine is able to throw her anger aside. She allows herself to rekindle her love for him. However, Laudine is also compelled to accept Iwein, since going against her oath would mean perjury; a perjury similar to the one committed by Iwein when he overstayed his absence and which was so despised by her. Unlike Yvain, the lady is true to her word. Laudine thus succeeds where Yvain once failed to honour his promise. Not only has she received the befitting respect from her husband, but she also manages to stay true to her word. Her 'feminine pride' is thus re–established. This feminine pride is however not a sign of courtly love. It serves as a shift in focus from the male to the female characters.

   After having pardoned Iwein for his offence, Laudine confesses regret for the suffering she had made him undergo.

   Dô sprach diu künegîn:

   'Her Îwein, lieber here mîn,

   tuot gnædeclîche an mir.

   Grôzzen chumber habt ir

   von mînen schulden erliten.

   Des wil ich iuch dirch got biten,

   daz ir ruochet mir vergebn,

wander mich, unz ich hân daz lebn,

von herzen iemer riuwen muoz.' (8189–97).

[Then the queen said:

'Sir Iwein, my dear lord,

act graciously by me.

You have suffered great troubles,

for which I was responsible.

Therefore I will request you by God

to deign to forgive me,

for those troubles, as long as I live,

must ever grieve me to the heart']

Hartmann, by adding this scene, grants the audience a taste of Laudine's suffering, which is absent in any of the other texts. The submissive connotation of her 'Kniefall' suggests that she is no longer the exalted lady present in *Yvain*, but the 'Ehefrau' Laudine. However, this is a deliberate change on Hartmann's part. By altering the ending, Hartmann thus stresses that it is a combination of the faults of both lovers that caused their suffering. He lets Laudine climb down the pedestal in order to convey an image of equal love. Hartmann thereby does not put out an ideological notion of love, presented by Chrétien as "an abstract philosophical concept",[136] but a realistic notion of love, reflective of social and marital duties. Hartmann makes sure that "there is to be forgiveness on both sides, as the equality of partners in marriage demands, and not the pardon handed down to her sinful lover by his revered *haute dame*."[137] Laudine's grant *gesture* thus alters the image of love given by Chrétien.

---

[136] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 108.
[137] Kratins (1982), 203.

The notion of courtly love is also absent in *YG*. Hunt argues that "Ywain is made less abjectly submissive before his lady".[138] Busby also argues that there is a "reduction in the submissiveness of men to women".[139] The anger expressed by Alundyne is less violent and only of short notice. The lady is quick to make peace. This may be due to the fact that, where all the other poets deploy the reconciliation scene as the climax of the story, the climactic peak in the English rewriting is formed by the battle between Ywain and Gawain. The lover's reunion is therefore much abbreviated. What is more, there are few emotions involved, since, unlike the other texts, Ywain's wrongdoing is a technical matter instead of an emotional one. In contrast to the other stories, the English poet does make sure to bring the story to an end for all the characters involved. The quick pace in which he concludes their stories, however, resembles a fairy tale ending. Although all the significant characters, even the lion, are ascribed a happy ending, they do not signify this happiness themselves.

The same is true for the Norse translation. Although it is in no way evident from Laudine's described behaviour, the poet relates how she wished to establish "óspilliligan frið ok undarligan fagnað" (99) ["inviolable peace and wondrous happiness"]. These narratives therefore remain emotionally superficial.

5.4 Lunete's Independent Agency

The power displayed by the French Laudine in her position as the exalted lady, is absent in her German counterpart. Instead, the independent agency demonstrated by Laudine in *Yvain,* is ascribed to Lunet in the MHG adaptation. When Laudine, for example, is prompted to bring about reconciliation between the knight and his lady, is it not her, but her maid that is portrayed as holding the reins. Where the French Laudine takes on the responsibility for this

---

[138] Pearsall (1977), 146.
[139] Busby (1987), 603.

task, the German lady asks Lunet for advice on how she should bring about the reconciliation: " 'Nû bewîse mich' " (8119) [" 'Now, instruct me' "]. Moreover, Lunete makes her lady swear an oath and, when the need is dire, prompts the Lady to keep to her oath. It is thus Lunet who ultimately is responsible for the reconciliation. Unlike Chrétien, who makes no mention of Lunete's involvement, Hartmann makes sure to remind his audience about the girl's decisive role in the reunion:

> Hie was frou Lûnet mite
>
> nâch ir diensthaftem site
>
> Diu het mir ir sinne
>
> ir beider unminne,
>
> brâht zallem guote.   (8217–21)

> [Lady Lunet was present there
>
> willing to serve them, as was her custom.
>
> By her good sense she had
>
> brought the disaffection between those two
>
> to an entirely favourable conclusion.]

The Old Swedish translation also narrates how Luneta appeases the two lovers. The Norse adaptation, however, relates the opposite. Not Luneta, but Íven brings his endeavours to a good end. Manuscript A even relates that he laboured for a long time to bring about this reconciliation.[140]

Furthermore, throughout the story Lunete appears as an advise–giver, both of Yvain

---

[140] Meyer (2011), 110.

and her lady. Because of her role as counsellor, Meyer has suggested that there is a "potentially 'masculine' meaning" to her, since she portrays knightly capacities.[141] A term earlier used by Hartmann to describe the serving girl seems to support this claim. Lunet is introduced to the audience as "eine rîterlîche magt" (1490) [a knightly maiden], when she saves Iwein from Ascalon's raving courtiers. This male epithet ascribed to Lunet is again reflected in the ending of *Iwein*.

After having reconciled Yvain and her lady, she is endorsed with much (political) power:

> Bürge, lant, rîche stet
>
> machet er [Iwein] ir undertân.   (8228–9)

> [Castles, land, and rich towns
>
> he [Iwein] made subject to her.]

Moreover, she is related to have married an influential husband:

> Sî ne wart mit hîrât niht betrogen.
>
> Einem rîchen herzogen,
>
> schœnem, jungen, manhaft,
>
> volchomen gar an rîterschaft,
>
> wîse and gewære,
>
> milte und êrbære.   (8232–6)

> [She was not deceived in marriage.
>
> To a rich duke,
>
> handsome, young, valorous,

---

[141] Meyer (2007), 662.

entirely perfect in chivalry,

wise and true,

generous and honourable.]

Where the French source merely states that the girl lacked for nothing, Hartmann ascribes Lunete more specific joys. Not only is she endorsed with political power — she receives castles, land, and rich towns — but the lady in waiting also marries a duke. By focusing on the girl's new position as landowner and duchess, Hartmann seems to suggest that Lunet has climbed the social ladder. Neither the Swedish adaptation, nor the Norse relate of this possible social upgrade. The latter, in fact, does not mention Hartmann's heroine again.

