Two for the Price of One: Courtly Love and Serial Polygamy in the *Lais* of Marie de France

SHARON KINOSHITA

The represention of repudiation and remarriage in *Fresne* and *Eliduc* constitutes a vindication of feudal dynastic politics over the church's efforts to regulate aristocratic marriages.(SK)

Like the *Tristan* and Chrétien de Troyes's Arthurian romances, the *Lais* of Marie de France appear to ponder the question of the compatibility of love and marriage. When read through the optic of the theme of courtly love, the emerging vernacular literature of the late twelfth century seems to constitute a counter-ideology to contemporary aristocratic practices. In this view, marriages contracted for political and familial gain excluded the possibility of true love, which by definition had to be unconstrained and freely chosen. The typical scenario of courtly love casts one woman between two men, husband and lover. Thus the adulterous love of a Tristan and Iseut or a Lancelot and Guenevere is taken as normative, while the conjugal love of *Erec et Enide* or *Le Chevalier au Lion* appears anomalous, a sign of Chrétien de Troyes's dissent from courtly convention.[1]

In this article I want to reconsider the theme of courtly love in the context of the historical practice of serial polygamy. During the second half of the twelfth century, as Georges Duby has shown, the French feudal nobility repeatedly clashed with church ideologues over definitions of marriage. In addition to the contestation between ecclesiastical and familial authorities over the role of verbal consent versus physical consummation, the Church increasingly insisted on the indissolubility of marriage. This policy, part of the Church's move to regulate the lives of the secular nobility, directly targeted the serial polygamy typical of the first feudal age, when matches of political expediency were made and unmade with relative ease. The difference between the marital politics of King Louis VII of France and those of his son Philip Augustus is instructive: in 1152, the former divorced his queen, Eleanor of Aquitaine, with impunity, despite Pope Eugenius III's best efforts to reconcile

them. By the end of the century, the latter (son of Louis and his third wife) met with intransigent papal opposition in his campaign to divorce his second wife, Ingeborg of Denmark.[2]

If the conventional literary triangle of one woman caught between two men produces tales of adulterous love—as in Marie de France's *Equitan, Laüstic* and *Chevrefoil*, for example—the combination of one man and two women produces something quite different: the courtly representation of serial polygamy. In *Fresne* and *Eliduc,* composed at the height of the church's insistence on the indissolubility of marriage, 'love' serves to legitimize the male protagonist's repudiation of his first wife and his remarriage to a second.[3] Religious personages and institutions, moreover, are represented as actively contributing to a feudal politics of marriage completely at odds with twelfth-century church policy, in one case bringing a pair of lovers together, in the other enabling their separation.

A glance at the Arthurian romances of her contemporary Chrétien de Troyes confirms just how radically Marie's representation of serial polygamy contests both literary and ecclesiastical norms. *Erec et Enide* and *Le Chevalier au Lion* constitute countertexts to the adulterous tradition, demonstrating the compatibility of love and marriage less ostentatiously but more decisively than his self-proclaimed anti-Tristan, *Cligés*. But the success of Chrétien's conjugal plots turns precisely on the programmatic rejection of serial polygamy. Erec may subject Enide to impossible ordeals in the forest, but never is it a question of divorcing her; she in turn resists the advances of two amorous counts, refusing to abandon her husband even when he is abusive or (as she thinks) dead. *Le Chevalier au Lion* opens with Laudine's marriage to Yvain, her first husband's killer. But from this point on, this text too maintains the indissolubility of marriage. Once repudiated by his wife, Yvain devotes himself to winning a reconciliation; to do this, he must reject multiple offers of marriage from the unmarried châtelaines he rescues (Kinoshita chs. 2, 4). Where Chrétien pointedly rejects serial polygamy for both his male and female protagonists, Marie's conjugal politics are quite different, as we see in turning to a closer examination of mechanisms of marriage, repudiation, and remarriage in *Fresne* and *Eliduc*.

I. LE FRESNE

Under the cover of a fairy-tale like plot, Marie de France's *Fresne* gives a startlingly cynical view of the sexual politics of the feudal aristocracy. The tale begins when an anonymous woman gives birth to twin daughters. Having earlier claimed that multiple births betray the mother's infidelity, the woman

hastily arranges to dispose of one of her babies lest she be accused of adultery. One of the infant girls is wrapped in a rich swaddling cloth and left in the hollow of an ash tree or *fresne*, with a ring as her only token of identity. Discovered by the caretaker of a nearby convent and brought up as the ward of its abbess, 'Fresne' grows into a lovely young woman. Her beauty attracts the attention of Gurun, a local baron, who seduces her within the walls of the abbey, then takes her home to be his concubine. At the urging of his vassals, he contracts a politically expedient marriage; upon learning that Fresne and his new bride are sisters, however, he repudiates the latter and marries the former—all with the connivance and assistance of the compliant archbishop of Dol.

From the start, Gurun's behavior bespeaks his disregard for ecclesiastical law. He stops at the abbey where he meets Fresne on his way home from a tournament: a favorite aristocratic pastime, but one repeatedly condemned by the twelfth-century church (Duby, *Bouvines* 84–85). This infraction is mild, however, compared with his subsequent action: making a pious donation to the abbey to secure access to the abbess's beautiful young ward. In the high middle ages, it was common for the feudal nobility to bestow gifts on favorite monasteries in return for spiritual benefits: masses for the souls of the donor and his family. Not uncommonly, they received (monetary) countergifts in return.[4] Gurun, however, seeks no such spiritual benefits or material recompense.

> D'une chose se purpensa:
> L'abeïe crestre vodra;
> De sa tere tant i dura
> Dunt a tuz jurs l'amendera,
> Kar il i voelt aveir retur
> E le repaire e le sejur.
> Pur aveir lur fraternité,
> La ad grantment del soen doné,
> Mes il i ad autre acheisun
> Que de receivre le pardun![5] (261–70)
>
> [He hit upon a scheme: he would become a benefactor of the abbey, give it so much of his land that it would be enriched forever; he'd thus establish a patron's right to live there, so that he could come and stay whenever he chose. To be a member of that community he gave generously of his goods—but he had a motive other than receiving pardon for his sins!]

This right of return is especially important since the abbey is located in 'a fine, prosperous town' ['une vile riche e bele' (149)] where a lord like Gurun could presumably easily find other accommodations. The countergift he

receives for his generosity is, in effect, Fresne herself, whom he seduces without ever arousing the suspicion of the less-than-vigilant abbess.[6] However irregular its origin, Gurun's love for Fresne in no way compromises the feudal politics of lineage.[7] Gurun installs Fresne as his concubine, and though she is loved and honored by all for her 'franchise' (311), no one ever suggests she might be a suitable bride for her lord.

