USUALLY WHEN A READER tells the plot of a narrative, he categorizes the main characters and describes the series of events in which they participate. The reader's account of the "structuring operations" of a narrative have therefore a basically transformational schema since he perceives its form through the changes from one stability to another. When literary critics, who are nonetheless humble and constant readers, try to express their experience of the relationship between stability and movement, they often use words like "dynamic," "energy," "tension," "transformation," "macrocosm," "microcosm," "space," "time," "archetype," and "universe." The critical community generally understands these abstractions, but the use of these words will remain impressionistic as long as it is conceptually severed from a methodology where they are defined and organized in a model that connects the reader's subjective experience of narrative form with the objective existence of form in the bio-physical universe. Such a set of definitions and schemata is available to literary critics in René Thom's Catastrophe Theory.³

³Extensive discussion of the theory and its applications are found in René Thom, Structural Stability and Morphogenesis (Reading, Mass.: VV. A. Benjamin, 1975); "Morphogénèse
Thom's interpretative system is based on a series of topological figures which show how the relationships between structural stability and structural transformations generate all forms. In reading, these figures can function as a shorthand which codifies the reader's sense of a fundamental dynamism underlying the interactions of the characters and the events. The reader can use Thom's simplest figure, the three-dimensional Cusp Catastrophe Model (henceforth CCM), 4 to organize his experience of the text according to what textual elements are associated with or comprise the two opposed complexes, which of those is the dominant stability, the relative structural tension between the two, and what transformations in the system the reader as well as the characters expect. (See Model I.)

Used here as a Kantian schema rather than a mathematical reality, 5


4My use of this type of Catastrophe Theory model is based on Zeeman's adaptation of Thom's figure.

5Alexander Gelley's discussion of the Kantian schema and its relationship to reading, "Metonymy, Schematism and the Space of Literature," New Literary History, 11, No. 3 (1980), 470-87, is also valuable for understanding how the CCM can be used in reading the dynamic form of the text:

The schemata are not to be thought of as a kind of adumbration or ghost of objects, for this notion, with its suggestion of a double or copy, would erode the concept by identifying it with a single instance. Kant defines the schema as an enabling agent, a "method" or "rule" or . . . "monogram." But this last term should not suggest a static element, akin to sign, for what is distinctive to the schema is its constructive and dynamic potential. The image is necessarily fixed and singular. The schema is capable of generating a multitude of images . . . we may think
MODEL I

Model I shows a bifurcation set on the lower or control surface. This set
of it as a characteristic gestic practice of the mind which does not so
much fix or stamp an image as delineate and articulate it.

The CCM is an exceptional type of schema, however, since it is also used to model the funda-
damental processes of the universe itself—thus the mathematical expression and often bio-
logical vocabulary of the Thom methodology. In applying it to the reading experience of tex-
tual form, the reader's subjective sense of dynamism in the textual microcosm is continuous
with his experience of dynamism in the macrocosmic matrix.

6See Thom. Structural Stability, for mathematical explanations; see Zeeman for dis-
cussion in non-specialist terms. A useful non-technical presentation of this material is also
found in Thom, "Morphogénèse," but he does not make the narrative associations that I do.
controls the divergence of the dynamic relationships shown on the sloped upper surface. The high end of the upper surface represents high energy values while the low end indicates low energy values. Either set of energy relationships, high or low, can assume dominance at the expense of the other, depending on how factors associated with one energy level or another are clustered in the text. At a point of structural crisis, there is no longer a smooth system where, despite the existence of an opposed configuration, one attractor (a stability complex attracts both like and unlike elements) is dominant. The cusp (curled line) expresses the structural coincidence of the two groups as they are pressed and folded together in a state of maximum structural tension. As the opposed configurations pass through the cusp—and they must since structural stability at this level of tension is impossible to maintain—the attractor which was competing but not previously dominant assumes dominance and the structure is transformed. Thom calls this transformational system a chreod. The chreod remains potential as long as the opposed elements do not pass into the cusp; the chreod is actualized when the pattern of structural tensions results in structural transformation. Catastrophe Theory thus schematizes an orderly if radical metamorphic process rather than only tragedies and disasters. In a structural system, repetition of the transformational pattern expressed in one CCM results in the presence of multiple CCMs; this common phenomenon is called the "stacking" of chreods. Thom’s method thus valorizes the microcosm which illuminates macrocosmic form by the high tendency of microcosmic patterns to repeat themselves and so greatly limit structural variation in the macrocosm.