Lunet's power and possible social upgrade are only hinted at in the ME text. She is described as having mastery over all things, however, "after the lord and lady" (4018). Instead the poet restores Ywain to his lordship as ruler over the lands. "The cultural anxiety" that is generated by the notion of "an autonomous and unattached widow in possession of land and power", was earlier in the story solved by quickly wedding Alundyne off to the slayer of her former husband."[142] The hierarchical balance is now again in need of re–establishment. In contrast to the Hartmann, whose ending lines focus on Lunet's power to bring peace to the kingdom, the English poet spends his last words on Ywain.

5.5   Conclusion Episode VII

When it comes to the closing episode, it is mainly the German rewriting that deviates from the source. A difference in emotional focus in Hartmann's reconciliation scene brings about deviating interpretations of the story.

For one, Iwein's maturation process is less apparent in the MHG narrative. He does

---

[142] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 108.

not reflect the sense of guilt and penitence that is present in Yvain. The absence of this maturation process in Iwein results in *suspense* about whether the lover's reunion will be brought about. It moreover, results into a less idealised, but more realistic view on love. Instead of the courtly love propagated by Chrétien, Hartmann emphasises equal love, which is in accordance with marriage. Hartmann is illustrating a feminine ideal, quite different from that of the courtly Lady. Kratins explains the different interpretations of love as follows:

> For Chrétien's heroine the axiomatic superiority of the woman in courtly love relationships is central to her characterisation; for Hartmann's heroine it is the dignified equality and emotional reasonableness of a noble wife with respect to her husband that explains her conception.[143]

Hartmann thus creates a framework of ideal married love, in which both parties ask for forgiveness.

The ME rewriting also shows little interest in *fine amour*. Ywain is not so much concerned with his personal obligation to Lunet as with his social obligations as a knight. For this reason, there is also no evidence of a maturation process in Ywain. The characters are flat and display no or little emotions. This is repeated by Rikhardsdottir, who explains that "[b]y removing the internal complexities of the characters the audience's attention is diverted from the elaboration of individualistic psychological insight to generalised traits of gendered and socially prescribed behavioural patterns."[144] The lack of emotional involvement of the characters is reminiscent of a fairy tale.

Another remarkable deviation in the German closing scene is the focus on the female characters of the story. For one, Lunet's independent agency is emphasised. Hartmann

---

[143] Kratins (1982), 205.
[144] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 106.

stresses her role as counsellor in the story and ascribes to her the political power and a high social status. Another way for Hartmann to ask attention for the female characters is by illustrating Laudine's suffering, next to Yvain's. He is able to do so by ascribing to her a grand *gesture*, her 'Kniefall'. The German adaptation is the only rewriting that grants the audience a glimpse of Laudine's emotions. Because of this focalisation, the reader/listener gets to see two different sides of the lady. Next to the image of the cold exalted ruler, Laudine acts in the loving spirit of the 'Ehefrau'. Hartmann thus spends many lines on the female characters of the story. The English poet, on the other hand, focuses on the male characters.

6 Conclusion

6.1 Main findings

In conclusion, this study shows how narrative techniques help bring about the emotional involvement of the contemporary audience in the texts of the *Yvain*–corpus. These techniques assisted Chrétien and his adaptors in giving expression to the major emotions in the story. The techniques used for this purpose differ between texts. However, the most frequently deployed are: *suspense*, *mirror characters/passages*, *imagery* and *non–verbal signifiers*.

Although at first sight, the adaptations show much fidelity to their source, the results from this thesis show that there are many deviations in the narrative configuration of each version. For one, some of the techniques deployed by Chrétien de Troyes have been ignored. They have been replaced by other techniques or have been left out altogether. Although some techniques do correspond, they are often deployed to convey a different emotional focus. Only rarely do the adaptors follow the narrative techniques deployed in the French source as well as the emotions emphasised by these techniques. The results from this comparative study have already been summarised in a conclusion at the end of each chapter. In this final conclusion, the correspondences and deviations in narrative techniques (and consequently in emotional focus) found in each of the three episodes will be connected. The following patterns can be discerned.

For one, although both Chrétien and the adaptors introduce their works with prologues, each deploys different techniques in it to establish an author–audience relationship. The adaptors use traditional *topoi* in taking steps to bring about the audience's involvement. Their main concern is to claim *auctoritas*. Chrétien, however, is able to link the audience to his main theme, by using narratorial intrusion.

Secondly, *non–verbal signifiers*, such as *gestures* and *facial expressions* often deviate in the adaptations to reflect different *imagery*. The human imagery deployed by Chrétien in the description of the lion and the herdsman, for instance, is replaced by animal imagery in the adaptations. The bodily reactions of the different Laudines also deviate.

Lastly, the use of *mirror characters and/or passages* seems specific for Chrétien. This narrative technique does not always seem to have been recognised by the adaptors. Such characters/passage are often left out. When they are repeated, the motivation behind the feelings of the characters in such passages is not given. The mirroring function is thus lost.

Thus far, I have given the main findings for all the texts of the *Yvain*–corpus. I will now present the patterns in the use of narrative techniques and the emotional focus evoked by them, discerned for each text individually.

Yvain

Characteristic for Chrétien is his focus on the psychology underlying the story of *Yvain*. His focus is not so much on the storyline itself, but on the characters' emotions, which function as a driving force in his story. That the emotional involvement of his audience is of importance to the French poet becomes evident from his long list of narrative techniques designed to emphasise certain emotions.

For one, as Chrétien states in his prologue, Love is the main theme of his story. It is thus clear from the start that Chrétien's story will revolve around a rather emotional topic. Through *narratorial intrusion*, Chrétien is able to debate the contemporary manifestation of love and ask his audience for their thoughts and feelings on the subject.

Secondly, Chrétien extends the prologue with Calogrenant's tale about the adventure of the Fountain. In this second narrative layer, Chrétien deploys the traditional *audite–topos* in a rather unusual way. Next to the normal request for attention, Calogrenant asks the

listeners to 'lend them their hearts'. Calogrenant is thus deployed to stress the importance of the listeners' emotional experience of the story in particular.