Unlike the Griselda story it closely resembles, the *lai* never questions the equation of nobility and lineage. Even the swaddling cloth and gold ring her mother had given her to show 'that she came from a noble family' ['Qu'ele est nee de bone gent' (134)] fail to signify: without an identifiable lineage she is nothing more than a foundling with no value on the marriage market.[8] Her presence becomes troubling only because of Gurun's failure to engender a legitimate heir—a failure which alarms his vassals:

> Soventefeiz a lui parlerent
> Qu'une gentil femme espusast
> E de cele se delivrast;
> Lié sereient s'il eüst heir
> Ki aprés lui peüst aveir
> Sa terë e sun heritage.
> Trop i avreient grant damage,
> Si il laissast pur sa suinant
> Que d'espuse n'eüst enfant. (316–24)
>
> [They often urged him to marry a noble woman, and to get rid of this mistress of his. They'd be pleased if he had an heir who could succeed to his land and inheritance; it would be much to their disadvantage if he was deterred by his concubine from having a child born in wedlock.]

Greatly concerned, the vassals themselves locate a suitable wife, the daughter of 'un produme' of appropriate station (332). Gurun agrees to their choice. Yet unknown to all, the bride is none other than Fresne's twin sister Codre ('hazel'). Without a word of complaint, Fresne—who had abandoned the security of the abbey to become Gurun's concubine—silently prepares to welcome the wife soon to displace her.

The wedding itself seems in perfect accord with the 'ecclesiastical model' of marriage described by Georges Duby (Duby 1981). Where the church demanded that proceedings be sanctified by a priest, this ceremony is attended by none other than the *archbishop* of Dol: 'the archbishop was there, the one from Dol, who was his vassal' ['l'ercevekes i esteit, / Cil de Dol, que de lui teneit' (my tranlation; 361–62)]. Ironically, it is expressly because of his presence that Fresne takes the step that leads to the revelation of her identity: thinking Gurun's wedding bed insufficiently rich to mark such a happy occasion, she

takes the silk swaddling cloth she had brought with her from the convent and:

> Sur le lit sun seignur le mist.
> Pur lui honurer le feseit,
> Kar l'ercevekes i esteit
> Pur eus beneïstre e seiner,
> Kar ç'afereit a sun mestier. (404–08)

[placed it on her lord's bed. She did it to honor him; the archbishop would be coming there to bless the newlyweds in bed. That was part of his duty.]

As the newlyweds are about to be bedded, the bride's mother recognizes the sumptuous silk covering the nuptial bed: Fresne is of course the daughter she had disposed of so many years before. Gurun, it is revealed, has married the sister of his long-time concubine.

Under the ecclesiastical model, the verbal consent of the partners is binding with or without physical consummation, and the marriage, once contracted, is indissoluble. The story leaves no doubt that the marriage of Gurun and Codre has in fact taken place: 'they held the wedding[9] in grand style; there was much celebrating' 'Les noces tindrent richement, / Mut i out esbanïement' (373–74). Yet as the news of Fresne's identity spreads, everyone—including the archbishop—assumes the marriage between Gurun and Codre can easily be undone:

> Sis pere ne volt plus atendre:
> Il meïsmes vet pur sun gendre,
> E l'erceveke i amena;
> Cele aventure li cunta.
> Li chevaliers, quant il le sot,
> Unques si grant joie nen ot!
> L'ercevekes ad cunseilié
> Que issi seit la noit laissié;
> El demain les departira,
> Lui e celë espusera.
> Issi l'unt fet e graanté. (493–503)

[Her father doesn't want to wait any longer; he goes to get his son-in-law, and brings in the archbishop too—he tells him the adventure. When the knight heard the story he was happier than he'd ever been. The archbishop advised that things should be left as they were that night; the next day he would separate [Gurun and Codre] and would marry him and [Fresne] They agreed to this plan.]

No one voices any impediment to Gurun's separation and remarriage. In essence, both Gurun and his father-in-law treat the initial ceremony not as a marriage but as a betrothal. Historian Jean-Louis Kupper describes the political

use the secular nobility made of this ritual well into the thirteenth century despite the church's efforts at reform:

> Ce rite, dont les nobles tiraient sans doute fort habilement parti, offrait une extraordinaire souplesse. La *desponsatio* était le mariage à moindre risque, car il permettaient d'étayer une alliance politique —hasardeuse ou peu sûre —tout en préservant l'avenir: les fiançailles, en effet, pouvaient être rompues, sans pour autant créer d'insurmontables difficultés.

The key to this strategic use of the *desponsatio* was avoiding all semblance of ecclesiastical participation:

> Afin de mieux limiter les risques ou d'éviter d'éventuelles sanctions religieuses, on veillait…à *ne point sacraliser la cérémonie par la présence du prêtre*: les fiançailles devaient rester profanes ou, si l'on veut, strictement politiques.[10] (emphasis added)

In *Fresne*, however, it is the archbishop himself who assures Gurun of his willingness to preside over the latter's divorce and remarriage: 'the next day he would separate (Gurun and Codre) and would marry him and (Fresne)' ['El demain les departira, / Lui e celë espusera' (501–02)]. Having verbally assented to these irregular proceedings, he discreetly disappears from the tale: the narrator recounts the divorce in the passive voice and makes Gurun the agent of his own remarriage:

> El demain *furent desevré*.
> Aprés *ad s'amie espusee*;
> E li peres li ad donee,
> Ki mut ot vers li bon curage:
> Par mi li part sun heritage!
> Il e la mere as noces furent
> Od lur fille, si cum il durent. (emphasis added, 504–510)

> [The next day, [Gurun and Codre] *were separated*. Then [Gurun] *married his beloved*; she was given to him by her father, who was well disposed toward her; he divided his inheritance with her. The father and his wife remained at the festivities with their daughter, as they ought.]

No one, least of all the narrator, seems to discern anything irregular in Gurun's immediate remarriage to the sister of his repudiated wife, even though marriage to two sisters in succession 'was incestuous in ecclesiastical law' (Boswell 369) and, in the twelfth century, remarriage was even more controversial than separation (Holmes, 'Further' 336). Having been demoted from concubine to chambermaid, Fresne becomes Gurun's legitimate wife as well as heiress to half her family's patrimony. Codre and her parents simply return home, where she is married off to a suitable lord, and everyone (we presume) lives happily ever after.

Since disputes over separation and remarriage were central to the church's efforts to regulate the secular nobility, Marie's representation of the archbishop's compliancy invites closer scrutiny. In specifying the archbishop *of Dol*, she writes into her fictional text a historical figure who embodied conflicts over Breton autonomy. In Marie de France's day, Dol was synonymous with ecclesiastical controversy.[11] In the mid-eleventh century, its bishops—subordinate to the archbishop of Tours—revived historical claims to metropolitan (archepiscopal) status. They were also condemned for other irregularities: Archbishop Juhel was excommunicated twice: by Pope Leo IX (1050) for having bought his office from the count of Brittany, and again by the great reformer Gregory VII (1076) for publicly marrying.[12] Gregory reminded other Breton bishops of their subordination to Tours; yet after deposing Juhel, he consecrated his own candidate archbishop and conferred on him the pallium (an archepiscopal vestment), for to have him submit to Tours 'would have deprived him of the all the credit and influence he needed to promote reforms' (Chédeville and Tonnerre 259; my translation). In 1094, Urban II declared that no subsequent bishop of Dol might claim the pallium; however, Baudry of Bourgueil was consecrated archbishop in 1107, and his successors kept the title.

