AN OFFPRINT FROM

SPECULUM

A JOURNAL OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

Vol. XXXVI October-1961 No. 4

THE COURT OF CHAMPAGNE AS A LITERARY CENTER

JOHN F. BENTON

THE MEDIAEVAL ACADEMY OF AMERICA

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

SPECULUM

A JOURNAL OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

Vol. XXXVI OCTOBER 1961 No. 4

THE COURT OF CHAMPAGNE AS A LITERARY CENTER*

By JOHN F. BENTON

The remarkable literary flowering of twelfth-century France grew from the fruitful meeting of representatives of different intellectual traditions, the collaboration of the laymen of the feudal courts and of those trained in monastic and cathedral schools.[1] This mixing occurred most often at the courts of great lords, either because authors met personally in that varied and changing society or because they wrote for an audience which they knew had sophisticated and eclectic tastes. Among these centers the court of Henry the Liberal and Marie of Champagne was one of the most important, notable for the education and patronage of its count and countess, for the prominence of the many scholars and authors associated with it in one way or another, and for the quality of its literary remains.

Ever since 1883, when Gaston Paris declared that it was a northern center for the dissemination of the doctrines of *l'amour courtois*,[2] the court of Champagne has interested literary and social historians alike. It is therefore surprising that there is no historical study of the court of Champagne more recent or more concerned with literary matters than that which Henri d'Arbois de Jubainville in-

* This article was originally prepared as part of my doctoral dissertation, "The Court of Champagne under Henry the Liberal and Countess Marie," submitted to the Department of History at Princeton University in May 1959 and reproduced photographically by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan. My gratitude to Professor Joseph R. Strayer for his supervision, to the Fulbright Exchange Program for making possible a year's work in France, and to many others is acknowledged in the dissertation itself. For this reworking I gratefully acknowledge the kind assistance of Mlle Jeanne Vielliard and the staff of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes for continuing to send me microfilms, transcriptions, and points of information, and of Professors Berthe M. Marti and William J. Roach, who read my article in manuscript and improved it greatly, without having any responsibility for its contents. The financial aid of a Special Faculty Research Grant from the University of Pennsylvania was most welcome.

[1] See the summary statement of Reto R. Bezzola, *Les Origines et la Formation de la littérature courtoise en occident*, 2: *La Société féodale et la transformation de la littérature de cour* (Paris, 1960), p. 129. The third part of this great work will cover the courts of the later twelfth century. Cf. the opinion summarized by Urban T. Holmes, Jr, "The Idea of a Twelfth-Century Renaissance," SPECULUM, XXVI (1951), 644.

[2] "Etudes sur les romans de la table ronde. Lancelot du Lac: II. Le Conte de la Charrette," *Romania* XII, 523.

cluded in his *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne* a century ago.[3] Literary historians have had to work with an insufficient knowledge of the court personnel, its administrative practice, and even of basic chronological data. The greater attractions of French studies over Latin and of romances over pious tracts and commentaries have led modern scholars to concentrate on special interests, leaving us without a survey of the literature of the court of Champagne as a whole.[4] Historians of mediaeval society have meanwhile often accepted without critical review the conclusions of their colleagues in literature about the relationship between life and imaginative writing at this particular court. In the absence of a historical treatment of questions of literary importance, a number of unfounded assumptions and loose generalizations have become a part of modern discussions of the court of Champagne.[5] A study which stays close to the available evidence may help to establish more firmly our knowledge about courtly literature and the society for which it was written.

The ways in which a court influenced literary activity can not always be easily established, but close attention to the authors themselves provides some useful clues. The major portion of this paper will be devoted to individual authors, classified in four groups according to their relationship to the court. Some few authors and scholars can be found among those who were in regular attendance at the court; a much larger number dedicated their works to the count or countess, wrote letters to the count, or mentioned the court and its rulers in their writing. A fifth section is reserved for those whose connection with the court is doubtful or mistaken. Such a classification is useful in showing that all the authors associated with the court were not uniformly intimate with its rulers. Dr Johnson's experience with Lord Chesterfield and his definition of a patron as "commonly a wretch who supports with insolence and is paid with flattery" are reminders that a dedication may be direct evidence only of the hopes of the author and not of the inclinations of the dedicatee; more evidence than a simple dedication is needed to prove a close relationship between a patron and an author. Probably an author who dedicated a work to the count or countess appeared at court to present his composition and to receive whatever reward was offered, but this does not mean that he was regularly a member of the court. The author of a letter, of course, may never have met the person to whom he wrote. Finally, it should be remembered that an author might mention the rulers of Champagne without being in any way connected with them.

The question of whether or not an author regularly attended the court is of

[3] 6 vols. in 7 (Paris, 1859–67). This was a pioneering work by a distinguished archivist at Troyes, but much more archival material has since become systematically available. I have been able to add over 150 charters to his catalogue for the period 1152–98.

[4] Recent studies concentrating on Marie are provided by Rita Lejeune, "Rôle littéraire de la famille d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, 1 (1958), 324–328, and Françoise Bibolet, "Marie, comtesse de Champagne," in *Almanach 1957 de l'Indépendant de l'Aube* (Troyes, 1957), pp. 64–73. I owe my thanks to both these scholars for their personal assistance.

[5] A representative though not exhaustive number of the opinions here challenged are cited in the footnotes in order to show the reason for considering some of these matters so fully.

great importance for this study, and only a fortunate combination of circumstances provides satisfactory evidence for an answer. Throughout most of the twelfth century the clerks of the court of Champagne concluded their charters with a list of the witnesses to the legal act described. Over four hundred such witness lists from this court in the second half of the twelfth century have survived in its well-preserved records. At places with different notarial practices, such as the royal court, witnesses were not commonly named, and as the evidential value of sealed documents became more generally accepted, even chanceries which had listed witnesses abandoned the practice. In Champagne, at the count's court, witness lists were usually omitted after 1187, so that, in spite of richer documentation, we know less of the administrative personnel of the court in the thirteenth century than in the twelfth.