Furthermore, Chrétien seems to prefer the deployment of direct speech, such as *dialogues* and *monologues*, to authorial description. This gives him more opportunity to show the emotions behind a character's actions. Examples of this are the emotional altercation between Kay, Calogrenant and the Queen and the *hyperbolical* argument of 'the sorest loser' between Yvain and Lunete. Chrétien even psychologises the lion's behaviour. He ascribes the lion human emotions, which are given emphasis by *narratorial intrusion, non–verbal signifiers* and *imagery.*

Finally, a much deployed narrative technique that serves Chrétien's emotional agenda is the *mirror character*. These *mirror characters* are deployed by Chrétien to reflect emotions onto the audience. Such is the case with Guinevere, who expresses anger with Keu. Keu himself is assigned the role of *false mirror character* in this scene. His emotions regarding Calogrenant, and later Yvain, do not serve as an example to the audience, but as a *foil.* Examples of marginal characters in *Yvain* whose reactions do serve as exemplary are the courtiers at the chatelain's castle and the group of damsels present at Lunete's trial. The mirroring function of the text is moreover supported by *question passages*. Such passages are deployed by the narrator to ask for the reader's thoughts and emotions regarding a certain character, as is the case with Keu, or regarding a moral issue, as is the case with the nature of the Wild Herdsman.

The German and Swedish translators can be said to show the most fidelity to their source. They have adapted many of the techniques deployed by Chrétien, although not always with the same purpose in mind.

Iwein

Hartmann in particular seems to have had a preference for certain techniques, which he not only follows faithfully, but whose use he at times also extends. Such is the case with *suspense*. He exploits the suspense deployed by Chrétien to a more full extend in three occasions: in 'the argument of the sorest loser', in (and towards) the rescue of Lunet and in the reconciliation scene. Hartmann also shows a preference for the use of *gestures* to emphasise certain emotions. Of these added gestures, Laudine's 'Kniefall' is the most significant in the redirection of the emotional focus. At other times, however, he completely ignores his source. Unlike the Norse and English adaptors, who seem to consistently ignore some of Chrétien's narrative techniques, Hartmann does not follow a clear line.

Whether a technique is adapted or not, seems to mainly depend on whether they support the poem's main focus. For Hartmann, this is the image of knighthood. In *Yvain*, Chrétien seems to be playing around with this image. Hartmann, however, does not question this image. For this reason, he ameliorates the disposition of some of the characters, focusing on their knightly qualities instead of their flaws. Such is the case with Key. Hartmann has retouched Key's behaviour. He tones down the seneschal's wicked nature. There is no sign of Kay's rude *sarcasm*. Instead, Key's 'rhetorical courtliness' almost makes him exemplary. He thus no longer functions as a *foil* against Yvain, but, like the other knights of the Round Table, he serves as a paragon of chivalry. Consequently, the queen's function as a *mirror character*, expressing her dissatisfaction with Key, is ignored.

Similarly, Kalogreant's courtliness is exaggerated by Hartmann. When the Queen joins the knights' company to listen to the knight's tale, Kalogreant does not simply stand up, but performs another *gesture*. He is also described as bowing to the Queen in order to welcome her courteously.

Even the Herdsman, the ugliest creature ever beheld, is ascribed the title 'herre' ['sir'], since he too is a fighter, defending people from the wild animals, which he holds in check. In order to stress the herdsman's benevolent nature, Hartmann has therefore followed Chrétien's *question passage* and has deployed similar human *imagery*.

Likewise, Harpin is also given a more favourable description. Not only is Hartmann's description of the giant less evil, he moreover ascribes him the title 'rîter'. In order to stay true to this epithet, the courtiers' focalisations, in which they are shown to express feelings of fear for the giant, are omitted.

What is more, the perfect image of Iwein, as a knight and the hero of the story, remains intact. Unlike Chrétien, Hartmann does not question Iwein's knightly status. Iwein does not profess guilt for his failed marriage until the end, and even then, Laudine shares the guilt. It thus seems that Hartmann prefers stressing Iwein's knightly status over his human fallibility. Since *Iwein*'s 'knightly' characters fulfil an exemplary function, Hartmann's representation of these characters is idealistic rather than realistic.

Despite Hartmann's focus on knighthood, there is, unlike the English rewriting, also room for an elaboration on the female characters. Next to the males' motivations, Hartmann also provides the reader/listener with the motivations behind the female's actions. Such is the case in the closing scene. Whereas all the other versions only show Yvain's side of the story, Hartmann also focalises Laudine's suffering. Her 'Kniefall' is unique for the *Yvain*–corpus.

Moreover, the image of knighthood is not only reserved for the male characters. Lunet, the heroine of Hartmann's story, is also favoured with this title. She is introduced to the reader/listener as a 'knightly maiden'. This epithet is later emphasised by Hartmann, by underlining the girl's independent agency, ascribing to her political power and the role of counsellor in the story. That Lunet plays an important part in Hartmann's story, becomes clear

from the *hyperbole* employed by Hartmann in favour of the girl in the argument of 'the sorest loser'.

Hærra Ivan

Like *Iwein*, *HI* is a little bit of a hotchpotch. Instead of introducing the audience to one main theme, the Swedish text speaks of many motifs. This may be due to the fact that the poem had at least two sources. At times the poem can be said to closely follow Chrétien, other times it seems to take example from *Ís*. The Swedish poet has followed most of Chrétien's narrative techniques, although they do not always invoke (the same) emotions. None of the scenes are omitted and only a few are streamlined. The, at times, lack of 'emotional investment',[145] however, corresponds to the Norse translation. Like *Iwein*, *HI* does not follow one clear line concerning the emotional focus of the poem and the narrative techniques it deploys.

Instead of an emotional focus, the text exhibits a clear religious focus. Some of the narrative techniques are deployed to underline this focus. In the very first lines of the poem, the poet deploys the 'prayer prologue' formula by invoking the Holy trinity. Moreover, when it comes to choosing between rescuing Gavian's family from a giant and rescuing Luneta from the pyre, Ivan expresses little emotions. Instead of expressing despair, Ivan puts his trust in providential guidance as is expressed in a *monologue.*

The Norse and English rewritings, have ignored many of the narrative techniques deployed by Chrétien. Notable is the omission in both texts of *authorial comments*, *imagery* and *mirror characters/passages*. The emotional involvement of the audience therefore seems to have been a less important objective of these texts.

---

[145] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 92.

Ywain and Gawain

The English poet is mostly concerned with the storyline itself. The poem's main focus is on the actions and events of the story. For this reason, many of Chrétien's intricately devised narrative techniques have been ignored by the English poet.

The streamlined nature of *YG* also becomes apparent from the omission or reduction of passages that reflect intense emotions. As Friedman and Harrington have put it:

> [t]he bias of the English poet against elaborate dissections of the human heart results in the excision of emotionally charged passages. […] What goes on in the minds of characters as they experience fear or grief or other emotions does not seem of interest to the English poet.[146]

As a consequence, the characters in *YG* are emotionally superficial. They do not show any signs of internal dilemmas or character development. This becomes evident from the *Ywain*–poet's representation of the altercation between Keu, Calogrenant and the Queen. The English poet has toned down the sharp bickering among them. There is no sign of Kay's rude *sarcasm* or of the Queen's tirade against it. Their functions as *mirror character* and *foil* have thus been ignored.