In the mid-twelfth century, the controversy over Dol's metropolitan status became enmeshed in Henry II's attempts to impose Norman control over Brittany. His takeover began with a feudal maneuver: interceding in a succession dispute, he supported young Conan IV against his step-father in exchange for the former's sworn homage. But Henry cannily exploited ecclesiastical politics as well. When in 1154 the newly-elected bishop, Hugh the Red, chose to submit to Tours, the people of Dol refused to receive him; the king, however, obtained the pallium for the hapless bishop from the English pope, Hadrian IV. After Hugh's forced resignation (1161), Henry secured the succession of two Norman ecclesiastics, the archdeacon of Bayeux and the dean of the chapter of Avranches. Thus 'Henry II could count on the bishops' loyalty. It is incontestable that his position in favor of the archbishopric of Dol earned him support (at least in the Bretonizing dioceses)' (Chédeville and Tonnerre 90–91; my translation). In 1166, after defeating a coalition of resistant Breton nobles, Henry forced Conan IV to abdicate; from then until the end of the century, the Plantagenêts worked to establish centralized government on the Anglo-Norman model. In 1181, Henry's son Geoffrey married Conan's daughter Constance and gradually assumed control of the administration of Brittany.[13] With his death (1186), the county passed once more under more direct Plantagenêt rule.[14] Finally, when Richard the Lionheart

died in 1199, Geoffrey's widow Constance brought Brittany under Capetian control, and Pope Innocent III declared that the bishop of Dol would no longer have the pallium: like all the other bishops of Brittany, he would henceforward be subordinate to the archdiocese of Tours (Chédeville and Tonnerre 260).

Given this complex political history, it is difficult to know what to make of Marie's depiction of the head of a politically contested archdiocese—one who owed his position to the king of England[15]—as the yes-man of a local Breton baron. On the one hand, the *lai*'s happily-ever-after ending depends on the radical subversion of the church's efforts to regulate the marriage practices of a resistant aristocracy. The marriage of Gurun and Fresne is represented as a purely feudal concern: the bride is given by her father as part of an arrangement ensuring the orderly transmission of property. The politically vulnerable archbishop, having conferred the appearance of ecclesiastical legitimacy on these highly suspect circumstances, leaves Gurun and his in-laws to regulate their own affairs according to dynastic and class interests. The question is complicated, however, by contemporary representations of Celtic customs and ecclesiastical practices. Eleventh- and twelfth-century Anglo-Norman churchmen and chroniclers routinely accused the Celts of polygamy, divorce, and marriage within the prohibited degrees. Of course, the attribution of sexual licentiousness to a cultural other is a common trope of ethnographic writing and goes a long way toward explaining (for example)

> the enormous chorus of Anglo-Norman outrage at Irish marriage customs: "they exchange wives with each other" (Lanfranc), "men change their wives just like one gets a new horse" (Anselm); "They have as many wives as they wish" (Roger of Howden).' On the continent, the Bretons were the target of a similar discourse: 'In Brittany,' wrote William of Poitiers, 'each knight produces fifty [children], since each has ten or more wives, like the ancient Moors' (Bartlett 170).

On the other hand, such comments also point to the specificity of certain Celtic customs, as when Gerald of Wales, in a less hyperbolic vein, noted a 'readiness' shared by both the Bretons and the Welsh 'to marry within the prohibited degrees' (Bartlett 188).[16]

As various critics have pointed out, Gurun's marriage to Codre—his concubine's twin—clearly constitutes a marriage 'within the prohibited degrees.' 'Presumably,' writes Urban T. Holmes, 'Marie thought the fact Guron had lived with the sister of his bride was alone sufficient to make his marriage null and void, provided he did not pass the wedding night with his newly wedded lady.'[17] Chantal Maréchal takes *Fresne* as an exemplum illustrating the prohibition on marriage between partners related *ex copula illicita*.[18] From

this perspective, in dissolving the marriage once Fresne's identity is revealed, the archbishop merely acts as the instrument of orthodox ecclesiastical law. But Marie's curiously-phrased introduction of 'the archbishop...the one from Dol, who was [Gurun's] vassal' 'l'ercevekes...Cil de Dol, que de lui teneit' (361–62) invites, I suggest, a more suspicious reading as well. In light of the critical tradition of identifying the 'noble reis' to whom Marie dedicates her *lais* (Prologue 43) as Henry II of England, we might take *Fresne* as the appropriation of a widespread folkloric motif[19] to an Anglo-Norman political project. In underscoring the archbishop of Dol's complicity in Gurun's irregular wedding, she recodes the dissolution of marriage and marriage within prohibited degrees of affinity—'violations' widespread among the feudal nobility of western Europe—as distinctly Breton practices. As Robert Bartlett observes, 'As ecclesiastical reformers...[encountered] extremely resistant and sometimes very well formulated bodies of custom operating on a different view of marriage...their criticism became entangled with the process of conquest, colonization, and resistance.'[20] Similarly, the unseemliness of the archbishop's political subjugation to Henry II is displaced: he becomes the 'man' not of the king of England and duke of Normandy, but of a modest local lord. At the same time, folktale convention overdetermines a happy ending perfectly consonant with the marital politics of the twelfth-century feudal aristocracy. The well-born foundling is restored to her rightful station, and the contradiction between conjugal and non-conjugal love is resolved, all through the mechanism of serial polygamy and thanks to the compliancy of the accommodating archbishop.

II. ELIDUC

Eliduc tells the story of one man caught between the allegiance to two overlords and the love of two wives.[21] The titular protagonist is a vassal of the Breton king. Banished from court as the result of slander and rumor, he leaves his wife Guildeluëc behind to cross the channel for the kingdom of Logres. There he enters the service of a local British king and falls in love with the king's daughter Guillïadun. Soon the king of Brittany summons him home; Eliduc goes, but pines for the sweetheart he must leave behind. When the term of service he had sworn to the British king expires, Eliduc sneaks back into the country to abduct the king's daughter. On the return crossing, Guillïadun learns that her lover is already married and falls into such a deep faint that everyone thinks her dead; upon reaching land, Eliduc leaves her body in a hermit's chapel. There his wife Guildeluëc finds Guillïadun, marvels at her beauty, revives her with a magic flower, and decides to take the veil so that her

husband will be free to marry Guillïadun. Eliduc establishes an abbey for Guildeluëc, then marries Guillïadun. In time, however, they too decide to turn to God: he founds a church for himself and places Guillïadun in Guildeluëc's abbey. 'Each one took great pains to love God in good faith and they made a very good end, thanks to God, the divine truth' 'Mut se pena chescuns pur sei / De Deu amer par bone fei / E mut par firent bele fin, / La merci Deu, le veir devin!' (1177–80).