Recognition of repeating patterns and reflection on their meaning is, of course, one of the fundamental acts of reading. By using the CCM to figure out the text, the reader changes the ill-defined abstract coin of literary criticism into fixed schematic values which also integrate the reading experience into the patterns of the reader’s bio-physical matrix—the same matrix that conditioned the production of the text. "Tension" in the narrative exists and varies according to the relationship of the two opposed complexes. In my formalization of narrative on the CCM, these opposed complexes are defined as groups of primarily behavioral elements. These behavioral manifestations have a fixed energy value (high or low potential for action) that is correlated with controlling emotions. The repeated

association of such emotional-behavioral complexes with certain types of characters, such as the Hero or the Mother, links them to the system of "archetypes" which defines the range of essentially dynamic patterns exploited obsessively by the human imagination. Variations in tension between these basically archetypal complexes comprise the "structuring operations" of the plot—that is to say, the "narrative dynamics." Though there may be specific references to real "space" or "time" (i.e., room dimensions, exact distance, dates, certain days or moments) in the work being read, these are always associated in the text with one opposing complex or another. Space and time are unified and defined in the CCM by the attraction-repulsion-transformation movements of the opposed groups. This unity of space and time in the CCM expression of narrative form reflects the actuality of the reading experience where any spatio-temporal references are subordinate to the "structuring operations" of the plot. Seen in Thom's framework, narratives are like every other form in the universe: they are generated by changing intervals of tension between a dominant system and a competing system in a space-time continuum that is dependent on the process of competition between these two stabilities and not on any General Concept of Space and Time. Let us turn now to the structural problems posed to the modern reader of an Old French epic, *Raoul de Cambrai* (henceforth *R*), to see how the Thom methodology can be used to figure out a particular narrative.

Debates about the unity of *R* have long raged because the single version we have apparently has two sections. There is a rhymed part, vv. 1-5555, often considered older because its hero-centered form reflects that of the canonical epic, and an assonanced part, vv. 5556-8726, usually thought younger because it features romance and burlesque elements.

8Thom, "Morphogénèse," 25-64.
9Thom, "Morphogénèse," 65-77; Lejeune, 113-118.
10By focusing my article on reading a medieval text. I am acknowledging only the present framework in which we experience medieval literature and not suggesting any conclusions about the medieval circumstances of its composition.
However, the correlation of the governing emotional and behavioral patterns in both parts shows them to have a unified narrative dynamics (see charts at the end of this article). I do not claim that my charting of textual structures is exhaustive. This is where the critic's reading experience comes in: I have chosen passages in both parts which support my reading of the dynamic system of the text. When these sections are analyzed according to their relative energy values (relative activity or passivity) and according to the dominance relationships of the competing complexes (composed of elements I have identified as structurally significant since they cohere through the stylistic differences of the two parts), the charts show the continuous presence of the same associations and oppositions in the same dynamic patterns. My charts are not presented as evidence of single authorship (another great R debate) because a later author might have read the structural patterns of the supposed "early" part and used them in constructing subsequent episodes.

In my reading of the text, two behavioral/emotional complexes control the shape of the plot: (1) violence and anger are consistently associated with high energy activity, maleness, and violation of cultural rules throughout the structure and are consistently opposed to (2) peace and love, linked in their turn with the acknowledgment of cultural rules, with passivity, and femaleness. The division between these competing stabilities and the transformational effect of their changing positions of dominance is evident on the charts. If a male or female character is angry in R, this emotion will almost always lead to violence. Women can and do act in the behavioral mode associated with maleness (let us take as an example the Queen's anger, vv. 6259-65), but this occasional crossing over serves only to underline the division in the cultural system. In the R world, where violence is power and love is weakness, words of love in a character's speech will almost always lead to a plea for peace or an evocation of its joys—along with the reality or consciousness of victim status.

The wider implications of this switchback narrative process become clear when the system is projected on the three-dimensional CCM. (See Model II.) When the interaction of these oppositions is analyzed in a

\[11\text{Cf. Bloch (peace vs. war); Crist and Calin (royal vs. feudal). For a consideration of the relationship of Raoul to contemporary history, see the Meyer and Longnon edition, Mata-rasso, Calin, and Bloch. Calin speaks frequently, however, of the use of archetypes in Raoul when he discusses the characters, 145-179.}\]
particular passage of the text, the energy value of that interaction is expressed by its relationship to the point of maximum—therefore transformational—structural tension: the cusp. On the sloped behavioral surface, the high energy violence complex is positioned on the upper end and the low energy passive cluster on the lower end. When the violence attractor is dominant, the attack catastrophe can be realized immediately or be present simply as the dynamic potential of the words and actions that are packed together. When the peace attractor is dominant, the victimization catastrophe is either realized or potentially present in the situation of the characters involved: they do not victimize but are themselves either conscious or unconscious victims. If at first they are not conscious of their status as victims, the revelation of this catastrophe can bring about either
the dominance of the violence attractor, or a passive lament of the state of victimization. The repetition of these transformational patterns individualizes the R plot since the amount of stacking relative to each pattern establishes a system of dynamic intensities specific to the text and thus defines its "universe." Because the R chreods are also part of Thom's classification of dynamic patterns in the universe, the reader's experience of their dynamics is integrated with his general experience of dynamic relationships.