The poet's emotional disinterest is also reflected in the *imagery* deployed in the representation of the lion. Instead of ascribing the lion human emotions, the *Ywain*–poet draws the attention to the lion's animalistic features.

Another example that shows the elimination of Chrétien's psychologising is the argument of 'the sorest loser'. *YG* deploys no hyperbolic treatment of Ywain's suffering. Any

---

[146] Friedman and Harrington (1964), xviii.

signs of the knight having undergone a maturation process are therefore absent. The scene thus does not evoke any feelings of compassion in the audience.

Likewise, Lunet's trial, a highly emotional scene in Chrétien, does not evoke compassion. The *Ywain*–poet has curtailed the scene in which the group of damsels at Lunet's trial lament her fate. The ladies lose their mirroring function, as the motivation behind their lament, the particularisation of their obligations to her, is omitted. Finally, the lack of emotional involvement of the characters in the reconciliation scene —Ywain is less submissive and Alundyne's anger is toned down — and the focus on rounding off the story for all the characters involved, resemble a fairy tale ending.

As is the case with *Iwein*, the adaptation or omission of narrative techniques in *YG* seems to be in the service of highlighting a specific focus. From the very outset, the audience is presented a tale of "doghtines" ["bravery"] and of "dedes of arms". The poem does not refer to Chrétien's emotional love–theme. Instead, it discusses the importance of 'trowth' between men. As the altered title of the work also indicates, this theme suggest that the friendship, the 'trowth' between Ywain and Gawain, is the main focus of the poem. With this, the English poet deviates from Chrétien's *leitmotiv*. The theme of 'bromance', supported by a focus on bravery and fighting, indicates that the English audience mainly consisted of males.

What is more, it is striking that the English poet, who, generally, is concerned with streamlining the narrative, does repeat Chrétien's deployment of *mirror characters* for the battle between Ywain and Harpin. By giving a separate focalisation of the male inhabitants of the castle from the female, the English poet uses the deployment of this narrative technique as an opportunity to place the male spectator in the foreground.

Finally, there is little left of Yvain's submissiveness towards Laudine as portrayed by Chrétien. Moreover, Alundyne takes on a less exalted position, since she shows less resistance in reuniting with Ywain. For these reasons, the reconciliation scene seems to have been

redirected to restore the natural hierarchical gender roles of a fourteenth–century male–oriented society.

Ívens saga

 Like the English text, the Norse story is emotionally distant. Where *Yvain* is known for its elaborate descriptions, psychological analysis and authorial commentary, *Ís* is characterised by its streamlined storyline, flat characters and depersonalisation of the narrative voice. Almost no 'emotional investment' has gone into the translation of *Ís*. Instead, the poet focuses on the adventures of Íven.

This becomes evident from the fact that the thematic conceptualisation of the story is altered. The prologue does not repeat the image of personified Love. No link to the contemporary audience is made. The prologue's motivation on the romance's *leitmotiv* is thus omitted. What is more, with the elimination of the *narratorial intrusion*, deployed to bring about the author–audience relationship, the narrative voice is depersonalised.

Like *Yvain*, *Ís* contains an *audite–topos* carried out by Kalebrant. However, whereas Calogrenant stresses the importance of the heart's involvement when interpreting his story, Kalebrant underlines the usefulness of the mind.

Moreover, the description of the lion is also emotionally distant. Like the English lion, the Norse animal shows canine *imagery*, instead of human *imagery*.

The Norse poet also replaces direct speech with an indirect narrative mode. *Mono–and–dialogues*, such as the emotional altercation between Kæi, Kalebrant and the Queen, are omitted. Instead of the queen expressing judgement on Kæye's disposition, the judgement is passed by the narrator in a curtailed description.

What is more, the Norse translator places the eventful above the emotional. Like the English adaptation, the focus thus shifts from the psychology behind the story to the actions

of the story. The philosophical subtext is eliminated and the narrative pace is increased. Such is the case in the scene of Lunet's rescue. The damsels' prayers are only mentioned once, thereby loosing their mirroring function for the audience.

6.2   Additional findings

Former studies that discussed the narrative techniques of Chrétien de Troyes's works and his adaptations have had the tendency to draw a comparison based on the judgement of the literary quality of the works. However, these rewritings should not be treated as mere translations, but as independent works, separated by time and space. The difference in the deployment of narrative techniques and in the emotional focus which these techniques may or may not put forward, can neither be explained by translation errors, nor by errors in interpretations. With this thesis, I therefore hope to show that any deviations in narrative techniques, which are deployed to bring about the emotional involvement of the audience in the story, are due to deliberate authorial choices. Instead of the author's literary competence, this comparative investigation therefore tells us something about the author's predilections.

The authors' predilections, in turn, can tell us something about the taste of the audiences these authors were writing for. The patterns in correspondences and deviations for the individual texts can, in fact, be explained by these predilections. Emotion researchers now generally agree that emotions are evoked when some personal interest is at stake. If this personal stake is not present in the narrative, the reader/listener is less likely to like the story and to react emotionally. To be able to bring about the audience's emotional engagement with the text, it is therefore important for the author to know his audience well. Since in medieval times people belonged to a social class system, it is likely that author and audience belonged to the same social circle and therefore shared emotional associations. Chrétien, for instance, is known to have been a clerk/poet at court. He must therefore have been aware of the audience

he was writing for and knew the social particulars of this audience well. It seems unlikely that he would appeal to certain emotions, unless he knew for certain that they were shared by the circle he was writing for. He must have been familiar with the expectations of his intended audience. Therefore I must follow Rosenwein in believing that "every document and text that we have (from the Middle Ages) reveals social practice. If emotions figure in those documents (and even if they do not) we have the right to ask what emotional structures are revealed by them".[147] The results of this study also seem to reveal the emotional structures of the audiences involved. The predilections that this study reveals can be used for drawing suggestive conclusions on the audiences of the texts. Since this evidence does not consist of irrefutable proof, we should, when reconstructing the contemporary audience, speak instead of the 'implied audience'. "The 'implied audience' is a construct, and is distinct from the real reader."[148]

Yvain and its implied audience

In *Yvain*, Chrétien deploys many narrative techniques that appeal to the audience's emotions. This seems to suggest that Chrétien's audience belonged to a circle that valued and enjoyed the emotional experience of a story. Chrétien's psychologising, reflects the emotional concerns of *Yvain*'s audience. This suggests that his audience was 'emotionally sophisticated', which explains why it would appreciate a story that is motivated by the emotions and psychology of the human nature.

Iwein and its implied audience

Hartmann does not refrain from bringing about an emotional involvement, nor is it his main focus. The implied audience can thus be said to be concerned with emotions, but does not seem to be as emotionally sophisticated as the audience of *Yvain*.