Because of this striking conclusion, *Eliduc* is often read as palinode, Marie's repudiation of the thematics of desire dominating the other *lais* in her collection. But the incongruity of this seemingly unmotivated ending helps mask, I suggest, quite a distinct ideological project: countering the anxiety aroused by a new mode of political relation, contractual service, coexisting with the traditional lord–vassal bond. The narrative reconciles these different modes of feudal loyalty by its canny deployment of generic discontinuity: beginning with the epic theme of the loyal vassal victimized by a disloyal lord, *Eliduc* is transformed in mid-tale into a romance plot of an adventurer who wins a lady's love through his outstanding prowess.[22] By recoding the protagonist as a 'knight,' Marie effaces the troubling distinction between vassal knights and knights-for-hire. The key to this ideologically-laden redefinition is Eliduc's serial polygamy: his exchange of Guildeluëc for Guillïadun.

The opening of the *lai* highlights the feudal values of vassalage and lineage. Eliduc is a cherished vassal of the Breton king, married to a woman of comparable station: 'He had a wife, noble and wise, of high birth, of good family' 'Femme ot espuse, noble e sage, / De haute gent, de grant parage' (9–10). When his lord capriciously turns on him, however, he seeks his fortune in exile. His words to his own vassals euphemize his plight: '[Eliduc] doesn't want to remain in the country but will, he says, cross the sea; he will go to the kingdom of Logres, *where he will enjoy himself for a while*' 'Ne voelt el païs arester, / Ainz passera, ceo dit, la mer. / El rëaume de Logre ira, / *Une piece se deduira*' (67–68, emphasis added); the narrator, however, puts things more baldly: 'but then, because of a war, *he went to seek wages* elsewhere' 'Mes puis avint par une guere / Que *il alat soudees quere*' (emphasis added, 13–14).[23] Fortuitously, Eliduc quickly finds a surrogate lord: upon reaching port at Totnes and learning of a war between two neighboring kings, he seeks service with the underdog, the king of Exeter: 'He wanted to give all the help within his power and remain in that king's service' 'Vodrat aidier a sun poeir / E en soudees remaneir' (109–10).[24] Eliduc 'auditions' by organizing an ambush in which his raiding party—a combination of his own men and some local knights—overcomes and captures thirty enemy knights; the king, gratified at Eliduc's success, offers him a one-year free agent contract; fortune—and his

own prowess—compensate Eliduc for the capriciousness of his feudal liege lord.

As a knight-for-hire, Eliduc is certainly not to be compared with the mercenary footsoldiers who in the second half of the twelfth century were transforming the face of medieval warfare (Warren 232). Yet neither is his new position to be compared to the status he enjoyed in Brittany. His relationship to the Breton king is a lifelong feudal bond, troubled but not broken even when Eliduc falls into disfavor. His bargain with the king of Exeter, on the other hand, is a contractual agreement for a specific term: 'the king loved and cherished him. He kept him a whole year—and those who had come with him' ['Mut l'amat li reis e cheri. / Un an entier l'ad retenu / E ceus ki sunt od lui venu' (266–68)].[25] In Brittany, Eliduc acted as his lord's seneschal and enjoyed the privilege of hunting unmolested in his forest; in Exeter, his service is recompensed by the spoils of war he is able to seize for himself. In his first ambush, for instance, he and his followers 'took armor to their profit. They made *exceptional gains* there and came back very happy: they had done very well' ['Del herneis pristrent a grant hait: / *Merveillus gaain* i unt feit! / Ariere s'en revunt tuit lié: / Mut aveient bien espleitié!' (223–26, emphasis added)].[26]

Thus it is not accidental, I think, that just at the moment Eliduc reaches his contractual agreement with the king, the *lai* undergoes a kind of generic transformation. As if to minimize the irregularity of his new position, the protagonist is invested with all the attributes of the standard romance hero. In recoding Eliduc as a *chevalier,* the text effaces the mortifying discrepancy between his former status as trusted feudal vassal and his current role as knight-for-hire. The agent of this mystification is his new employer's daughter:

> Elidus fu curteis e sage,
> Beaus chevaliers e pruz e large.
> La fille al rei l'oï numer
> E les biens de lui recunter. (271–74)
>
> Eliduc was courtly and wise, a handsome knight, brave and generous. The king's daughter heard him spoken of, his virtues described.

When the princess sends for Eliduc and scrutinizes him with an attention usually reserved for the male gaze,[27] the distinction between feudal and contractual service is neutralized in the gender inversion that transforms the king's lieutenant into the object of female desire:

> Icele l'ad mut esgardé,
> Sun vis, sun cors e sun semblant;
> Dit en lui n'at mesavenant,
> Forment le prise en sun curage. (300–04)

[She looked at him intently, at his face, his body, his appearance; she said to herself that there was nothing unpleasant about him. She greatly admired him in her heart.]

The amorous gaze of the king of Exeter's daughter confirms Eliduc's worth, highlighting the injustice of the king of Brittany's suspicion of his loyal vassal.

As in *Fresne*, however, feudal and dynastic considerations remain paramount. Love is accommodated to the extent that it can be reconciled with these other interests. Guillïadun is not just any amorous maid: she is her father's heir, the cause of the war that has drawn Eliduc into the king's pay:

Vieuz hum e auncïens esteit;
Karnel heir madle nen aveit.
Une fille ot a marïer.
Pur ceo k'il ne la volt doner
A un suen per, sil guerrïot,
Tute sa tere li gastot. (93–98)

[(The king) was an old and ancient man. He had no male heir of his own flesh, but a daughter of marriageable age. Because he did not want to give her to his peer, the latter made war on him, laying waste his whole land.]

Even overcome by desire, the princess maintains a clear-eyed consciousness of her own dynastic value. Never imagining that her love is already married, Guillïadun imagines a solution in which the satisfaction of her desires coincides with the fulfillment of Eliduc's fortunes:

Si par amur me veut amer
E de sun cors asseürer,
Jeo ferai trestut sun pleisir;
Si l'en peot grant bien avenir:
De ceste tere serat reis. (emphasis added, 343–47)

[If he wants to give me his love and promise his person to me, I shall do whatever he likes; great good will come to him: *he will be the king of this land.*]

Guillïadun sees no contradiction between the erotic and the political. Eliduc, on the other hand, remains acutely aware of the double obstacle to their love: his obligations to his (first) wife and to his second lord:

Mes ja ne li querra amur
Ki li aturt a deshonur,
Tant pur sa femme garder fei,
Tant pur ceo qu'il est od le rei. (473–76)

[(H)e would not pursue the love that would dishonor her because of the faith he owed his wife and because he served the king.]