Using a crucial passage from R, I shall now illustrate the way in which these opposed stabilities approach the point of maximum tension expressed by the fold or cusp (the infolding of the structure) and the way in which these opposites move away from the fold area towards maximal stability (outfolding). The play of tensions and crises here involves Raoul's uncle, Guerry le sor, who angrily confronts a peaceful Raoul after having just quarreled with the king over Raoul's inheritance. Guerry's anger has a truly catastrophic effect on Raoul and his adherents. Raoul's movement from peace to violence here fixes him and his uncle Guerry le sor, who goads him into transformation, as the principal actors in the actantial system of violence, despite their occasional efforts to move back into the peace system (one always corrects the actantial imbalance by goading the other back into violence). A look at the charts shows the persistence of the anger/violence association throughout the epic. This early passage, then, is critical to the reading of the form of R. The R narrative expands by stacking the chreod expressed here; this repetition gives the R form a very high degree of dynamic unity which transcends any subject matter or stylistic divisions. In R, the apparent expansion of these dynamic patterns through the addition of other situations and actors actually condenses the structure since all these diverse elements are packed into one set of dynamic relationships. Though the violence-peace chreod has been previously established in the opening angry scenes featuring Raoul's mother, the king, and Guerry, the chreod becomes structurally critical only in this passage where the hero, Raoul, is initiated into the anger structure. Once the hero is bound into a set of inevitabilities, the reading of the subsequent plot developments in R show them also to be bound to those inevitabilities—even long after the hero's death (e.g., where Guerry kills Bernier in late but still angry vengeance).

13 All quotes from the Meyer-Longnon edition; all translations by the author of this article.
And the red-haired man says: "We've been cheated. I challenge
this, by Saint Guerry!" Quickly he went out of the room. In
fury he came to the ancient palace. Raoul of Cambresis is play-
ing chess like a man who did not expect wickedness. Guerry
sees him, seizes him by the arm, tears and rips his fur cloak.
"Whore's son!" he calls him, false in fury. "Evil wretch! Why
are you playing here? You don't even have enough land to take
care of a pack horse! I'm telling it to you truly!" Raoul hears
him, jumps to his feet, shouts so loudly that the palace shakes,
so loudly that throughout the room many a fine warrior heard
him: "Who stole it from me? I think he's much too bold!"
Guerry answers, "I'll tell you at once: the king himself surely considers you a man to be shamed, the king himself—by whom we should be protected and guaranteed!" Raoul hears him; he shivers throughout his being. Two knights whom his father brought up heard it all, both the noise and the outcry; they were ready to help him. And Bernier the cup-bearer also serves Raoul. These defiant men come before the king: this speech does not lie at the king's feet! Raoul speaks haughtily; Guerry stands next to him.

This passage follows Guerry's and the king's confrontation over Raoul's hereditary and feudal right to Cambrai. The king regrets the injustice but refuses Raoul the fief supposedly because of pressure from the other barons (vv. 641-52). This royal refusal detonates Guerry's defiant anger and reinforces his previously-established identification with the actantial complex of violence and rule breaking (see charts). Not yet at the point of transformation, the tensions are building and constricting the CCM space between this construct and the dominant existential mode of civilized peace. Guerry quickly moves out of the constraint imposed by the king's presence and finds Raoul, though the two men remain within the tradition-laden structure of the royal palace. Along with his uncle Guerry, Raoul has been peacefully serving the king for some time in the hopes that the disinheritance which occurred near his birth would be reversed. He is thus at peace and identified with the general state of victimization—even the king has claimed himself to be victimized. Uncle Guerry, however, has activated conflict by challenging this harmonious reign of peace, civilization, and victimization.

Since he is playing chess without a thought for any challenge to his existential framework, Raoul incarnates the characteristics of the peace attractor. In fact, the extreme degree to which Raoul embodies the passive actantial system works to force Guerry into an even more extreme state of opposition. Guerry's anger is expressed in a physical and moral attack on his nephew. This violent emotion and the associated behavior cause Raoul to shift catastrophically from his state of civilized peace, where conflict and victimization are controlled in the game of chess, to that of uncivilized anger which menaces the civilized structure of the palace. The actualization of the CCM which figures the dynamics of the relationships in this passage is expressed in the two parts of one line, v. 665, where the tensions
between the actantially opposed have clearly reached the maximum state of coincidence (i.e., the transformational region of the cusp). Raoul's passivity coincides with his uncle's anger as Raoul receives Guerry's message in the first half of v. 665, *Raoul l'oï*. This precipitates the realization of catastrophic change, and Raoul switches from passive to active in the second half, *dessor ses piés sailli*. The statement of the physically and culturally violent power of Raoul's words, *Si haut parole qe li palais fremi* (v. 666) which precedes their quotation (v. 668) emphasizes the transformation which Guerry has effected: the royal palace is structurally threatened as it will be all through the text as a result of Raoul's and Guerry's anger. However, this reference to the vulnerability of the palace precedes Guerry's focusing of Raoul's anger on the king, so it serves only to underline the general threat to civilization posed by anger. The dominating power of the verbal violence draws allies to Raoul, including Bernier, who will later kill Raoul, as the structure of anger transforms almost all relationships throughout the epic into violent ones. The Guerry/Raoul CCM becomes more and more central to the reader's structural figuring as succeeding episodes repeat its pattern, thus "stacking" the narrative chreods and increasing the structural density of the macrotextual form. At the end of the text, the peace attractor is reestablished definitively, rather than ephemerally, as the dominant mode in *R* when Guerry, the last of the angry company of Raoul, disappears. Various characters may advocate, embody, or long for peace at different points in the poem, but they are constantly being pulled back into the anger system by those around them—as this structurally critical scene shows. On one level, the poem deals with the inevitable pernicious effects of disinheritance and unjust kings on a feudal society. But on another level, as in the sagas, the *Song of Roland*, the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, the *Nibelungenlied*, the *Aeneid*, and *Beowulf*, the real dynamic focus of the poem is the power of anger. The dominance of the Anger construct and the associated stacking of chreods in *R* may well be a defining feature of the epic in the general system of stability and transformation patterns that characterizes the narrative dynamics.