---

[147] Rosenwein (2001), 233.
[148] Rimmon–Kenan (2002), 88.

Hartmann's focus on knighthood might be attributed to the fact that the author was a knight himself. At least, from his prologues we learn that Hartmann identifies himself as a 'ritter' and a 'dienstman' serving the house of Aue. This, supported by the fact that the author is linked with the family of the dukes of Zähringen, suggests that Hartmann moved in (semi–) aristocratic circles.[149] However, apart from the author's predilections, the work's focus on knighthood may also reflect upon the predilections of the audience. After all, the popularity of Hartmann's work is attested by the large number of manuscripts in which it has survived. As W. H. Jackson explains,

> the spread of Arthurian literature in the German empire was part of a broader reception and appropriation of aristocratic culture […] The values of chivalry and courtliness thus became major factors in the cultural identity of the upper levels of German society.[150]

The image of knighthood thus belonged to the cultural identity of the German upper class.

Furthermore, Hartmann's focus on both the male and female characters suggests that contemporary German society recognised some level of equality between men and women. This suggestion is supported by Hartmann's de–emphasis of courtly love. Instead of the French *fine amour*, Hartmann propagates equal love, as is in accordance with the nature of marriage. He does so by adding a passage to the closing scene in which Laudine also begs for forgiveness. Cyril Edwards notes that "it is conceivable that, what has been considered as a later reworking by Hartmann, serves as a response to female readership or even female patronage."[151]

---

[149] Edwards (2007), ix.
[150] Jackson (2000), 280.
[151] Edwards (2007), xxv.

Hærra Ivan and its implied audience

Like *Ís*, the Swedish translation of the French poem was assigned by royalty. The work's royal patron implies, as is the case for *Ís*, an aristocratic audience. In fact, the many parallels between the two texts suggest that *HI* was translated for the same purpose as its Norwegian counterpart: to educate the Swedish court on chivalry and the feudal system.[152] Whereas the Swedish poet has adapted many of Chrétien's narrative techniques, the poem does not show the same 'emotional investment' as *Yvain*. Like *Iwein*'s implied audience, *HI*'s does not seem to have been as emotionally sophisticated as the audience of *Yvain*. However, unlike the English and Norse, the Swedish implied audience does not seem to have been completely unconcerned with emotions. What can be discerned is a religious concern. This interest, however, may have been author-driven.

Ywain and Gawain and its implied audience

The English poet seems to deliberately avoid most of the narrative techniques used by Chrétien to underline certain emotions. Its implied audience can therefore be said to have had little concern for emotions. The adaptor, however, does repeat Chrétien's narrative techniques to put emphasis on a different aspect. The poem reveals a focus on fighting and male friendship. Busby believes many of the poem's alterations to be the result of a difference in gender–orientation of the English contemporary audience. He notes that "there is a general switch of attention from women to men"[153] in the English poem. Like Busby, Rikhardsdottir attributes this switch "to the conservative and hierarchical structures of a male–oriented society" – in terms of "the societal structures portrayed within the Middle English romances"

---

[152] Layher (2011), 137.
[153] Busby (1987), 603.

in general, which are reflected in and dependent on "the intended reading public of the text" in particular.[154] *YG*'s implied audience can thus be said to be a male–oriented audience.

<u>*Ívens saga* and its implied audience</u>

Like the audience of *YG*, the Norse implied audience also seems to have had little concern for emotions in medieval literature. The lack of emotional motivation underlying the adventures of Íven and the overall streamlining of the story, suggest that the Norse audience was not familiar with the courtly ideals, refinement of manners and emotional and philosophical subtleties of the French court, which are displayed in *Yvain*. Instead, the reader/listener can be said to have been more interested in the action and events of the story; the storyline itself.

It should be borne in mind, however, that the Old Norse translation has only been preserved in Icelandic manuscripts. Since, in theory, some of the alterations and adjustments can also be attributed to Icelandic scribes[155], suggestions on the implied Norse audience are arguable. Rikhardsdottir, however, has observed correspondences to these modifications in other texts belonging to the same period.[156] The pattern pointed out by her suggests that the alterations for *Ís* are, in fact, inherent to the predilections of the Norwegian audience of that time.

While the alterations in the German and English versions lead to very specific conclusions about the possible predilections of the implied audiences of these texts, this is not the case for the Norse and Swedish translations. The cultural transformation of these texts display a more complex pattern. In the case of the Norse translation, this may be attributed to the fact that the

---

[154] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 108.
[155] See: Kalinke, Marianne E., *King Arthur North–by–Northwest. The 'matière de Bretagne' in Old Norse–Icelandic Romances*. Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 37. Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Boghandel, 1981.
[156] Rikhardsdottir (2012), 93.

text possibly also contains Icelandic cultural influences, added by Icelandic scribes. For the Swedish text, however, this remains unclear.

Although not all of the results from this comparative study add to our immediate knowledge of the emotional involvement of the contemporary audiences of the *Yvain*–stories, these findings may be of use to later studies. The gathering of more data can result in more valid conclusions. Having now spent some time with these texts, it has become clear to me that there is still much ground to be won in this area of research. Further research could, for instance, zoom in on the deployment of one specific narrative technique in the different texts. *Non–verbal signifiers* in particular deserve to be investigated as they remain, up until now, mainly unexplored. As this study shows, this kind of *imagery* can be used to reveal a text's emotional focus. The examination of emotions in more medieval narratives in general will help the suggestions made in this thesis develop into more steadfast interpretations.

7 Bibliography

Primary sources

Aelred of Rievaulx, *Spiritual Friendship*. transl. by M.F. Williams. Scranton: Univ. of Scranton Press, 1994.

Anonymous*, Ywain and Gawain*, ed. by Mary Flowers Braswell, Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan Univ., 1995.

Anonymous, *Ywain and Gawain,* "*Harken To Me" Middle English Romances in Translation,* ed. by George W. Tuma, and Dinah Hazell. Hosted by the English Department, San Francisco State University: 08/23/09. Consulted on: 02/12/12. < http://www.sfsu.edu/~medieval/romances/ywain_gawain_rev.html >

Anonymous, *Hærra Ivan*, ed. and transl. by Marianne E. Kalinke. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, *Arthurian Archives V: Norse Romance III*, 1999.

Anonymous, *Ívens saga*, ed. and transl. by Marianne E. Kalinke. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, *Arthurian Archives IV: Norse Romance II*, 1999.

Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. and transl. by R.P.H. Green. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Chrétien de Troyes, *Arthurian Romances: The Knight with the Lion (Yvain),* ed. and transl. by William W. Kibler. London: Penguin Books, 1991.