The witness lists permit a thorough study of the nature of the court of Henry and Marie and of the persons who composed their entourage. Over six hundred people witnessed at least one court charter which did not apparently pertain to them personally, and some names recur over one hundred times. The frequency and circumstances of these listings allow us to know the names of a relatively small group of men who were often at court, and to differentiate those who traveled with the itinerant ruler, those who attended the court when it was resident near their homes, and those who traveled from a distance to attend its sessions. While men of importance and high social standing were those most likely to be named as witnesses, simply knights and clerics appear frequently, and even serfs, court menials, and burghers are listed occasionally. If, during the time in which witness lists are abundant, the name of a man of any importance is never recorded, we cannot conclude that he never visited the court, but we may be reasonably sure he was not a regular member of the court circle. It should be noted that the documentation of court personnel is rich for the period before 1181, fair from 1181 to 1187, and poor after 1187.[6]

A chronological outline introduced at this point will provide some biographical data about the rulers and clarify the following discussion of the court authors. Henry the Liberal, eldest son of Thibaut the Great of Blois, was born in 1127 and became count of Champagne at his father's death in 1152. Marie, eldest daughter of Louis VII and Eleanor of Aquitaine, was born in 1145.[7] Newly recovered evidence shows that their engagement was contracted in 1153 and not before, so that

[6] The validity of witness lists as evidence, chancery practice at the court of Champagne, and the locations and editions of the court charters are discussed in appendices of my dissertation. The number of charters with witness lists analyzed there is as follows: from Henry I (1152–81), about 370; from Countess Marie in the same period, 7; from Marie's first regency (1181–87), 32; from Henry II while in Champagne, 5; from Marie after the accession of her son (1187–98), 13. The figures are affected by the regrettable tendency of mediaeval and early modern copyists to omit witness lists, and by their apparent preference for recording the acts of men rather than women.

[7] Edmond-René Labande, "Pour une image véridique d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine," *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest*, 4th ser., II (1952), 180. This thoughtful summary is the best available presentation of the personality and career of Marie's mother. Unannotated material in this paragraph may be found in H. d'Arbois de Jubainville's *Histoire*.

one of Henry's first independent acts as count was to form an alliance with the Capetian monarchy which his father had generally opposed.[8] That the marriage had taken place by 1159 seems to me established by a charter of that year in which Henry referred to Marie as "comitissa sponsa mea" and "Trecensis comitissa." "Sponsa" could mean either bride or fiancée, but the title of countess indicates that the marriage had been solemnized. Marie's youth and the use of "sponsa" rather than "uxor" suggest that the marriage was celebrated not long before the charter was issued.[9] The later date, 1164, commonly cited for this marriage was proposed by Henri d' Arbois de Jubainville on the basis of the chronicle of Robert de Torigny, who said under 1164 that Count Henry "iterum assumpsit filiam Ludovici regis, quam prius dimiserat."[10] Since we know now that this passage is not a garbled account of the marriage, it may be evidence of an actual separation of the spouses, perhaps brought about by the count's temporary estrangement from Louis VII after the failure of the meeting between the king and Frederick Barbarossa at Saint-Jean-de-Losne in 1162.

After returning from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, Henry died on 16 March 1181, leaving Marie a thirty-six-year-old widow with four children: Henry (born 29 July 1166), Thibaut (born in the spring of 1179), and Marie and Scholastique, whose birth dates are uncertain. From 1181 until Henry II's majority in 1187 Marie had direct control of the affairs of the county; for some years she sided with her relatives in opposition to young Philip-Augustus, and at one point Count Philip of Flanders, another rebel, negotiated with the pope for a dispensation to marry her.[11] Marie acted again as regent after Henry II departed for the Third Crusade in 1190. When her elder son died at Acre in September 1197, his brother Thibaut had not yet reached his majority and Marie continued to govern the county until her death early in March 1198.

[8] H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, 12–13, places the engagement at the time of the Second Crusade and discounts the statement of the learned editors of the *Art de vérifier les dates* (4th ed., in 18 vols. [Paris, 1818–19], XI, 370) giving the date as 1153. The Benedictine scholars used charters which Arbois de Jubainville did not consult, so that he based his statement on a grammatical technicality in a late and unreliable chronicle. The two elusive charters of Count Henry, in which he notes that 1153 was "anno illo quo filiam ipsius regis affiduciavi," appear in B. N. ms. fr. 12021, fol. 13 r° and 15 r°.

[9] Professor Urban T. Holmes accepted the analysis of the implications of the charter of 1159 which I sent him personally, and conveniently reprinted the document in his *Chrétien, Troyes, and the Grail* (Chapel Hill, 1959), p. 18. Although the charter is known only in a late copy, the date is supported by a reference to Archbishop Samson of Reims, who died in 1161. It is gratifying to see how quickly and thoroughly Jean Misrahi developed the implications of the revised dating for Arthurian scholarship in "More Light on the Chronology of Chrétien de Troyes?," *Bull. bibl. de la Soc. Int. Arthurienne*, XI (1959), 109–113. Working independently, Professor Misrahi reached the same conclusions about Arbois de Jubainville's date of 1164 as I did in my dissertation, pp. 30–31.

[10] Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, 96.

[11] Both the negotiation of the marriage and its termination were surely politically determined. A contemporary explanation of the change of plans, that Marie granted her favors to the count too soon and had nothing left to tempt him into marriage, sounds like idle gossip and did not convince the chronicler who reported it. See William of Ardres in *MGH SS*, XXIV, 715.