Narrative and non-narrative genres *can* intersect, however, when they both exploit the same emotional and behavioral relationships. Anger and violence, along with characters and plot elements common to the Old French epic, are present in Old Provençal lyric poetry. Even the transformational system of the epic narrative is invoked, though not actualized, in the poems of the late twelfth-century troubadour, Bertran de Born. Bertran
used epic, patterns and references to emphasize the tension between his unrealized ideal of a world gloriously at war and the reality of a world flaccidly at peace.\textsuperscript{14}

$R$ occupies a unique place in the epic invocations of Bertran's extant poems since he refers to a specific episode from that epic alone. Nevertheless, there can be no direct proof of textual borrowing because the unique $R$ manuscript dates from the late thirteenth century and because Bertran, immersed in the oral culture of his day, most likely knew the epic in an oral version. Used to express both the supposedly real and the desired dynamic structure of the conflicts between Philip-Augustus, Richard the Lion-Hearted, and Henry II of England in 1187, references to the stacked narrative chreod of $R$ play a major rôle in the structure of PSS32 $Al$ non
doutz termini blanc and PSS33 $Pois$ als baros enoia en lur pesa. Though Bertran merely maps out the unrealized transformational relationships of actantal oppositions in many of his poems, he does realize the transformational pattern in PSS32 by switching from the love-structure of the \textit{canso}\textsuperscript{15} which dominates the first stanza to the political focus of the \textit{sirventes},\textsuperscript{16} which dominates the rest of the poem. Given the variations among the troubadour texts in the manuscripts, my analysis of Bertran's use of $R$ does not pretend to be based on true texts but on possible performances of originally flexible poetic structures. The specific shapes of these performances have been determined by me and my fellow editors, William D. Paden, Jr., and Tilde A. Sankovitch.\textsuperscript{17}

In PSS32, Bertran focuses on the disjunction between the presence of epic war elements and the lack of energy in his morally deficient society.


\textsuperscript{15}For the most extensive study done of the form of the \textit{canso} (600 texts evaluated), see Eliza Ghil, \textit{The Canzo: Structural Study of a Poetic Genre}, Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1978.

\textsuperscript{16}On the \textit{sirventes}, see discussion in Dietmar Rieger, \textit{Gattungen und Gattungsbezeichnungen der Trobador lyrik} (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1976).

\textsuperscript{17}All texts and translations are from the edition forthcoming at the University of California Press. I have also drawn on the edition for historical and literary interpretations.
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which prevents its transformation into the cohesive high energy actantial system of the epic world.\(^{18}\) He changes genres within the lyric range, moving from the *canso* to the *sirventes*, to express the catastrophic intensity of his moral frustration.

1. Al nou doutz termini blanc
del pascor vei la elesta
don lo nous temps sens contenta,
qand la sazos es plus genta
et hom deuri'esser plus gais
e meillor sabor me a jais.

2. Per qu-'m pesa car m'estanc
q'ieu ades non pas la festa,
c'us sols jorns tni sembla trenta
per una promessa genta
don mi sortz trebaills et esglais.
E non vuoiill sia mieus Doais
ses la sospeisson de Cambrais.

1. In the fresh, sweet, white season, I see the signs of Easter with which the new time delights the senses, when the year is most noble, most gracious, and most prized, and people should be gay-est, and my joy has its best savor.

2. So it depresses me to stand still, and not get the Midsummer feast over with now; one single day seems thirty to me because of a lovely promise which has brought me trouble and pain. I do not want to own Douai unless I can hope for Cambrai.

Bertran underlines the harmony and joy that unite the poet with nature in an actantial complex typical of the *canso*—as Spring expands so do the poet and his society. However, an oppositional system can also exist in the *canso*: Bertran portrays himself as depressed and anguished relative to the joyous beauty of Spring in the second stanza. All the expansive energy of the first strophe, in which Bertran and Spring are in harmony, is sharply

contracted as Bertran comes to exist in conflict with nature. Since this dynamic reorientation is within the *canso* system, no generic catastrophe has occurred, but potentially transformational tension is certainly present in the structure.

The first allusion to *R* occurs in this agonistic context; this reference introduces another lyric genre to challenge the structural dominance of the *canso*. The second stanza brings up the content of a *promessa genta* (v. 11) that is troubling Bertran. Since he reveals it is not the promise of a lady's love as in the *canso* but the lure of political power as in the *sirventes*, the interiority of the *canso* is thus challenged by the exteriority of the *sirventes*. The matter, if not the form of *R*, is that of Bertran's *sirventes*: *E non vuoi l sia mieus Doais/ ses la sospeisson de Cambrais* (vv. 13-14).