Instead he and the princess settle down to a comfortable routine of gift-giving and courtly banter—a non-sexual intimacy reconcilable, it seems, with the pledges he has made both to his wife (463–65) and to Guillïadun's father.[28]

Just then, a letter arrives from the king of Brittany asking Eliduc to return, invoking the indissolubility of the feudal bond:

> Pur sun grant busuin le mandot
> E sumuneit e conjurot,
> Par l'alïance qu'il li fist
> Quant il l'umage de lui prist,
> Que s'en venist pur lui aidier,
> Kar mut en aveit grant mestier. (565–70)

[Because of his great need, he was sending for Eliduc, summoning and begging him—in the name of the alliance that bound them when the king received homage from Eliduc—to come and help him, for the king needed him badly.]

Eliduc never hesitates: vassalic duty to the overlord who has wronged him takes precedence over both his attachment to Guillïadun (588–96) and his commitment to her father. Even when the king of Exeter offers him 'a third of his inheritance and the whole of his treasure' 'a tierce part de s'herité / E sun tresur abaundoné' (629–30) if he will stay, Eliduc cannot be dissuaded: 'I will not remain, no matter what' ['Ne remeindrai en nule guise' (637)], he says—adding, however, that he will return should he be needed.

Though Eliduc's service to the king of Exeter proves negotiable, the loyalty he owes him is not. When Guillïadun begs to be allowed to accompany him overseas, he sternly refuses, since to abduct his employer's daughter would be a violation of his feudal bond:

> Bele, jeo sui par serement
> A vostre pere veirement:
> Si jeo vus enmenoe od mei,
> Jeo li mentireie ma fei,
> De si k'al terme ki fu mis. (685–89)

[Sweet, in truth I am pledged by my word to your father—if I took you with me I would betray my faith to him—until my term is over.]

But the catch is that, in contrast to his obligation to his liege lord, this bond is temporary. What had seemed a liability now turns to his advantage: once the term of the contract has expired, Eliduc (having presumably restored order in Brittany) quickly devises an excuse to return to England, this time to spirit away the object of his desire.

Just what Eliduc has is mind is not clear. Before returning to Brittany, he had raised the possibility of marrying Guillïadun only to dismiss it: 'S'a m'amie

esteie espusez,/ *Nel sufferreit crestïentez*' ['If I were married to my love, *Christianity would not allow it*' (601–02)]. But now, as Guillïadun sneaks off at night to board Eliduc's waiting ship, thoughts of feudal loyalty, dynastic fortune, and religious prohibition are all apparently abandoned. When the ship is caught in a violent storm on the high seas, however, the text introduces the discourse of divine vengeance in the voice of one of Eliduc's crew:

> Uns des escipres hautement
> S'est escriez: 'Que faimes nus?
> Sire, ça einz avez od vus
> Cele par ki nus perissums:
> Jamés a tere ne vendrums!
> Femme leal espuse avez
> *E sur celi autre enmenez*
> Cuntre Deu e cuntre la lei,
> Cuntre dreiture e cuntre fei;
> Lessiez la nus geter en mer!
> Si poüm sempres ariver.' (emphasis added, 830–40)
>
> [Then one of the sailors loudly cried: 'What are we doing? Lord, you have inside with you the one who is causing our deaths. We'll never reach land! *You have a faithful wife but you're bringing another back* in defiance of God and the law, right and faith. Let us throw her into the sea! Then we could still make it.]

The sailor's condemnation vividly draws attention to the legal ambiguity of Eliduc's action. In effect, he is taking a second wife while the first is still living; in this his case resembles that of King Philip I of France, repeatedly condemned by the pope for his repudiation of his first wife Bertha of Holland and his remarriage to Bertrada de Montford at the turn of the twelfth century.[29] Though Eliduc himself had previously acknowledged that such a marriage would be anti-Christian—'*Nel sufferreit crestïentez*'—he now makes short work of the offending sailor, clubbing him with an oar and throwing his body into the sea.[30] In the meanwhile, however, Guillïadun has fainted from shock at learning that her lover is already married. Unable to revive her, Eliduc thinks her dead. By the time the ship reaches port, the moral ambiguity surrounding their bigamous elopement has been doubly silenced, by the murder of the dissenting sailor and by the 'death' of the prospective bride.

At this point, the text anticipates the turn towards religion that characterizes its conclusion. Eliduc first has the idea of founding a monastery as a burial site for his love:

> Une forest aveit...
> Trente liẅes ot de lungur.
> Uns seinz hermites i maneit
> E une chapele i aveit;

Quarante anz i aveit esté,
Meinte feiz ot od lui parlé.
A lui, ceo dist, la portera,
En sa chapele l'enfuira;
De sa tere tant i durra,
Une abeïe i fundera,
Si i mettra cuvent de moignes
U de nuneins u de chanoignes,
Ki tuz jurs prierunt pur li:
Deus li face bone merci! (889–902)

[There was a forest…thirty leagues long, where a holy hermit lived, and there was a chapel. He'd been there forty years; Eliduc had often spoken with him. He would, he said, bring Guilliadun to him, and bury her in the chapel; he would give enough of his land to found an abbey and would establish a convent of monks, or of nuns or canons, who would always pray for her. God have mercy on her!]

The hermit, having died eight days before, is spared the burden of having to endorse this rather unorthodox project. But Eliduc, undeterred, announces his determination not only to endow a monastery but to enter one himself:

'Bele, fet il, ja Deu ne place
que jamés puisse armes porter
N'el siecle vivre ne durer!…
Le jur que jeo vus enfuirai,
Ordre de moigne recevrai;
Sur vostre tumbe chescun jur
Ferai refreindre ma dolur.' (938–40; 947–50)

['Lovely one,' he said, 'may God never let me bear arms again or live or endure in the world…The day I bury you I shall become a monk; each day on your tomb I shall make my grief resound.']

Since Guilliadun is not in fact dead, Eliduc's plan to trade the secular world of the *bellatores* for the spiritual world of the *oratores* is somewhat premature; on the other hand, it helps further dispel the suspicions of impiety raised by the sailor's accusation. It is as if, in anticipating his final turn from the courtly to the spiritual, Eliduc redeems *in advance* the irregularity of a marriage that has not yet taken place.

Though Eliduc does in fact establish an abbey, it is not for himself but for his wife. When Guildeluëc revives Guilliadun, she is overwhelmed by the young woman's beauty. Immediately she decides to take the veil, expressly in order to enable her husband's serial polygamy:

Cungié li ad rové e quis
Qu'ele puisse de lui partir;
Nune voelt estre, Deu servir;

De sa tere il doint partie
U ele face une abeïe;
Cele prenge qu'il eime tant,
Kar n'est pas bien ne avenant
De deus espuses meintenir,
Ne la lei nel deit cunsentir.
Elidus li ad otrié
E bonement doné cungié:
Tute sa volunté fera
E de sa tere li durra…
Grant tere i met e grant aveir:
Bien i avrat sun estuveir.
Quant tut ad fet bien aturner,
La dame i fet sun chief veler,
Trente nuneins ensemble od li,
Sa vie e sun ordre establi. (emphasis added, 1122–44)

[She sought and asked his leave to depart from him, she wanted to be a nun, to serve God. *Let him give her a piece of his land to establish an abbey; then let him take Guillïadun, whom he so loved, for it is neither good nor fitting to keep two wives, nor should the law consent to it.* Eliduc made her a promise and graciously gave her leave: he would do what she desired, he would give her land…[H]e put much land and wealth into it: she would have whatever she needed. When everything was well prepared, and the lady took the veil and thirty nuns with her; she established a rule of life for herself and her order.]