I. AUTHORS WHO APPEARED OFTEN AT COURT

Although many authors may have attended the court occasionally,[12] the witness lists show that only a few were regularly in the entourage of the count or countess. We know for certain of only two authors who were often in the company of Count Henry, and both of these men were more closely attached to their ecclesiastical posts than they were to the court. Andreas Capellanus, who is discussed in the fifth section, may have been Countess Marie's chaplain, and Henry's chancellor may have been a literary man. An author might, of course, have talents which would recommend him as a court official; we need not conclude from these less certain cases that an author was given a court position because he was an author. The conclusion that authors were seldom regular attendants at the court of Champagne is not surprising; this was the normal situation at mediaeval courts.[13] If Henry or Marie wanted to reward an author with a living, the grant of a quiet prebend as a canon would encourage more future writing than a post at the busy court.

Maître Nicolas de Clairvaux (also known as Nicolas de Montiéramey) received his early education at the Benedictine monastery of Montiéramey ten miles from Troyes.[14] His subsequent career reveals an ambitious man with a talent for ingratiating himself with influential patrons. In his youth he was chaplain to Bishop Hatto of Troyes and conducted business at Rome for both Peter the Venerable of Cluny and Bernard of Clairvaux. In 1145 he abandoned his black robe and entered Clairvaux, where he became Saint Bernard's secretary. There he dealt with part of the monastery's voluminous correspondence, became adept at writing in the style of his master, and probably also composed many of his extant sermons and liturgical pieces. This productive period at Clairvaux ended in 1151, when Nicolas was expelled from the monastery for theft and the improper possession and use of the seals of Bernard and the prior. Bernard wrote to Pope Eugene III about Nicolas, denouncing him in the strongest terms.[15] With this letter a matter of public knowledge, it would seem that only unusual personal charm could have allowed Nicolas to advance his career.

After Bernard's death Nicolas received the favor of Adrian IV at Rome, by 1158 he was back at his old monastery of Montiéramey, and by 1160 he had become the prior of Saint-Jean-en-Châtel, a dependency of Montiéramey at Troyes. From then until his death some time between 1175 and 1178 he lived at Troyes,

[12] Walter Map, for instance, stopped at the court in 1179, without ever leaving any record of his visit in the local documents. See below, p. 576.

[13] See Samuel Moore, "General Aspects of Literary Patronage in the Middle Ages," *The Library*, 3rd ser., IV (1913), 369–392.

[14] On Nicolas see the summary of Augustin Steiger, "Nikolaus, Mönch in Clairvaux, Sekretär des hl. Bernhard," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-ordens*, XXXVIII (1917), 41–50 and the contributions of Jean Leclercq, "Etudes sur Saint Bernard," *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis*, IX (1953), 62–67 and "Les collections de sermons de Nicolas de Clairvaux," *Revue Bénédictine*, LXVI (1956), 269–302. Dom Leclercq very kindly sent me the proofs of this latter article before it was published.

[15] The letter is in Migne, *P.L.*, CLXXXII, 500–501.

where he appeared on occasion at the court of the count. As prior of Saint-Jean, Nicolas witnessed six charters of the count, all apparently enacted at Troyes. Count Henry made several substantial donations to Nicolas directly or to Montiéramey "pro amore carissimi mei magistri Nicolai." In 1160 Henry gave Nicolas the income from a house in the market place at Troyes, and in the next year he granted an income to Montiéramey from two houses at Bar-sur-Aube on condition that during his life Nicolas should have the income "ad facienda negocia sua." In 1170 the count recorded a grant to Nicolas of an annual income of one hundred sous at Saint-Etienne-de-Troyes; this probably had some connection with Nicolas' position as canon of that church. Henry made other grants to Saint-Jean-en-Châtel, which the prior naturally received, but the presents mentioned here stand out because they were of personal benefit to Nicolas.[16]

Nicolas dedicated two collections of his literary endeavors to Henry, each prefaced by a letter of eulogy. One, of which only the introductory letter is known, was a collection of letters which Nicolas probably presented to the count about 1161 and which he had recently written to the pope and other great people.[17] The other work dedicated to Henry was a manuscript which contained a group of nineteen sermons, some other sermons, a collection of commentaries on verses of the Psalms, and some liturgical pieces, including ten sequences. Nicolas' works show an author well read in the Bible and the classics, not an original thinker but a man abreast of the thought of his time, whose passion for style and rhetorical devices led to the repetition of clichés and commonplace quotation. They also show a man whose pretentious labors were not impeded by intellectual integrity. Nicolas mentioned casually in the letter introducing this second collection to Count Henry that it was his own work except for the contribution of others "paucis in locis." In fact, a number of the sermons were written by Saint Bernard and the commentaries on the Psalter were the work of Hugh of Saint-Victor, in which Nicolas changed only the words "frater carissime" to "comes dulcissime."[18]

In this instance we can see quite clearly the relationship between author and

[16] Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, 146–147, 457–458; his "Recueil des chartes d'Henri le Libéral," in *Trésor des pièces rares et curieuses de la Champagne et de la Brie*, ed. J. Carnandet (Chaumont, 1863), I, 282–283; and Charles Lalore, *Collection des principaux cartulaires du diocèse de Troyes*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1875–90), VII, 73–76. Maître Nicolas witnessed a charter of 1158 involving the abbot of Montiéramey, Aube 6 H 705. As canon, Nicolas established masses for himself at St-Etienne with an endowment of sixty livres. See *Recueil des historiens de la France: Obituaires*, ed. Auguste Molinier, *Obituaires de la province de Sens*, IV: *Diocèses de Meaux et de Troyes* (Paris, 1923), p. 529 B.

[17] Migne, *P.L.*, CXCVI, 1651–52. For the dating of the letter see Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, 199, n. 3. Nicolas' own estimation of his career is summed up in this letter by the statement, "ab ineunte aetate mea placui magnis et summis principibus hujus mundi." Nicolas compared Henry to Plato's philosopher-king, beginning his letter with this rephrasing, "Philosophus dicit: 'Ego tunc humanarum rerum statum arbitror esse felicem cum aut philosophus principari aut principes philosophari contigerit.' " William of Malmesbury also quoted Plato (*Republic*, V, 473), in a form closer to the original, when he praised the learning of King Henry I in *De Gestis Regum*, ed. William Stubbs, (London, 1887–89), II, 467. Nicolas' alteration of kings to princes was presumably intentional.