This change in the actantial focus from the love quest to the political quest indicates the structural presence of two opposing actantial sets in tension. The *canso* still dominates, but the dynamic complexity makes the CCM once again a useful figure of reading.

Although the allusion in vv. 13-14 is unclear in terms of the *R* text we have now, the intent to allude to *R* is confirmed by the more definite references in the third stanza and in PSS33 (see below). The lack of precision may also stem from Bertran's use of epic material to suggest another form rather than to imitate the epic itself. In the *R* version we have now, the area dominated by Douai and Cambrai is a patchwork of different holdings where lords are either allied or in conflict. Bertran's point—that there is real power only in the possession of both—is then consistent with the struggle over this region that is the focus of Raoul and Guerry's effort in the extant version of *R*. In Bertran's time (1183), Douai and Cambrai were part of French Flanders, so the poet is not purely interested in the tense dynamic structure created by the convocation of divergent poetic forms within his poem. Bertran is a topical poet as well as a great one: he is encouraging King Philip-Augustus of France to pursue territorial quarrels with Philip of Flanders.

The high dynamic intensity of the curses which begin stanza III signals the transformative passage through the CCM cusp from *canso* actantial dominance to the dominance of the actantial system of the *sirventes*. (See Model III.) In keeping with the new formal arrangement, a new emotion also dominates—anger instead of the joy of the *canso*. The further
development of the $R$ associations also testifies to the restructuring of the CCM relationships. Just as the catastrophe in the $R$ passage analyzed above was signaled by Guerry's physical attack on Raoul, this catastrophe is expressed in the typically non-active form of the lyric genre by Bertran's wish for the king's adviser to be physically harmed.

3. \begin{center}
3. Pustell'en son huoill e cranc
qui jamais l'en amonesta!
Qe ja malvastatz dolenta
no-il valra mession genta,
ni sojorns ni estar ad aies
tant cum gerra, trebails e fais.
So sapcha'l seigner de Roais.
\end{center}
3. Asty in his eye and a canker to the man who advises Philip. For never will a miserable whine be as good as a noble effort, or pleasure and loafing as good as war, trouble, and toil. Let the Lord of Roais know that!

The joy characteristic of the *canso* structure is condemned here in favor of war, which is a focus typical of the *sirventes*. Realization of the epic structure and thus of narrative form hinges on the behavior of the Lord of the Arrouaise, Philip-Augustus (Roais can also mean Edessa, but the French region is obviously meant here). The *sirventes* sets up the morphogenetic field of narrative but never structurally realizes it. In keeping with the focus on war of this *sirventes*, the presentation of Philip-Augustus as Lord of the Arrouaise reinforces the *R* illusions of stanza II. The Arouaise is a wooded region on the borders of Cambresis, Vermandois, and Artois. In *R* the region of Arrouaise is notorious for the cowardly character of its men.

\[
\text{Hom d'Aroaise ne vaut une cinele} \\
\text{Trop par sont bon por vuidier escuele,} \\
\text{Mais au combatre, tex en est la novele} \\
\text{Ne valent mie .j. froumage en fisiele.} \\
\text{(vv. 1184-87)}
\]

An Arrouaise man is not worth a haw. Plenty are good enough to empty a porringer but in fighting—this is what people say—they are not worth a cheese on a string!

Strophe three thus begins with an attack on Philip's adviser and ends by using resonances with the *R* narrative to scorn Philip as Lord of the worthless.

In the succeeding stanzas, Bertran further develops the structure of epic warfare that Philip and his adversary Richard the Lion-Hearted (vv. 4-9) have failed to realize. This *sirventes* is a poem about the absence of the epic narrative dynamic which constantly evokes that dynamic in the implacably lyric world. While the transformation from one genre to another does take place within the lyric system, the metamorphic passage from lyric to narrative is not actualized. Bertran's criticisms and judgments can only point the way towards the existential transformation that must be realized in his society before his poetic mode can be transformed.
In PSS33, *Pois als baros enoia en lur pesa* (written about the same time as PSS32), Bertran works with a similar set of oppositions but this time uses an episode from *R* to express his narrative ideal. Bertran explores the moral and political relationships of King Henry II of England and King Philip-Augustus of France and their barons in the first four stanzas. Philip's love of peace is presented as essentially weak and corrupt relative to Henry while the latter's aggression is judged ignoble. Since both kings fail to realize the epic idea, Bertran embeds a recapitulation of an epic episode in his lyric form to reinforce the contours of his ideal and thus to intensify the opposition between that ideal and his portrayal of an ignoble reality. The dynamic play of tensions between the two in the context of potential transformation is clearly figured for the reader on a CCM. (See

![MODEL IV](image-url)
Model IV.) The use of the CCM to express these relationships also facilitates the comparative analysis since both the active and passive actantial sets of the stacked CCM characteristic of \( R \) happen to be present in the episode cited by Bertran.