Chrétien de Troyes, *Le Chevalier au Lion ou Le Roman d' Yvain*, ed. and transl. by David F. Hult. Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1994.

Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova*, ed. and transl. by Margaret F. Nims. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1967.

Hartmann von Aue, *Iwein,* ed. and transl. by Cyril Edwards. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, *Arthurian Archives: German Romance III,* 2007.

Secondary sources

Abrams, M.H., *A Glossary of Literary Terms.* Boston: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 2005.

Aussems, Mark, "Spiegelpersonages in Chrétiens Le Chevalier de la Charrette". *Madoc*: 21.2 (2007), pp. 23–31.

Barnes, Geraldine, "The Lion–Legend in Old Norse Romance" in: *Die Romane von dem Ritter mit dem Löwen*, ed. by Xenja von Ertzdorff. Amsterdam/ Atlanta: Rodopi, 1994.

Blake, Norman (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Vol. II*, Cambridge: C. U.P., 1992.

Brandsma, Frank, "Spiegelpersonages", in: *Hoort Wonder! Opstellen voor W.P. Gerritsen bij zijn emeritaat*, ed. by Bart Besamusca, Frank Brandsma and Dieuwke van der Poel. Hilversum: Verloren, 2000.

———."Luisteren naar de Spiegel", in: *Maar er is meer. Avontuurlijk lezen in de Epiek van de Lage Landen*, ed. by Remco Sleiderink, Veerle Uyttersprot en Bart Besamusca. Davidfonds: Amsterdam U.P., 2005.

———."Mirror Characters", in: *Courtly Arts and the Art of Courtliness*, ed. by Keith Busby and Christopher Kleinhenz. D.S. Brewer: Cambridge, 2006.

Brown, A. C. L. *Iwain: a Study in the Origins of Arthurian Romance*. Boston: Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature VIII, 1903.

Burrow, J.A., *Gestures and Looks in Medieval Narrative*. Cambridge: C.U.P., 2002.

———. *Medieval Writers and their Works*. New York: O.U.P, 2008.

Busby, Keith, "Chrétien de Troyes English'd". *Neophilologus*: 71.4 (1987), pp. 596– 613.

———."The Manuscripts of Chrétien's Romances", in*: A Companion to Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy and Joan Tasker Grimbert. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer,

2005.

Busby, Keith, Terry Nixon, Alison Stones and Lori Walters, *Les Manuscrits de Chrétien de Troyes, Tome I*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: GA, 1993.

Corbett, Edward P.J., *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York: O.U.P., 1971.

Cuddon, J. A., *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. London: Penguin Books, 1991.

Friedman, Albert B. and Norman T. Harrington (eds.), *Ywain and Gawain*. London/New York/Toronto: O.U.P., 1964.

Frijda, Nico H., "De structuur van emoties", in: *Emoties in de Middeleeuwen*, ed. by R.E.V. Stuip and C. Vellekoop. Verloren: Hilversum, 1998.

Garrison, Mary. "The study of emotions in early medieval history: some starting points". *Early Medieval Europe*: 10.2 (2001), pp. 243–50.

Gordon, Robert M., *The Structure of Emotions*. Cambridge: C. U. P., 1987.

Gowans, Linda, *Cei and the Arthurian Legend*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1988.

Green, D.H., "Irony and Medieval Romance", in: *Arthurian Romance: Seven Essays*, ed. by D.D.R. Owen. Edinburgh/ London: Scottish Academic Press, 1970.

Grisby, John L., "Narrative Voices in Chrétien de Troyes — A Prolegomenon to Dissection". *Romance Philology:* 32.3 (1979), pp. 261–73.

Harris, Julian, "The Role of the Lion in Chrétien de Troyes' *Yvain"*. *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association of America:* 64 (1949), pp. 1143–63.

Hasty, Will, *Adventures in Interpretation: The works of Hartmann von Aue and their Critical Reception*. Columbia: Camden House, 1996.

Hunt, Tony, "The Rhetorical Background to the Arthurian Prologue", in: *Arthurian Romance: Seven Essays*, ed. by D.D.R. Owen. Edinburgh/ London: Scottish Academic Press, 1970, pp. 1 23.

Jackson, W.H., "The Arthurian Material and German society in the Middle Ages", in: *The Arthur of the Germans*, ed. by W.H. Jackson and S.A. Ranawake. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press, 2000.

Jaeger, Stephen C., *The Origins of Courtliness. Civilizing trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals 939–1210*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

Jaeger, Stephen C. and Ingrid Kasten (eds), *Codierungen von Emotionen im Mittelalter*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

Jones, Martin H. and Roy Wisbey (eds.) *Chrétien de Troyes and the German Middle Ages*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1993.

Kalinke, Marianne E., "The Introduction of the Arthurian Legend in Scandinavia", in: *The Arthur of the North,* ed. by Marianne E. Kalinke. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press, 2011.

Kelly, Douglas, "Narrative Poetics: Rhetoric, Orality and Performance", in: *A companion to Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Norris Lacy and Joan Tasker Grimbert. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2005

———. "Chrétien de Troyes" in: *The Arthur of the French*, ed. by Glyn S. Burgess, and Karen Pratt. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales, 2006.

Kratins, Ojars, *The Dream of Chivalry: A Study of Chrétien de Troyes's Yvain and Hartmann von Aue's Iwein*. Washington, D.C.: U.P. of America, 1982.

Kurath, Hans (ed.), *Middle English Dictionary vol. 19*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1952.

Layher, William, "The Old Swedish *Hærra Ivan Leons Riddare*", in: *The Arthur of the North*, ed. by Marianne E. Kalinke. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press, 2011.

Le Goff, J. *La civilisation de l'occident médiéval*. Paris: 1964.

Meyer, Evelyn, "Gender erasures, knightly maidens and (un)knightly knights in Hartmann von Aue's Iwein". *Neophilologus*: 91 (2007), pp. 657–672.

———."Manuscript Versus Edition: The Multiple Endings of *Yvain/ Iwein/ Ywayne* and their Gender Implications". *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur Germanistik*: 68 (2011), pp. 97–141.

Ollier, Marie–Louise, "The Author in the Text: The Prologues of Chretien de Troyes". *Yale French Studies*: 51, Approaches to Medieval Romance (1974), pp. 26–41.

Pearsall, Derek, *Old English and Middle English Poetry*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.

Rikhardsdottir, Sif, *Medieval Translations and Cultural Discourse: The Movement of Texts in England, France and Scandinavia*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2012.

Rimmon–Kenan, Shlomith, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London/New York: Routledge, 2002.

Robinson, Jenefer, *Deeper than reason: emotion and its role in literature, music and art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.