[18] An analysis of this second manuscript with identification of the borrowing is provided by Dom Leclercq, *Rev. Bén.*, LXVI (1956), 270–279, 300–302. I have prepared an edition of the sequences in this manuscript.

patron. Nicolas dedicated some of his works to the count and praised him fulsomely; Henry rewarded Nicolas liberally and addressed him as "dearest." Since Nicolas lived in Troyes he could attend the court easily when it was in town, and the two men may have conversed frequently and at length. But Nicolas did not travel with the court or take any significant part in its administration. One curious reference shows that at least once Nicolas acted as private secretary to the count. We have the reply to a letter which Nicolas wrote to Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux complaining about a young canon of Saint-Etienne-de-Troyes whom he charged with forging the seal of the count of Champagne to obtain a loan. In his reply Arnulf referred to a letter which he had received from Count Henry and thought Nicolas had written. In Arnulf's identification of the style and handwriting of the letter we may suspect a touch of sarcasm: "Porro littere ille stilum vestre peritie redolebant, apicesque his, quos noviter a vestra sanctitate recepi, identitatem manus michi certis indiciis penitus expresserunt."[19]

Pierre de Celle, one of the finest spiritual writers of the twelfth century, was another literary churchman who might sometimes be found at Henry's court. Pierre's life was one of contemplation, writing, and ecclesiastical administration. He was born into a noble family of Champagne about 1118, and in his youth entered the Cluniac priory of Saint-Martin-des-Champs near Paris. By 1145 he had been chosen abbot of the Benedictine monaster of Celle on the outskirts of Troyes, and in 1162 he became abbot of the important church of Saint-Rémi-de-Reims. In 1181 he was named bishop of Chartres, succeeding his friend John of Salisbury; he died soon after 1183. He has gained the attention of posterity, not for his administrative activities, but because of his spiritual writings. His education was similar to that of Nicolas de Clairvaux, and he knew the classics, the Fathers, and (first and always foremost) Scripture. Both Pierre and Nicolas wrote monastic sermons and spiritual letters, and in fact the two men had an extensive and friendly correspondence over doctrinal and exegetical matters. Their writings, however, are in striking contrast. Pierre had little concern for rhetoric, and though he could achieve the heights of poetry, it is not likely that he took much care to polish his writing. His letters are direct and forceful, with no trace of hypocrisy. Pierre does not parade his knowledge of the classics. His self-effacing stylistic goal was to write like the Bible, and his text is often a cento of scriptural words and phrases. Above all, he was a symbolist in the monastic tradition; Dom Leclercq has called him the Claudel of his time.[20]

Pierre dedicated a treatise on monastic discipline to Count Henry. The praise usual in dedications is of course present, but it is not effusive, and restraint lends it dignity. The subject of the treatise was of no particular concern to Henry, and it was actually written for a canon regular who had requested it from the author. Pierre made no claim that this work was written for Henry, and said that he

[19] *The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux*, ed. Frank Barlow, Camden Society, 3rd series, LXI (London, 1939), Letter 66, p. 117.

[20] On Pierre see Jean Leclercq, *La Spiritualité de Pierre de Celle* (Paris, 1946). For his style see in particular pp. 17, 53, 93, and 101. The correspondence with Nicolas is discussed by M. D. Chenu, "Platon à Cîteaux," *Archives d'hist. doctr. et litt. du moyen âge,*" XXI (1954), 99–106.

dedicated it to the count in order to add luster and make it publicly acceptable. He did not even say that he expected the book to interest Henry, but advised him to put it down as soon as it began to drag.[21]

Pierre's name as witness to six of Henry's charters between 1152 and 1178 is evidence of continuing contact between the two men.[22] Since ecclesiastical affairs could easily bring the abbot of Celle or of Saint-Rémi into the count's presence, these charters are not in themselves indicative of personal friendship. Dom Leclercq, who does not consider Pierre's restrained dedication an evidence of intimacy, says that his words "semblent ici empreints de déference plutôt que de véritable affection."[23] Henry made a few grants which favored Pierre as abbot of Celle, but they did not have the personal character of his donations to Nicolas. The one surviving letter from Pierre to Henry is a rather curt note dealing with finances, but in Pierre's correspondence with others the two men appear on good terms. Soon after Henry became count, Pierre wrote to the pope to support William of Champagne's candidature to the office of provost of Soissons, emphasizing how well he would be protected and supported by his brothers Henry and Thibaut. The abbot also acted as Henry's agent in writing to the Carthusians to support the count's attempt to get an outpost of that order to settle in his estates. In one of these letters Pierre stated that he was writing for Henry because the count was at the time too much occupied with his own and the king's business.[24]

The count of Champagne and the abbot of Celle were naturally brought together by their affairs, but we cannot see that the personal or literary relationships between Henry and Pierre were particularly close. It is noteworthy that Henry was the only layman to whom Pierre addressed a dedication, and probably Henry's education and interests were to some degree responsible for this. Henry may well have rewarded Pierre for the dedication, but literary patronage is not as clearly established here as it was in the case of Nicolas de Clairvaux.

Maître Etienne "de Alinerra." When writing about the controversy St Bernard had with Gilbert de la Porrée in 1148, the Cistercian monk Helinand de Froidmont reported that certain overzealous disciples of Gilbert and Peter Abelard later began to denigrate Bernard and the whole Cistercian order.