5. Lo sors Guerrics dis paraulla cortesa
  qan son nebot vic tornat en esfrei,
  qe desarmatz volgrə n fos la fins presa,
  qand fo armatz non volc penre plaidei.
E non semblent ges lo seignor d'Orlei,
  qe desarmatz fon de peior mercei
  qe qand el cap ac la ventailla mesa.

5. Guerry the Red spoke a courteous word when he saw his nephew turn in fear, saying that when he himself was disarmed he wanted to make peace, but when he was armed he would accept no offer. He little resembled the lord of Orleans, who has been more stubborn disarmed than with his helmet on his head.

This stanza seems to be based on material that must have closely resembled the following passage (vv. 2166-93) from the \( R \) version we have now. The section concerns Guerry's advocacy of the peace offer made to Raoul and his men by Ybert, who is the natural father of Raoul's former ally, Bernier. Wronged by Raoul, Bernier is now his bitter enemy. The four sons of the deceased Herbert de Vermandois join Ybert in the peace offer. It is their land that the king reluctantly yielded to Raoul in fulfillment of the ill-considered royal promise to compensate for the king's equally reluctant disinheritment of Raoul by giving him the land of the next vassal to die.

CVII

Vait s'en R. a G. conseiller:
  Tout le mesaige dant G. le Poitier
Li a conté, ne l'en vost plus laisser.
  Oit le Gueris, Dieu prist a mercier:
  "Biax niés, "dist il, "bien te dois faire fier,
  Quant 'iii. conte se vule[n]t apaier.
Niés, car le fai, por dieu t'en vule proier:
  Laisse lor terre, ne la te chaut baillier."
R. l'entent, le sens quide changier;
  Ou voit G. se li prent a huchier:
"G'en pris le gant voiant maint chevalier,
Et or, me dites q’il fuit a relaissier!
Trestos li mons m’en devroit bien huier. 

CVIII
Raous parole au coraige hardi:

"On soloit dire le riche sor G.
Qu’en tout le mont n’avoit j. si hardi,
Mais or le voi couart et resorti."
G. I’ôi, fierement respondi;
Por trestot l’or d’Abevile en Ponti,
Ne volsist il qu’ il l’eüst gehi,
Ne qes niés l’en eüst si laïdi.
Par malaulent a juré s. Geri:
"Qant por coart m’en avez aati,
Ains en seront .M. hauberc dessarti,
Qe je ne il soions ja mais ami!"
Dist au mesaige: "Torne toi tos de ce:
As fix Herbert isnelement me di
Bien se desfendent; bien seront asailli."

CVII. Raoul goes to consult Guerry. He tells him the whole message of Gerart le Poitier; he wants to leave nothing out. Guerry listens to him; he began to thank God. "My fine nephew," says he, "You must be proud of yourself since the four counts want peace. Nephew, do it! By God, I entreat you! Leave their land; holding it does not matter to you." Raoul hears him. He thinks he will go mad with fury. When he sees Guerry, he starts to shout at him: "I took up the glove in the sight of many knights and now you tell me it must be dropped. All the world must well mock me over it!"

CVIII. Raoul the brave speaks: "People were accustomed to say to the powerful Guerry that in all the world there was not one so hardy, but I see him now a coward and a deserter." Guerry heard him; he answered proudly. For all the gold from Abbéville in Ponthieu he would not wish that Raoul had said that to him, nor that his nephew would have so insulted him about that. In anger he swore by Saint Guerry: "Since you have
provoked me by accusations of cowardice, a thousand hauberks will be broken into pieces over it before I and he [Ybert] will ever be friends.” He said to the messenger, “Return right away from here. Tell the sons of Herbert to defend themselves vigorously, for they will surely be attacked.”

The division noted in R between an actantial complex associated with peace and one linked with violence holds true for the analysis of the textual dynamics in these laisses. Guerry’s acceptance of the peace message and his subsequent extreme advocacy of peace is countered by Raoul’s angry and extreme advocacy of war: R. l’entent, le sens guide changier (v. 2175). His angry denunciation of Guerry’s position causes Guerry to shift—catastrophically—to anger and violence. This scene shows the actantial dynamics outlined in Bertran’s stanza: when Guerry was not in the anger/violence structure, he would make peace; but once he had switched modes, he embodied the new actantial set absolutely. Bertran’s reference to Guerry’s comforting a fearful Raoul with the possibility of peace does not, however, correspond to events in the R version we have now. Yet the dynamic maps of the two texts coincide: Bertran’s portrait of Guerry as a man who knows how to act appropriately is consistent with that in the epic. Bertran ends the stanza by measuring the distance between the fully articulated dynamic of Guerry in the R narrative and the malformed actions of Philip-Augustus, lord of Orleans, which inhibit actantial transformations and thus compel the poet to lyric expression: E non semblet ges lo seignor d’Orlei (v. 33). Bertran does not establish this structural differentiation for purely esthetic purposes. As in PSS32, he has a pragmatic political end in view also. Since epic structure is a tool as much as an ideal for Bertran, he uses it to place more pressure on Philip to shift his behavioral mode. In the succeeding stanza, Bertran further develops the references to Philip’s armed cowardice and thus expands the statements in PSS32 on the French king’s lack of proven prowess.