Rosenwein, Barbara H. "Writing Without Fear about Early Medieval emotions". *Early Medieval Europe*: 10.2 (2001), 229–234.

Rosenwein, Barbara H. "Thinking Historically about Medieval Emotions". *History Compass:* 8.8, (2010), pp. 828–42.

Schröder, Werner, *Laudine's Kniefall und der Schluß von Hartmanns Iwein*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997.

Sonnemans, Gerard, *Functionele aspecten van Middelnederlandse versprologen, deel I. Proefschrift aan de Katholieke Universiteit van Nijmegen.* Boxmeer: Sonnemans, 1995.

Sparnaay, Hendricus, *Hartmann von Aue: Studien zu einer Biography, II*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975.

Specht, Henrik, "The beautiful, the handsome, and the ugly: some aspects of the art of

character portrayal in medieval literature". *Studia neophilologica*: 56.2 (1984), pp. 129–146.

Sullivan, Joseph M., "The Lady Lunete: Literary Conventions of Counsel and the Criticism of Counsel in Chrétien's *Yvain* and Hartmann's *Iwein*." *Neophilologus:* 85 (2001), pp. 335–354.

———. "Kalogreant/Calogrenant, Space, and Communication in Hartmann's *Iwein* and Chretien's *Yvain*". *Seminar: A Journal of Germanic Studies*: 42.1 (2006), pp. 1–14.

Szkilnik, Michelle, "Medieval Translations and Adaptations of Chrétien's Works" in: *A Companion to Chrétien de Troyes*, ed. by Norris J. Lacy and Joan Tasker Grimbert. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2005.

Treharne, Elaine (ed.), *Old and Middle English, c. 890–c. 1400: An Anthology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Uitti, Karl D., "Narrative and Commentary: Chrétien's Devious Narrator in *Yvain*". *Romance Philology*: 33.1 (1979) pp. 160–167.

Wijden, L. van der, "Scheve ogen in de Lage Landen. De functie en betekenis van afgunst en jaloezie in Middelnederlandse teksten" (Dissertation Utrecht University), 2011, < http://igitur–archive.library.uu.nl/dissertations/2011–0211–b200322/wijden.pdf>

8 Appendix: Narrative Techniques

- *Authorial comments*

The *authorial comment* serves as a way for the author to intrude the narrative and influence the reader/listener. The presence of the narrator in the text is often signified by *narratorial intrusions*, "interruptions spoken in the first person and second person that directly address the audience".[157] Rimmon–Kenan explains how such commentary either reflects upon the story or upon the narration.[158] The first involves comments on characters and events within the storyline. The second are statements about the nature or fidelity of the narration.

Authorial comments can be given by different narrators. The *omniscient narrator*, for instance, is all–knowing and provides the reader/listener with information on a character's past and/or future or about a character's innermost thoughts and feelings. The *intrusive narrator* evaluates the actions and motives of the characters. This narrator gives judgement and expresses his/her opinion about characters, events, or life itself.[159] A character within the story may also act as the narrator of a story. This is the *intradiegetic narrator*.[160] His/her interpolations are highly subjective.

- *Dialogue/monologue*

Dialogue and monologue are non–descriptive passages in which an author allows a character or multiple characters to speak directly. Such scenes often have an emotional charge. In *dialogues* characters engage into conversation. Such conversations often betray the emotional

---

[157] Grisby (1979), 266.
[158] Rimmon–Kenan (2002), 99.
[159] Abrams (2005), 241.
[160] Rimmon–Kenan (2002(, 95–96.

relationship between characters. A *monologue* is "a lengthy speech by a single person". When it expresses a character's private thoughts and feelings in particular, it is called a *soliloquy*.[161]

- *Hyperbole*

This Greek word for *hyperbole* means 'overshooting'.[162] It is used to exaggerate or to describe an extreme overstatement. Its deployment creates a heightened effect. It may be used for comic effect, although this is not the case in the *Yvain*–corpus.

- *Imagery*

Imagery is descriptive or symbolic language that is deployed to evoke 'mental pictures' in the reader/listener.[163] Imagery, in its more narrow meaning, can signify specific qualities of something or someone.

- *Irony*

Three types of irony occur in *Yvain* and its adaptations. The first is *verbal irony*. Verbal irony conveys a meaning other than the literal meaning of the words. The meaning implied by the narrator or speaker differs sharply from the meaning that is ostensibly stressed.[164] It often implies the exact opposite.

    Dramatic irony is another kind of irony. When the audience has knowledge of a fact or a situation of which the character(s) do(es) not. When such is the case, the audience often shares with the author knowledge about future developments of the story.

    In common speech, *sarcasm* is often used to indicate all forms of irony, however it is

---

[161] Abrams (2005), 70.
[162] Abrams (2005), 127.
[163] Abrams (2005), 128.
[164] Abrams (2005), 142.

mainly deployed to indicate the "crude and taunting use of apparent praise for dispraise."[165]

This dispraise can be directed at a group or an individual. Sarcastic expressions translate best

when given voice to.

- *Leitmotiv*

Literally means 'guiding motif'. This motif is the main focus of a story. The term was initially

coined to designate a musical theme within a single work. Thomas Mann was the first to

deploy this term as a literary term to denote a recurrent motif.[166]

- *Mirror character*

In *Hoort wonder!*, Brandsma presents his thoughts on author–controlled emotions.[167] He

describes how medieval narratives evoke emotions and the term *mirror character* is first used.

In his first narratological definition, a *mirror character* is a character in the diegesis that is

presented with a hypodiegesis. By reacting to an event or situation described in this

hypodiegesis, the intradiegetic character expresses an opinion which is exemplary to the

extradiegetic audience.[168] This somewhat complex definition is translated by Brandsma into

an example. In de film *Forget Paris*,[169] an engaged couple is waiting in a restaurant for their

friends Mickey and Ellen. In order to kill time, the groom–to–be entertains his partner and

guest who already present by relating to them Mickey and Ellen's unusual first encounter in

Paris. The story related by the groom is played out in the film. Mickey and Ellen's story

makes up the hypodiegesis, since it is a story (of Mickey and Ellen's love life) within a story

---

[165] Abrams (2005), 143.
[166] Cuddon (1991), 485.
[167] Brandsma (2002), 37–42.
[168] Brandsma (2002), 38. These different narrative levels (hypodiegetic, intradiegetic and extradiegetic) are explained in Rimmon–Kenan (2002), pp. 92–97. The hypodiegetic level presents a second narrative layer; a story within a story, i.e. "the level 'below' another level of diegesis." The intradiegetic level (or diegetic) are the events presented in the primary narrative. The extradiegetic level is, according to Rimmon–Kenan, the highest level, superior to the first narrative and concerned with its narration. It is external to any diegesis.
[169] Billy Christal (director), USA, 1995.