Quorum unus magister Stephanus, cognomento de Alinerra, dixit mihi, seipsum interfuisse illi Remensi concilio, et Bernardum nostrum nihil adversus Gislebertum suum praevaluisse; sed econtrario ipsum Gislebertum opinionem suam rationibus et auctoritatibus per omnia confirmasse: quosdam vero episcopos et abbates Galliae privata gratia Bernardi nostri somnium illius sententiae praetulisse, et papam Eugenium ad ejus damnationem induxisse. *Adjiciebat etiam* Bernardum nostrum eo tempore magnam confusionem passum fuisse apud Antissiodorum: ubi quemdam mortuum, quem coram omni populo suscitandum praedixerat, post multas orationes incassum fusas suscitare non praevaluit. Erat autem iste Stephanus de clericis Henrici comitis Campaniae, canonicus Bel-

[21] The dedication is in *P.L.*, CCII, 1097–1100.

[22] To the four acts cited in Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, 147 (in which, for no. 6 read no. 2) add Lalore, *Cartulaires*, VI, 40–41 and Cart. de St. Thierry, Reims Bibl. mun. ms. 1602, fol. 71 v°-72 r° (1162 at *Minziacum*).

[23] Leclercq, *Spiritualité*, p. 42.

[24] These letters are in *P.L.*, CCII, 438–439, 408, 472–473.

vacensis, et Sancti Quiriaci apud Prevignum, et exercitatissimus in omni genere facetiarum utriusque linguae, Latinae et Gallicae; avarissimus tamen; velut qui semper secutus fuerat otium, et cibum alienum: qui eodem anno quo mihi haec narravit, mortuus est, credo in ultionem sancti Bernardi, cui detraxerat.[25]

The search for Maître Etienne "de Alinerra," clerk of Count Henry and canon of Beauvais and of Saint-Quiriace-de-Provins, is inconclusive. The only Maître Etienne known to have been closely associated with Count Henry is a man usually identified in our charters as Maître Etienne de Provins, who was elected provost of Saint-Quiriace in 1169, replacing the count's brother William.[26] This Etienne was named as a witness in nine of Count Henry's charters between 1164 and 1174, almost all enacted at Provins.[27] He was also a canon of Saint-Etienne-de-Troyes, and it is possible that such a collector of prebends may also have been a canon of Beauvais. Maître Etienne became Count Henry's regular chancellor in 1176, and as chancellor he travelled about Champagne with the count, in contrast to his earlier stationary witnessing at Provins and Troyes. He accompanied Henry on his pilgrimage in 1179 and reached the Holy Land, but he is not known to have returned.[28]

Since a man might easily be known by more than one cognomen, a name associating the chancellor with Provins is no bar to his identification as the subject of Helinand's account. The name of "Magister Stephanus de Aliorra" appears in one of Henry's charters of 1161 as a canon of Saint-Etienne, and since Chancellor Etienne was also a canon of that church, a variant spelling of the cognomen given by Helinand would seem to have been found. In a charter of 1186, however, "Stephanus de Aliotra" is listed as a priest and canon of Saint-Etienne.[29] Possibly the variation of one letter here distinguishes two men; perhaps we have to do with a coincidence or a pair of relatives with the same name. But if Etienne "de Aliotra," alive in 1186, was the man named by Helinand, then that man was presum-

[25] *P.L.*, CCXII, 1038. Helinand's allusion to the story of Bernard's embarrassment at Auxerre suggests a much more scurrilous version of what is apparently the same anecdote, reported by Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. M. R. James (Oxford, 1914), p. 39. Walter visited the court of Champagne in 1179, the same year in which Maître Etienne de Provins presumably died and therefore the year in which he told his story to Helinand, if he was the one who did so. See below, p. 576.

[26] John R. Williams, "William of the White Hands and Men of Letters," in *Haskins Anniversary Essays*, ed. Charles H. Taylor and John L. La Monte (Boston, 1929), pp. 380–381. I see no reason why this Etienne de Provins should not have been a witness to the charter Williams cites in n. 104.

[27] Add to the references noted in Arbois, *Histoire*, III, 131: Elizabeth Chapin, *Les Villes de foires de Champagne* (Paris, 1937), pp. 282–284; Lalore, *Cartulaires*, V, 35; original charter of 1174 in Yonne H 198 (liasse); Marne G 1308 (orig.); and AN K 192 #212 (copy).

[28] Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, 133. Doubts that Maître Etienne the Chancellor might not have been the provost of St-Quiriace are allayed by references in the charters in Félix Bourquelot, *Histoire de Provins* (Provins, 1839–40), II, 400, and AN K 192 #71.

[29] Both of the original charters exist today. That of 1161 is in Aube 6 H 286 (liasse), and is printed in Lalore, *Cartulaires*, VII, 73–74; that of 1186 is in Aube 6 G 7 (carton 2). In Helinand's *Chronicle* the spelling "Alinerra" is that given by Migne and his printed source. The autograph manuscript of the *Chronicle*, once kept at the seminary of Beauvais, can no longer be located, in spite of a diligent search by the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes. Cf. *Comptes-rendus des séances de la Société académique de l'Oise*, April 1920.

ably not the chancellor, who appears not to have come back from the crusade in 1179. One solid link of identification could resolve these doubts, but at present our knowledge is unsatisfactory.

In the chance that the chancellor was the learned clerk of Helinand's story, some other information about him may be useful. Before he became chancellor Etienne de Provins appeared as often at court as other important churchmen who were not court officers but who were frequent attenders. He acted occasionally as chancellor before he took regular office, and since the count controlled appointments to prebends at Saint-Etienne and Saint-Quiriace, his positions there are signs that he enjoyed Henry's favor. During his life he amassed a certain amount of property including an oven, a mill and a field which he owned outright, a house at Provins, and a stone house near the count's palace at Troyes; this may support Helinand's charge of avarice.[30]

Whatever "clerk" Helinand had in mind, this student of Abelard and Gilbert de la Porrée, skilled in both Latin and French, is the most scholarly individual identified as a member of the court. J. R. Williams has suggested that he was the Master Stephen of Reims, canon of Beauvais, under whom the poet Gautier de Châtillon studied, and thinks it probable that he was a grammarian cited as Stephen of Beauvais and Stephen of Reims in the notes of a twelfth-century student of Priscian.[31] Unfortunately he was a scholar whose works, if there were any, have not survived, and all that we can say is that Count Henry had as a clerk a man with a reputation for learning.