6. A rei armat o ten hom a flaquesa
   quand es en camps e vai qerre plaidei.
   Ben ant camjat honor per cobeesa,
   segon q’auch dir, Bergoignon e Francei.
E valgra mais, per la fe q’ieu vos dei,
al rei Felip, comenses lo desrei
que plaideiar armatz sobre la glesa.
6. It is considered a weakness for an armed king to go seeking peace when he is in the field. The Burgundians and French have exchanged honor for greed, according to what I hear. It would be better, by the faith I owe you, for King Philip to start the attack than to parley, armed, in the mud.

Just as Philip is the opposite of Guerry, so is his greed opposed to epic honor; but the oppositional state and not the catastrophic shift between actantial modes is the focus of the lyric artist. As Bertran's condemnation expands from Philip and the men of Champagne to the Burgundians and the French, he increasingly details his prescriptions for honorable action, in order to create more pressure for structural transformation. Bertran's outpouring of bile thus leaves Philip positioned on the cusp, with his choice clearly indicated. The catastrophe complex is present, but its dynamic realization is exterior to the poetic structure just as the political reality that conditions a sirventes is nevertheless exterior to the esthetic construct.

Faced with this dynamic impasse, the poet turns to a motion he can effect, that of his jongleur, and through him sends his sirventes to Conon de Béthune in the land of Artois.

7. Vai, Papiol, mon sirventes a drei
   mi portaras part Crespin el Valei
   mon Isembart en la terra artesa.


Bertran hopes his poem will stimulate the transformation of his lyric world into epic form, and significantly, he sends it to one of the crucial regions in the R conflict.

This expression of the poet's desired dynamic pattern is then followed by an incomplete transformation of his poetic structure from that of the sirventes to the canso.

8. Edigas li q'a tal dompna soplei
   que marves pose jurar sobre la lei
   qe-ill mieiller es del mon e il plus cortesa.
8. And tell him I bow to a lady who—as I can solemnly swear on the faith—is the best in the world and the most courteous.

In this final *tornada*, Bertran locates his poetic form on the cusp between the *sirventes* and the *canso*. He therefore closes his poem at the point of highest structural tension, ignoring the usual closure process wherein all tensions are minimized if not entirely resolved. The *sirventes* is not necessarily abandoned here, since its political concerns could underlie the *canso* language: the lady in question may well be a lord, just as lords are sometimes ladies in the *senhals* of *cansos*. Bertran’s use of legal terminology, *jurar sobre la lei*, may evidence a real and not simply analogical feudal context. This *tornada*, written in the amorous language that dominates the poetry of Conon, may then express a political as well as an artistic message to the noted *trouvère*.

Using Thom’s CCM to objectify the dynamic shapes of the lyric and epic genres illuminates the textual and intertextual complexity of the structural quotation of one genre within another. Since this CCM also expresses patterns active in the fundamental shape of the universe, we extend the concept of the mimetic relationship of life and art to that of art and the universe. Literary form is only one aspect of all form.

Patricia Harris Stäblein
Grand Junction, Colorado
## Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>male</th>
<th>anger</th>
<th>rule violation</th>
<th>violence</th>
<th>peace</th>
<th>rule ack.</th>
<th>love</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.'s future adoubement</td>
<td>319-21, 326-35</td>
<td>King disinherted R. as child</td>
<td>331-3, 355-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male inheritance</td>
<td>641-709</td>
<td>disinheritance of R. as knight</td>
<td>659-600, 666, 689-91, 706-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836-60</td>
<td>R. disinherrts the fils Herbert—guilt of King also</td>
<td>919-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Passivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>male rôle as &quot;vassal&quot;</th>
<th>female counsel</th>
<th>Bernier's &quot;disloyalty&quot; twd. his seigneur Raoul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Determined to achieve H. disinheritance</td>
<td>1012-16, 1022-7, 1038-41</td>
<td>964-1135 A. pleads for peace, incapacity of men of Arouaise for war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity of fils Herbert for war</td>
<td>1032-4, 1054-6</td>
<td>1071-4, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother's predic</td>
<td>1087-90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Death of menace of sin if R. Disturbs 1304-6 |

## Origny Episode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>destruction of female 1490-1530 (mother/abbess)</th>
<th>1261-5, 1270-3, 1462-76 R 1507-40 B</th>
<th>1270-3 R. wants to destroy mou tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1270-3 R. will to destroy mou tier</td>
<td>1249-57, 1388-96</td>
<td>orderly beauty of O., religious association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462-1506 all civ. older destroyed</td>
<td>1462-1506 destruction</td>
<td>menace of sin if R. Disturbs 1304-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Mother of R. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>985, 1001 and 1002, etc. nun 1009-1011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Mother of B. (Marsent) Abbess also |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1307-13, 1335-41, 1368-71f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1341-2 r. etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Men of Arouaise= garconelle 1183
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Passivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>male</strong></td>
<td><strong>female</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rule violation</td>
<td>rule ack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td>peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peace</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(menaced or actual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B. protests to R. | Marsent denies culpability for her |
| 1638-52          | "sin" 1336-42 after R. accuses her 1328-35 |
| R.'s anger at B.'s protest | Marsent presents R. with civ. alternative: 1342-58 |
| 1711-18          | B.'s defense of mother's innocence 1687-94 |
| R. violates, and wills to violate | 1556-84 |
| Lenters and other civ. rules | 1704-11 B. wills to fight R. |
| 1716-18 R. hits B. | 1711-18 |