(a engaged couple meeting their guests in a restaurant). Occasionally, the focalisation switches back to the restaurant, when the bride–to–be or one of their friends (intradiegetic audience) comments on the story. By expressing their joy, anger, amazement and other emotions about the story, their reactions serve as exemplary to the viewer (extradiegetic audience). These represent the emotions that the director/screenwriter wishes to evoke in the viewers. The intra– and extradiegetic audience are served the exact same dish, which results into the intended effect that both react in the same way to the hypodiegesis presented.

In his subsequent publication on the subject in 2003, however, Brandsma disposes of the idea of the hypodiegesis being a conditional criterion for the presence of *mirror characters*. Instead, he expands the definition and proposes that characters that occur in the original storyline (diegesis) and comment on an event or situation, may also be regarded as *mirror characters*. From his many examples of such *mirror characters* it becomes clear that readers/listeners/viewers react with the same intensity to an event or situation from the diegesis as to an event or situation in the hypodiegesis. Instead a character's mirroring function depends on its role in the story. Passages in which *mirror characters* occur are therefore always charged with emotions. A mirror character fulfils the role of 'emotional transmitter'.

This role may change from passage to passage and therefore, a character can also stop serving as a mirror character. Moreover, we do not necessarily have to speak of one mirror character per story. There can be multiple characters that fulfil a mirroring function in a story. It seems, in most cases however, that the role of mirror character is ascribed to a character with which the audience is familiar. The audience will often already have come across this character earlier in the story. The recurrence of emotional expressions by this character is therefore not unlikely. In fact, the degree of empathy displayed by the audience depends on it. Emotional passages that betray this narrative technique are therefore often quite elaborate.

A character may also serve to highlight the disposition or temperament of another character, by being the complete opposite of this character. Although the first is in fact not exemplary, this character serves to emphasise the exemplary function of the latter. Such characters are usually describes as a *foil*, but can, in this study, be assigned the function of *false mirror character*.

Mark Aussems, who wrote about *mirror characters* subsequent to Brandsma, has proposed a dichotomy of passages in which *mirror characters* occur.[170] He distinguishes *descriptive passages* and *question passages*. *Descriptive passages* are characterised by explicit emotional expressions. Characters in such passages verbally articulate their emotions and opinions, which are to be exemplary for the reader/listener. *Question passages*, on the other hand, are passages in which a character shows amazement or confusion about a certain event or about another element in the story. The character's astonishment is verbalised in a question. In a *question passage*, the extradiegetic audience shares these feeling of astonishment with the character. This correspondence in feelings of confusion directs the audience towards posing the right questions. The answers to these questions, occasionally answered by the narrator himself, are in turn coloured with emotions and opinions.

- *Non–verbal signifiers: gestures and facial expressions*

Non–verbal signifiers translate into "those forms of bodily behaviour, supplementing or replacing speech, by which people convey their thoughts and feelings to each other."[171] In the Middle Ages, two types of such non–verbal communication were distinguished. Both Augustine's early medieval theological text *De Doctrina Christiana* and Vinsauf's thirtheenth–century treatise on rhetorical poetics *Poetria Nova* differentiate between gestures *(gestus)* and facial expression *(vultus)* as instruments to communicate a person's thoughts or

---

[170] Aussems (2007), 25.
[171] Burrow (2002), i.

feelings.[172] Augustine further classifies facial expressions under natural signs in contrast to gestures, which are given signs. The first are given unconsciously, without an urge to signify something, such as blushing or crying. The latter are given consciously and are meant to signify something, such as bows or nods. He calls them *voluntas significandi* and stresses their intentional nature. The fact that these signs are intentional is what makes them interesting for this investigation. Because of their deliberate nature, gestures perform a clear communicative function. Unlike blushing, a gesture, like bowing to your superior, is a choice and thus signifies meaning. In a way, gestures have a similar function as words. Like words, they can convey emotions and can thus be seen to serve as visible words (*verba visibilia*).[173]

In *La civilisation de l'occident médiéval*, Le Goff characterises the medieval period as "une civilisation du geste".[174] Medieval narratives house many gestures, which are expressed by the characters in the narrative. The gestures described in these narratives are therefore suitable research tools for emotion research, since they are entirely open to inspection. Burrow explains how the figures in texts will always be accessible. "Unlike real people, they cannot harbour intentions beyond what their author states or implies".[175] Where the observer does not always have access to the full intend of the person gesturing, the reader or listener of a romance can fully understand the gesture's implications, since the intention does not come from the characters itself, but from the author who created them.

- ▪ *Suspense*

"As a plot evolves, it arouses expectations in the audience or reader about the future course of events and actions and how characters will respond to them. A lack of certainty, on the part of a concerned reader, about what is going to happen, especially to characters with which the

---

[172] *De Doctrina Christiana,* Book II, 5.
   Poetria Nova, ll. 2031–2.
[173] *De Doctrina Christiana,* Book II, 5.
[174] Burrow (2002), 185.
[175] Burrow (2002), 3.

reader has established a bond of sympathy, is known as *suspense*."[176] In short, suspense is a state of uncertainty, fuelled by anticipation and curiosity, about the development and/or outcome of the story. Robinson explains how, "suspense — either a succession of moderate increase or a temporary sharp increase — produces a rise in arousal of the reader/listener and is followed by a reduction of arousal".[177] The state described by Robinson may be established by an acceleration or deceleration in the narrative's pace. The passages subject to *suspense* are generally slowed down, whereas the less significant passages are accelerated.

Moreover, Abrams explains how *suspense* can also be evoked by "emotional tension."[178] Such *tension* is brought about by contradictions between characters and/or scenes.

- *Topoi*

Topoi or 'topics' are part of the classical and medieval rhetoric. *Topoi* is an umbrella term for "recurrent poetic concepts or formulas."[179] Aristotle distinguished two kinds of *topoi*: the common topics and the special topics. "The common topics were a limited stock of arguments that could be used for any occasion. The special topics were those types of argument appropriate to particular kinds of discourse, for instance, in the law courts or public forum, but also to particular kinds of writing, for instance historiography or poetry."[180] In poetry, such *topoi* were often presented as formulas to establish an author–audience relationship. An example of such a formula is the *sententia*. This is a short proverb–like statement expressing feeling, opinion or judgement. Another example is the *audite–topos*. This formula requests silence from the audience and invites the reader/listener to listen. This request is often accompanied with specific instructions on how to interpret the story.[181]

---

[176] Abrams (2005), 234.
[177] Robinson (2005), 124.
[178] Robinson (2005), 324.
[179] Abrams (2005), 178.
[180] Corbett (1971), 35.
[181] Sonnemans (1995), 162.