Guillïadun's solicitude in facilitating her husband's remarriage is not only astounding but politically controversial, evoking yet another area of contention between the twelfth-century church and feudal aristocracy. The notion that a 'husband should be allowed to remarry after his wife had taken the veil,' suggested by Fulbert of Chartres in 1020, was subsequently 'strongly disputed by the Church councils and authorities, although it hung on in the popular mind' (Holmes, 'New Thoughts' 336). 'Canon law required that both spouses agree to abandon the marriage vow when one or both desired a life of celibacy,' even though, as Penelope Johnson cautions, 'in practice this may not have always been rigorously observed.' In some instances, canon law may have been violated, as in the case of Guildeluëc, by an assertion of female agency: 'The wording of some charters suggests that married women would function quite independently, choosing to leave marriage for their own reasons.' But, she notes, it is also possible that 'in some of these cases women's choices were not free if husbands were actually rejecting unwanted wives—those who were barren or no longer desirable—and forcing them into nunneries'—an observation that casts a more suspicious light on Guildeluëc's eager volunteerism.[31] In any event, by the end of the pontificate of Alexander III

(1159–81), 'two parties [who] had lived together [were] never permitted a dissolution of the marriage by entry into a monastery or convent' (Holmes, 'New Thoughts' 336). In other words, *Eliduc*'s easy solution to the dilemma of the two wives—that the first should take the veil so her husband might marry the second—is an 'option' tailored to the political desires of the feudal patriarchy that flies in the face of ecclesiastical opposition.

Under these circumstances, it is understandable that Eliduc's marriage to Guilliadun is quickly recounted in four lines (1145–48), with, significantly, no indication of clerical presence or sanction. Their married life is even more briefly dispatched: 'They lived together many days; there was perfect love between them' ['Ensemble vesquirent meint jur, / Mut ot entre eus parfite amur' (1149–50)]. The illegality of this union under canonical law—along with the political implications of this love-match between the Breton king's vassal and the daughter of the king of the Exeter—are minimized by the text's conspicuous refusal to narrate the 'meint jur' of their marriage. Instead, in yet another moment of generic discontinuity, the *lai* lingers over the couple's good works and their turn to religion:

> Granz aumoines e granz biens firent,
> Tant que a Deu se cunvertirent.
> Pres del chastel, de l'autre part,
> Par grant cunseil e par esgart
> Une eglise fist Elidus.
> De sa terë i mist le plus
> E tut sun or e sun argent;
> Hummes i mist e autre gent
> De mut bone religïun
> Pur tenir l'ordre e la meisun.
> Quant tut aveit appareillé,
> Si nen ad puis gueres targié:
> Ensemble od eus se dune e rent
> Pur servir Deu omnipotent.
> Ensemble od sa femme premiere
> Mist sa femme que tant ot chiere. (1151–66)

> [They gave great alms and did great good, so much so that they turned to God. Near the castle, on the other side, after great care and deliberation Eliduc founded a church to which he gave most of his land and all his gold and silver. To maintain the order and the house, he put his men in it, and other people devout in their religion. When he had prepared everything, he delayed no longer; with the others he gave and rendered himself up to serve almighty God. With his first wife he placed the wife whom he so cherished.]

Eliduc's abandonment of the world of the *bellatores* for that of the *oratores*, we remember, echoes the intention he announced before his marriage, when he

thought Guillïadun dead—a foreshadowing that, together with the sheer length of this concluding passage, helps mask the strategic *belatedness* of the protagonist's conversion.

If *Eliduc* is meant as a reaffirmation of the primacy of spiritual over temporal values, it is a remarkably ineffectual one. For the *lai* enacts a self-generating chain of contradictory compensations: the king of Brittany's betrayal forces Eliduc to take service with the king of Exeter; the mercenary nature of this bond is occulted by the mutual passion of Eliduc and Guillïadun; the limited term of his Exeter contract makes it possible for him to spirit her away without violating his loyalty to his overlord; his attachment to his patrimony and liege lord pulls him back to Brittany, protecting him from the wrath of Guillïadun's father; and their withdrawal from the world, after the 'many days' of their marriage in contravention of canonical law, places them in an unassailable moral position behind monastery walls. In the end, the *lai* makes two paramount concessions: in abducting Guillïadun, Eliduc apparently relinquishes any potential claim to her father's kingdom: the throne of Exeter will not be occupied by an upstart Breton baron. Second, despite his two marriages, no heir is born to perpetuate Eliduc's lineage. Nevertheless, the plot of serial polygamy—its illegality masked by the text's recourse to the intrigue of romantic love on the one hand and abandonment of the secular world on the other—naturalizes the monetarization of vassalic relations in late twelfth-century Europe.

III. CONCLUSIONS

In the middle ages, marriage was not only the institution through which the feudal aristocracy reproduced itself, it was the practice through which it conducted its politics, legitimized its ambitions, and expressed its desires. In Marie de France's *lais* of *Fresne* and *Eliduc*, the particular interests of two feudal barons—one portrayed as a good lord, the other as exemplary vassal—are served by the repudiation of legitimate wives in favor of more desirable second wives. To fulfill this plot, the *lais* paint a cynical portrait of the lay aristocracy's attitude to the church. Not content to represent nobles acting in quiet violation of ecclesiastical law, Marie conspicuously interpellates abbesses, archbishops, and arguably even God as witnesses and complacent supporters of Gurun's and Eliduc's love affairs and audacious marital politics. Religious houses are represented as places in which to seduce beautiful girls or to stash repudiated wives in order to marry younger and higher ranking brides. *Fresne* and *Eliduc* don't simply favor the aristocratic model of marriage over the clerical model, they represent the church as acquiescing to feudal dynastic politics

directly opposed to its own interests. Once restored to its socio-political context, *Eliduc*'s last-minute abandonment of the ethos of the courtly romance functions, I would argue in conclusion, not as a palinode but as quite the contrary: a bold assertion of the feudal nobility's freedom to conduct its own marital politics. But this 'freedom,' gained under the cover of a thematics of courtly love, is not without its victims: it comes at the cost of female sacrifice, in the form of Fresne's Griselda-like patience and the saint-like forbearance of Guildeluëc.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

Sharon Kinoshita teaches medieval French literature at the University of California at Santa Cruz. She is finishing a book on the romances of Chrètien de Troyes and is now working on representations of cultural contact in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article was supported by a research grant by the Academic Senate of the University of California, Santa Cruz. I thank Judith Haas for her excellent research assistance.