**Love of B. and Biantriz (fille de Guerri le sor)—initial episode**

| B. and Bi. meet because now peace 5556-94 | her desire for him in terms of wifehood 5604, 5696, etc. |
| B. desires marriage to seal peace (greater soc. good) and banish war 5716-5728 | Ber. fear of marrying her since bastard 5703-15 |
| erotic 5591-4 and marital 5604-5, etc. | daughter of Guerry, wife of Bernier |
### Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>male</th>
<th>anger</th>
<th>rule violation</th>
<th>violence</th>
<th>peace</th>
<th>rule ack.</th>
<th>love</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>5918, etc.</td>
<td>King and vassals at war — bad king</td>
<td>5919-King’s desire for violence</td>
<td>King and vassals at war — bad king</td>
<td>5919-King’s desire for violence</td>
<td>5919-King’s desire for violence</td>
<td>5919-King’s desire for violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.’s anger 6104, 6114-17</td>
<td>King ambushes B. and Bi. lovers separate — interferes with marriage structure 6085-6135. etc.</td>
<td>B. and Bi. lovers separate — interferes with marriage structure 6085-6135. etc.</td>
<td>Bi. injured because of K.’s threat 6254-8</td>
<td>G.’s threat of violence 6484-5</td>
<td>Peace made 6570-74</td>
<td>B. and Bi. reunited 6582-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. wants to replace one male with another (husband issue)</td>
<td>Bi. injured because of K.’s threat 6254-8</td>
<td>B. and Bi. reunited 6582-4</td>
<td>wifehood realized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>War with King continues — he interferes with Love union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bi. victim in episode, menaced and passive 6253-4 (faints, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### St. Gille episode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julien-B.’s male child baptized</th>
<th>B.’s fear of God’s anger 6588-94</th>
<th>B. killed his seigneur 6588-94</th>
<th>B. fights for pagans 6618-6674</th>
<th>Bi. remains faithful to B. by surrendering false husband female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.’s identity as dubbed knight-must fight 6623-6</td>
<td>B.’s anger at pagans 6623</td>
<td>G. betrays Bi. 6761-6817</td>
<td>B. fights for pagans 6948-7031 (remembers past violence)</td>
<td>Bi. love for Bi. 6820-1, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.’s chevalric identity 6917</td>
<td>Bi.’s anger at G., her father—Treihson 6817-27</td>
<td>Bi. married against her will 6820-1</td>
<td>Bi. attempts to hit B. 7296-7302</td>
<td>Bi. renders Erchenbaut female 6848-91, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s scorn for Bi. 6128</td>
<td>Corsable’s anger against other pagans 6901</td>
<td>Bi. thinks “B.” trying to interfere with her fidelity 7270-7283</td>
<td>After B. taken by pagans, Bi. “married” to false husband; lives in “peace” (battle over 6747-6762)</td>
<td>Bi. and B. reunited with Bi.’s virtue intact—derly feudal 7575-7583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bi.’s anger at Baspelein 7280-3 | Bi.’s anger at Baspelein 7280-3 | Bi.’s anger at Baspelein 7280-3 | Bi. attempts to hit B. 7296-7302 | Real peace restored 7560-7583 |

### Julien-B.’s male child baptism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.’s fear of God’s anger 6588-94</th>
<th>B. killed his seigneur 6588-94</th>
<th>B. fights for pagans 6618-6674</th>
<th>Bi. remains faithful to B. by surrendering false husband female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.’s identity as dubbed knight-must fight 6623-6</td>
<td>B.’s anger at pagans 6623</td>
<td>G. betrays Bi. 6761-6817</td>
<td>B. fights for pagans 6948-7031 (remembers past violence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.’s chevalric identity 6917</td>
<td>Bi.’s anger at G., her father—Treihson 6817-27</td>
<td>Bi. married against her will 6820-1</td>
<td>Bi. attempts to hit B. 7296-7302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s scorn for Bi. 6128</td>
<td>Corsable’s anger against other pagans 6901</td>
<td>Bi. thinks “B.” trying to interfere with her fidelity 7270-7283</td>
<td>After B. taken by pagans, Bi. “married” to false husband; lives in “peace” (battle over 6747-6762)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bi.’s anger at Baspelein 7280-3 | Bi.’s anger at Baspelein 7280-3 | Bi.’s anger at Baspelein 7280-3 | Bi. attempts to hit B. 7296-7302 | Real peace restored 7560-7583 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>male</th>
<th>anger</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Passivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rule violation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>violence (menaced or actual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rule ack.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>love</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. kills B.

- G.'s identity as father of B.'s wife
- B.'s as husband of G.'s daughter
- Father of his descendants
- G.'s anger at memory of R.'s rule breaking
- B. remembers R.'s rule breaking
- G. betray's B., who calls him *traitor*