Geoffroi de Villehardouin took the office of marshal at the court of Countess Marie in 1185. In the succeeding years his official duties must have brought him often to the court of Champagne, but he can in no way be considered a court author, for Villehardouin dictated his celebrated history of the Fourth Crusade long after he had left Champagne. It would be pleasant to think that the influence of a cultured court affected his later work, but there is no way to demonstrate this thesis.[32]

II. AUTHORS WHO WROTE FOR THE COURT

A sure indication of the importance of a court as a literary center is the list of authors who wrote for its patronage. Besides Nicolas de Clairvaux and Pierre de Celle, we know of a number of authors who addressed works (other than letters) to the count or countess, or who wrote at their command. Three of the pieces discussed in this section, the *Eructavit*, the *Venjance Alixandre*, and the song of Richard the Lion-Hearted, have dedications which do not claim that the person addressed encouraged their composition. The most effective demonstration of the literary influence of Henry and Marie is that Chrétien de Troyes, Evrat, Gace Brulé, Gautier d'Arras, and Simon Chèvre d'Or all acknowledged their personal

[30] For Etienne's property see Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, 134; Victor Carrière, *Histoire et cartulaire des Templiers de Provins* (Paris, 1919), pp. 46–47; *Obituaires de Sens*, IV, 477 C; and an undated act of William, archbishop of Sens, Yonne H 935.

[31] "The Quest for the Author of the *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum*," SPECULUM, XXXII (1957), 740–741.

[32] For details on the marshal and author see Jean Longnon, *Recherches sur la vie de Geoffroy de Villehardouin* (Paris, 1939).

intervention. This influence should not be exaggerated, however, since Gace Brulé wrote only one of his many songs specificially for Marie, and she was not the principal patron of Gautier d'Arras.

Chrétien de Troyes. After years of investigation all attempts to identify the author Chrétien with Chrétiens named in contemporary documents have failed to provide more than interesting speculation. A man named Chrétien appeared as a canon of Saint-Loup-de-Troyes in 1173 and another (or possibly the same man) was a canon of Count Henry's church of Saint-Maclou at Bar-sur-Aube. If it could be shown that either of these men was an author, or even that he was connected in some special way with the court of Champagne, some support would exist for an identification. Professor Holmes has constructed an ingenious argument based on handwriting to show that the canon of Saint-Maclou was the father of Countess Marie's chancellor Gautier.[33] Unfortunately this link of identification is not possible, for clear evidence establishes that the chancellor Gautier was a younger son of Clarembaud III de Chappes, viscount of Troyes.[34] We are left with no secure knowledge of the author Chrétien outside of that provided by his writing.

Two passages in his own works connect the author Chrétien with Champagne. The first is his use of the cognomen "de Troies" in *Erec* (l. 9); the second is the introduction to *Lancelot* in which he states:

> Puis que ma dame de Chanpaigne
> vialt que romans a feire anpraigne,
> je l'anprendrai molt volentiers
> come cil qui est suens antiers
> * * * *
> Mes tant dirai ge que mialz oevre
> ses comandemanz an ceste oevre
> que sans ne painne que g'i mete.
> Del CHEVALIER DE LA CHARRETE
> comance Crestïens son livre;
> matiere et san li done et livre
> la contesse, et il s'antremet
> de panser, que gueres n'i met
> fors sa painne et s'antancïon.[35]

[33] Professor Holmes discusses previous suggestions (including that of L. A. Vigneras) and his own research in *Chrétien, Troyes, and the Grail*, pp. 52–61. While I agree with him that Chrétien was a rare name (no witness of that name appears in the court charters of Champagne), I do not share all his conclusions about the identification of the author. When I wrote to him about the Chrétien, canon of St-Maclou, whose name I found in two charters (not from the court), I suggested that the problem of identity must remain uncertain until further evidence is found. Such evidence has not yet been produced. I can see no justification for Philipp A. Becker's assumption that a knight named Chrétien mentioned in the *Feoda Campanie* was the author. See his "Neues über Chrestien de Troyes," *Romanische Forschungen*, LX, (1947), 536–545.

[34] On Gautier de Chappes see Lalore, *Cartulaires*, I, 117–118; V, 57–58, 117–118; and *Obituaires de Sens*, IV, 238 F and 453 A.

[35] *Le Chevalier de la charrete*, ed. Mario Roques, (Paris, 1958), ll. 1–29. On the literary significance of this passage see D. W. Robertson, Jr, "Some Medieval Literary Terminology, with Special Reference to Chrétien de Troyes," *Studies in Philology*, XLVIII (1951), 669–692. On the interpretation of Lancelot note p. 691. But see also Faith Lyons, "'Entencion in Chrétien's *Lancelot*," *Studies in Philology*, LI (1954), 425-430.

This introduction alone establishes Marie's importance as a literary patron; it clearly informs us that Chrétien was in personal communication with the countess, that she encouraged him to write, and that she suggested the story which Chrétien developed. He therefore can be called a court author, that is, someone who wrote for the court. But we are not justified in calling Chrétien a member of the court. A thorough search of the charters of Henry and Marie has failed to turn up any mention of any person named Chrétien. This absence should not surprise us, since, as has been said, few other authors appeared often at the court, and then not simply because they were authors. In view of Chrétien's dedication of his *Perceval* to Count Philip of Flanders it may also be noted that no one has found any trace of the author's name in the numerous documents of the court of Flanders.