NOTES

1 In this polarized scheme, the *lais* of Marie de France occupy a middle ground: some of her twelve tales (*Guigemar, Yonec, Chevrefoil*) seem to glorify adulterous love while others (*Equitan, Bisclavret*) condemn it. Some lovers live happily ever after without the benefit of marriage (*Lanval*), some eventually legitimate their formerly illicit relations (*Fresne, Milun*), while others die in the attempt (*Les Deus Amanz*). Given the confusing variety of these plots, it seems impossible to say anything substantive about the literary 'ethics' of their author. Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner gives a succinct overview of the contrast between husbands and lovers in Marie's *lais* (251). She notes: 'Two male characters, Eliduc and Gurun, fall into both categories and consequently present an ambivalent picture.'

2 Philip repudiated Ingeborg the day after their marriage in 1193; twenty years later, in order to gain Pope Innocent III's support for his planned invasion of England, he was obliged to reinstate her as his wife and queen (Duby, *Knight* 204–06; Pernoud and de Cant). The church's own rule against consanguinity—the marriage between partners related within seven degrees of kinship—became the mechanism by which aristocrats appealed for the dissolution of inconvenient unions. The church responded at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 by reducing the prohibited degree of kinship from seven to four.

3 Deborah Nelson sees these two *lais* as linked by the theme of redemption through sacrifice: both Guildeluëc and Fresne, 'when faced with other women who desire to replace them,' show totally unselfish behavior 'motivated by the purest Christian

caritas' that insures their salvation and that of other sinners. W. Ann Trindade attributes their mutual resemblance to a common Celtic source (466–78).

4 For the complex relations between monasteries and lay aristocrats documented for twelfth-century Burgundy, see Bouchard. A gift (*donatio*) to a monastery was generally not a one-time only transaction: 'a social and religious exchange that could involve the donor's family, feudal lord, friends and neighbors, the saints, and God.' It often required the consent of one's relatives (*laudatio*) and was recompensed by a countergift—usually cash, but sometimes an animal or a piece of clothing—in symbolic recognition of the gift (67–93).

5 Quotations from Rychner (ed.), *Les Lais de Marie de France*, translations, which I have occasionally modified, from *The Lais of Marie de France*, trans. Robert Hanning and Joan Ferrante.

6 Note the intriguing slant this gives to attempts to identify Marie de France as the abbess of Shaftesbury, illegitimate daughter of Geoffrey Plantagenêt and half-sister of Henry II of England. Urban T. Holmes contested this identification as early as 1932 (5–6). In manuscript B.N. nouv. acq. fr. 1104, the abbess contributes to Fresne's eventual seduction by dressing her richly 'mult richement la vesteit' (after 234); hearing of Fresne's beauty, local lords come and petition the abbess to speak to her lovely ward (after 242). The same manuscript later emphasizes the expenditure of Gurun's marriage to Fresne (after 510).

7 On the importance of dynastic issues in the opening scenes of the *lai,* see Freeman (7, 10).

8 In a discussion of *Fresne* (369), Boswell writes: [f]eigned biological relationship is a common aspect of high medieval abandonment stories, suggesting that shame attached to being a foundling. (In this case, however, the abbess may simply have wished to obviate suspicion that Fresne was her own child.)' Historically, child abandonment was rarer in the eleventh and twelfth centuries than in preceding and subsequent periods (Boswell 276).

9 Here and in line 359, Hanning and Ferrante translate 'noces' as 'betrothal.' However, they translate 'espuse' (390) as 'new bride' (391), and 'li chevaliers...[k]i sa serur ad espusee' as 'the knight who has married her sister' (483–84).

10 Kupper 254. Kupper cites chronicler Renier de Saint-Jacques on the betrothal, in 1198, of Emperor Otto IV (nephew of Richard the Lionheart) to Marie of Brabant (great-niece of Philip of Alsace, count of Flanders): 'Ces fiançailles...ne furent célébrées 'ni par un évêque, ni par un prêtre, mais par le comte Guillaume de Hollande.' La remarque de Renier n'est pas indifférente. L'Eglise s'efforçait alors de sacraliser la cérémonie des fiançailles en veillant à ce que l'engagement soit accompagné d'une bénédiction. Visiblement, Henri de Brabant et Otton de Brunswick avaient tenu l'Eglise à l'écart, préservant ainsi le caractère profane du rituel: sans doute voulaient-ils garder, jusqu'au mariage, leur liberté d'action' (250–1). The actual marriage did not take place until 1214.

11 Situated just southeast of Mont-Saint-Michel, Dol was the northernmost outpost of the frontier zone between Brittany and Normandy, the site of Breton-Norman confrontations since the eleventh century (Cintré 15–20). At the death of John of

Dol, baron of Fougères (1162), Henry installed a Norman administration in this key stronghold (Chédeville and Tonnerre 87).

12 Brittany was striking for its ecclesiastical dynasties: in the tenth and eleventh centuries, bishops—often close relatives of the counts of Brittany and other great secular lords—routinely married and passed their offices down to their sons. While this practice obviously became a target for the Gregorian reforms of the mid-eleventh century, there is no evidence that contemporaries saw any need for reform (Chédeville and Tonnerre 241). That benefices were often inherited in both Brittany and Wales led Gerald of Wales to conjecture that it was an ancient characteristic of the British church (Bartlett 30).

13 'It is incontestable that by about 1185 Geoffrey's government was accepted by the Breton aristocracy, which appreciated the young duke's autonomy vis-à-vis his father. The future of an Angevin dynasty in Brittany seemed assured' (Chédeville and Tonnerre 84, my translation).

14 Constance was forced to marry Henry II's vassal Ranulf of Chester, viscount of Avranches. In 1199 she divorced him and married the Poitevin lord Guy de Thouars, who was faithful to Philip Augustus.

15 'In the middle of the twelfth century...the archbishopric would most likely have disappeared had not Henry II used his influence at Rome....for the archbishops of Tours, with their patrons the kings of France strongly in support, were persistent in appeals to Rome' (Warren 561).

16 On the Celtic tradition of ecclesiastical dynasties, see note 12.

17 Holmes, 'Further' 338. This, he points out, constitutes a misunderstanding of *affinitas superveniens*, a procedure that 'allows an unconsummated marriage to be dissolved if one of the parties *subsequent to the exchange of vows* has illicit relations with a relative of the other' (336, emphasis added). Holmes wishes to argue that Marie must have been a laywoman with 'only a vague notion of the conditions that surrounded this type of annulment' and not, as others have claimed, the abbess of Shaftesbury, who would have been more informed on papal rulings.

18 Citing a precedent from 1121 in which Pope Calixtus II 'ordered the dissolution of a marriage in Castile on the ground that the man had enjoyed carnal intercourse with a relative of his wife prior to their marriage,' she concludes that '[l]e dénouement de *Fresne* est en parfait accord avec les décrets canoniques du XIIe s.' (Maréchal 140).