Since Marie was involved in the composition of *Lancelot*, one might expect the poem to be of great value as an indication of her literary and social ideas. Because the hero of the romance has an illicit affair with the wife of his lord and sovereign, it has often been assumed that the countess of Champagne advocated a new concept of love and commissioned Chrétien to disseminate a revolutionary doctrine.[36] It is not possible, however, to move directly from the existence of a romance about adultery to the conclusion that it expressed Marie's views. We are dealing with a literary work of subtle construction; modern critics have suggested that Chrétien's romances are as full of symbolism as mediaeval sculpture and that we must beware of a strong strain of irony.[37] It is not surprising that current interpretations of *Lancelot* are not in agreement,[38] since irony, symbolism, allegory, or other literary devices can be demonstrated convincingly only by reference to conventions independent of the story itself. I have suggested elsewhere that *Lancelot* is a humorous satire in which the hero reveals how an improper love turns him away from the ideals of Christian and feudal society.[39] This is not the place to develop such a thesis, and I mention it only as one possible alternative to the view

[36] This is one of the major theses of the article by Gaston Paris in *Romania*, XII (1883) cited above, n. 2. Its influence can be seen in a statement from the introduction to John J. Parry's translation of *The Art of Courtly Love by Andreas Capellanus*, (New York, 1941), p. 14: "The poem [*Lancelot*] is an elaborate illustration of the doctrine of courtly love as it was introduced into northern France by Eleanor and Marie. Here for the first time in Chrétien's extant works we find the glorification of the love of one man for another man's wife. . . . Chrétien clearly found the theme distasteful and left the poem unfinished."

[37] Reto R. Bezzola cites Louis Bréhier's conclusions about religious art and applies them to Chrétien in *Le Sens de l'aventure et de l'amour* (Paris, 1947), p. 6; D. W. Robertson, Jr, raises some most challenging questions about Chrétien's use of ironic humor in "Chrétien's *Cligès* and the Ovidian Spirit," *Comparative Literature*, VII (1955), 32–42.

[38] Mario Roques cites some of the views with which he disagrees in "Pour l'interpretation du *Chevalier de la Charrete* de Chrétien de Troyes," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, I (1958), 148.

[39] In my dissertation, "The Court of Champagne," pp. 236–245. Part of that argument was based upon an attempt to show that the proper names would have had meaning to an audience listening to Old French. Professor Roach has pointed out to me that *gorre* as a common noun is not attested before the fourteenth century and that *bade* occurs at this time only in the phrase *en bades*; I therefore withdraw my entire etymological adventure, while still feeling that ample evidence of humorous irony remains. Cf. Holmes, *Chrétien, Troyes, and the Grail*. p. 45–46.

that Chrétien's romance shows that the author or Marie idealized adultery. Rather than use a work of imaginative literature as a key to the social standards of a court, the more secure procedure is to investigate the historical evidence to see what light it sheds on literature. In any case, we should avoid hypotheses based on assumptions about the personal life of an author unknown to us. Jean Frappier has appropriately warned us against imagining that Chrétien left *Lancelot* unfinished because he was ordered to write a work unsuited to his tastes.[40]

Evrat. In 1192 a man named Evrat began to write a verse translation of Genesis at Marie's request.[41] The poem, which contains much commentary and incidental material, runs to over 20,000 lines and was not completed until after Marie's death in 1198. Of its author, active in a time when witness lists were no longer common, we know nothing except his name and the little which can be drawn from the poem itself. The learning displayed proves him a well-read cleric, and his fulsome praise of Henry the Liberal, Marie, and young Henry shows that he aspired to favor from the court. Evrat refers to himself often in the poem, but he gives almost no personal information in the process.[42]

Jean Bonnard, the only scholar to publish an analysis and criticism of this unedited work, concluded that it was not poetry but versification and dismissed Evrat with the judgment that Marie was not fortunate in her choice of an author.[43] Bonnard's evaluation of the literary quality of the work was accurate, for Evrat's style is banal and monotonous and he seldom achieves the rhetorical effects for which he strives. But, as Bonnard recognized, symbolic exegesis and moral applications were of greater interest to the author than the surface qualities of his presentation; it is therefore only fair to judge Evrat and, by extension, the taste of his patroness, principally in terms of his own intention. His announced goal is to lead his audience, both clergy and laity, to understand the significance of his Biblical material. Following the usual mediaeval practice, the text is presented with a gloss which explains the difficult words and concepts, explicates the symbolic levels of the text, and points out both hidden and obvious morals. In so doing, Evrat draws on previous commentators, and frequently cites by name Eusebius, Josephus, Bede, Augustine, and above all, Jerome. Other authorities

[40] *Chrétien de Troyes* (Paris, 1957), p. 124–125.

[41] "De la gentis contesse encor / Ki l'estoire en romans fist faire. . . . " There is an analysis of this unpublished poem in Jean Bonnard, *Les Traductions de la Bible en vers français au moyen âge* (Paris, 1884), pp. 105–119; the lines quoted here are on p. 107.

[42] There is some reason to connect Evrat with Le Mans, and possibly with the cathedral church there. The only personal reference I have found beyond the name is: "Se cil le peut metre en romanz / Ja par Saint Julien del Mans / S'anrme ne sera mais perdue / n'espoentee, n'esperdue." Paris, B. N. ms. fran. 12456, fol. 2 v°. Saint Julien was the patron saint of the cathedral of Le Mans.

[43] Bonnard, *Traductions*, pp. 118–119. The reader can judge the style from these opening lines:

> Cil ki toz biens fait commancier
> Soit a cest livre enromancier.
> Le prologes ici commance
> Del romanz q'Evraz enromance.
> Comment donc senz enromancier
> Ne peut romanz encommancier? (fol. 2 r°)

and traditions appear in his work, and much of Evrat's labor of over six years must have gone into weighing the different glosses available to him.[44]

For what audience did Evrat intend his translation? His references to clergy and laity and to his auditors suggest that he expected the poem would be read aloud to a group. But besides stating that Marie requested the translation, Evrat says that the countess, who would know how to understand and read his work, could read it in her library.[45] Presumably the author wrote with both the countess and her court in mind.