19 François Suard notes analogous tales in Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and Flanders. In the latter two traditions, the heroine's name is Adelheid—nobility.

20 Bartlett 170–71. Cf. Gerald of Wales, who denounced clerical concubinage among the Welsh even though it was common in Anglo-Norman England as well (Bartlett 34–35).

21 Like *Le Chaitivel*, it bears a double title. Originally called *Eliduc* after its male protagonist, its name was changed, recounts the narrator, to that of the two women: 'D'eles deus ad li lais a nun/*Guildeluëc ha Guilliadun*' (21–2).

22 My analysis of genre-switching is inspired by Fredric Jameson's reading of the 'generic discontinuities' in Senegalese novelist Ousmane Sembène's *Xala* (80–84).

23 In a footnote, Hanning and Ferrante note that *soudees quere* 'literally means to hire himself out to fight for a lord in return for pay and maintenance' and translate *soudees* as 'service' throughout (196n.1). See also ll. 110, 118, 246.

24 In the message he sends, he asks that, should the king not want to hire him, he at least grant a safe-conduct to facilitate Eliduc's pursuit of employment: 'Avant ireit soudees quere' (118).

25 The one-year term limit is later evoked by Guilliadun's chamberlain (450–52) and Eliduc himself (524–530). In the Anglo-Norman domain, the distinction 'between vassalic knights, who were fighting free for the service of their fief, and paid knights' dates back at least to the end of the eleventh century (Duby, *Bouvines* 77).

26 The promise of gain figures prominently in the recruiting speech Eliduc delivers to the knights of the besieged town (189, 198).

27 The most thorough exploration to date of this topic in a medieval French context is Sarah Stanbury's 'Feminist Film Theory: Seeing Chrétien's Enide,' *Literature and Psychology* 36:4 (1990), 47–66.

28 On the prominence of the theme of loyalty in *Eliduc*, see Ribard (297–98).

29 The sailor's phrasing—'Femme leal espuse avez / E sur celi autre enmenez'—strongly echoes chroniclers' descriptions of Philip's marriage to Bertrada de Montford: 'Selon Sigebert de Gembloux, il fut maudit pour avoir «sa femme étant vivante pris pour femme en plus (*superduxerit*) la femme d'un autre qui, lui aussi, était vivant».' Philip's years-long struggle against Pope Urban II and his reformist clerics is the cause célèbre around which Georges Duby focusses the opening chapter of *Le chevalier, la femme et le prêtre*.

30 Fitz reads this murder as a Girardian sacrificial scapegoating (547).

31 Johnson adds: 'This, however, is unlikely, since the canonists forbade a husband to remarry while his wife lived as a nun, so to rid himself of a wife this way did not free a man to remarry lawfully' (31–2). Thus this issue of entry into religion and remarriage accentuates the contrast Johnson raises in her introduction between 'documents of practice' (primarily cartularies) on which she chooses to concentrate, and prescriptive 'documents of theory:' treatises, hortatory sermons, theoretical tracts (Introduction 7).

WORKS CITED

Bartlett, Robert. *Gerald of Wales 1146-1223*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Boswell, John. *The Kindness of Strangers: the Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*. New York: Random House, 1988.

Bouchard, Constance Brittain. *Holy Entrepreneurs: Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Exchange in Twelfth-Century Burgundy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Bruckner, Matilda Tomaryn. 'Of Men and Beasts in *Bisclavret*,' *Romanic Review* 81:3 (1991): 251–69.

Chédeveille, André and Noël-Yves Tonnerre. *La Bretagne féodale: XIe-XIIIe siècle*. Ouest-France, 1987.

Cintré, René. *Les Marches de Bretagne au Moyen Age: Economie, Guerre et Société en Pays de Frontière (XIVe-XVe siècles)*. Pornichet: Editions Jean-Marie Pierre, 1992.

Duby, Georges. *Le dimanche de Bouvines*. Paris: Gallimard, 1973. Trans. *The Legend of Bouvines: War, Religion, and Culture in the Middle Ages*. Trans. Catherine Tihanyi. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

————.*Le chevalier, la femme et le prêtre: le mariage dans la France féodale*. Paris: Hachette, 1981. Trans. *The Knight, the Lady and the Priest: The Making of Modern Marriage in Medieval France*. Trans. Barbara Bray. New York: Pantheon, 1983.

Fitz, Brewster E. 'The Storm Episode and the Weasel Episode: Sacrificial Casuistry in Marie de France's *Eliduc*.' *Modern Language Notes* 89:4 (1974): 542–49.

Freeman, Michelle A. 'The Power of Sisterhood: Marie de France's 'Le Fresne.'' *French Forum* 12:1 (1987): 5–26.

Holmes, Urban T. 'New Thoughts on Marie de France,' *Studies in Philology* 29:1 (1932): 1–10.

————.'Further on Marie de France.' *Symposium* 3 (1949): 335–339.

Jameson, Fredric. 'Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism.' *Social Text* 15 (1986): 65–88.

Johnson, Penelope D. *Equal in Monastic Profession: Religious Women in Medieval France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Joris, André. 'Un seul amour...ou plusieurs femmes?' *Femmes Mariages Lignages XIIe-XIVe siècles: Mélanges offerts à Georges Duby*. Brussels: De Boeck University, 1992: 197–214.

Kinoshita, Sharon. *The Feudal Imagination: Historicizing the Romances of Chrétien de Troyes*. Forthcoming.

Kupper, Jean-Louis. 'Mathilde de Boulogne, duchesse de Brabant (1210).' *Femmes Mariages Lignages XIIe-XIVe siècles: Mélanges offerts à Georges Duby*. Brussels: De Boeck University, 1992. 233–55.

Maréchal, Chantal. 'Le lai de *Fresne* et la littérature édifiante du XIIe s.' *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 35 (1992): 131–41.

Marie de France. *Les Lais de Marie de France*. Ed. Jean Rychner. Classiques français du moyen âge 93. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1966.

The Lais of Marie de France. Trans. Robert Hanning and Joan Ferrante. New York: Dutton, 1978; repr. Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1982.

Nelson, Deborah. 'The Implications of Love and Sacrifice in *Fresne* and *Eliduc*,' *The South Central Bulletin* (Winter 1978): 153–55.

Pernoud, Régine and Geneviève de Cant. *Isambour: la reine captive*. Paris: Stock 1987.

Ribard, Jacques. 'Le *Lai d'Eliduc*: étude thématique.' *Mélanges de langue et de littérature françaises du moyen âge et de la Renaissance offerts à Charles Foulon*. Rennes: Université de Haute-Bretagne, Institut de Français, 1980. I, 295–99.

Suard, François. 'L'utilisation des éléments folkloriques dans le lai du 'Frêne.'' *Cahiers de Civilisation médiévale* 21:1 (1978): 43–52.

Trindade, W. Ann. 'The Man with Two Wives: Marie de France and an Important Irish Analogue,' *Romance Philology* 27 (1973): 466–78.

Warren, W. L. *Henry II*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.