Evrat's commentary provides a slight but illuminating clue to the views about women which might be found at Marie's court. Not surprisingly, Evrat gives no approval to anything like "courtly love." God ordained marriage and created love between man and woman so that they might keep faith with one another, Evrat states, and no one, not even a monk or a hermit, should separate what God has joined together.[46] When telling the story of the Fall, Evrat compares the guilt of Adam and Eve. In a couplet he sums up his sense of a man's responsibility for the direction of family affairs:

> Hom doit avoir et sens et force;
> N'est pas hom cant femme l'esforce. (9 v°)

But though Adam foolishly allowed himself to be deceived, Eve's guilt was greater, for she had suggested the sin to which Adam assented. The author accepts Adam's excuse and reveals something of the influence expected from a wife by saying that Adam acted reasonably in believing Eve. Evrat's condemnation of Eve led him to make a few unchivalrous remarks about women in general. They are unable to hold back from doing something a man has forbidden; they extract secrets from a man and then quickly pass them on; if a man says anything which displeases a woman, never will he have any peace. It is true that Evrat may well have found these criticisms in whatever source he was using, that his comments are less bitter than much mediaeval anti-feminism, and that he hails the role of the Virgin in bringing into the world the remedy for Eve's sin. Nevertheless, that a flattering poet included any critical remarks in a composition intended for a powerful woman suggests that such comments were commonplace and could be made without exciting any particular attention, even at the court of the countess of Champagne.[47]

[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 105, 110–113. On Biblical exegesis see Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1952), and Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1959).

[45] "Quant la contesse de Champaigne / Ki bien lo sout entendre et lire / Lo peut en son armaire eslire . . . " (fol. 2 r°). Bonnard quotes a passage referring to an audience of clergy and laity on p. 110. Before citing a passage directed to auditors, Bonnard (p. 117) denied its significance by saying, "Une assemblée de barons n'aurait pris que fort peu de goût aux gloses interminables qui retardent la marche de son récit." One suspects that Bonnard has extended to the mediaeval audience his own dislike of allegorical explication. He does not take account of the tastes either of a learned layman like Count Henry or of his contemporary, the illiterate count of Guines, who listened to Scripture and understood both literal and mystical meanings. See the *Chronicle* of Lambert of Ardres in *MGH SS*, XXIV, 598.

[46] The passage is quoted by Bonnard, *Traductions*, p. 114.

Evrat's future editor will need to be widely read in Biblical exegesis, since the poem includes glosses, apocryphal material, and variations from the text of the Vulgate whose sources cannot be easily identified. Moses Gaster attempted to explain these puzzles by arguing that Evrat was a heretic and that his *Genesis* was derived from the mediaeval Slavonic *Palaea*, in which the Old Testament story was embellished with many legends and apocrypha which are part of the literature of Bogomilism.[48] If this hypothesis could be proved it would be of great importance, since it would point to a literary and scholarly link between northern France and the Eastern heretics and would call into question the orthodoxy of Countess Marie and the court of Champagne. But Gaster worked only from Bonnard's scanty analysis, and if he had read the text itself he presumably would not have made his suggestion. In addition, he was not sufficiently familiar with the Biblical commentaries of Western Christendom. He considered it a sign of the influence of the *Palaea* that Evrat includes Cain's murder by Lamech, the legend of Antichrist, the denunciation of arrogant clergy, the change of Joseph's sale price from twenty pieces of silver to thirty, and other explanations of Old Testament passages by reference to the New Testament. All of these matters are commonly found in western literature of undoubted orthodoxy, however, and we do not need the *Palaea* to explain their appearance. In one significant detail Evrat departs from the orthodox tradition: he places the creation of the beasts on the fifth day, so that Man does not share his day of creation with any other animal. Although this variant also occurs in the *Palaea*, the rest of Evrat's text shows that he was not following that version of Creation, since the *Palaea* differs widely from Genesis, and in all other respects Evrat follows the Vulgate faithfully and almost literally.[49] A fuller reading of Evrat's texts, moreover, demonstrates the author's orthodoxy. His continual references to Holy Church, his belief that confession in the Church wards off the Devil, and his views on marriage are enough to show that Evrat was not a Bogomil or even a Waldensian. The translation of the Bible into the vernacular was condemned by the hierarchy at this time because un-

---

[47] The commentary on the fall is on fols. 9 v°-10 r°. Evrat bases his greater condemnation of Eve on a hairsplitting distinction which is only made clear by the context of the comparison. The woman, he says, "consenti / lo mal ou li hom s'asenti" (9 v°). Mr Richard O'Gorman kindly aided me with a transcription of this passage.

[48] *Ilchester Lectures on Greeko-Slavonic Literature* (London, 1887), pp. 164–171.

[49] Evrat's decision to place the creation of the beasts of the field on the fifth day was deliberate and not a matter of confusion: "Tot ce fist Deus sens devinailhe / al quint joor, ce sachies sens failhe" (fol. 5 v°). In this point Evrat differs from the text of Genesis and from all the Western Christian commentaries I have read. But no other aspect of the cosmogony of the *Palaea* as analyzed by Gaster (pp. 28 and 154), including the creation of Satanael and the other angels on the first day and of paradise on the third, appears in Evrat. Gaster never published his planned English translation of the *Palaea*. Father Francis Dvornik of Dumbarton Oaks and Mr Ivan Korowytsky of Temple University kindly introduced me to the literature on the *Palaea*. Possibly the creation of the beasts on the fifth day came to Evrat through Jewish Biblical studies going back to the Hebrew sources of the *Palaea*. Cf. "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," xxx, 7–8, in R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudoepigrapha*, II (Oxford, 1913). There are suggestions in the *Zohar* that the beasts of the field were created at the same time as the flying and creeping animals. See *Zohar*, 34 and 47a, trans. by Harry Sperling and Maurice Simon, 5 vols. (London, 1931–1934), I, 129–130, 147.

instructed people might be led into error. Evrat's translation, on the other hand, presented a full commentary to insure that Genesis would be read with the help of the traditional and orthodox glosses.[50]

Eructavit. A third literary work written for Marie is a poetical paraphrase of the psalm *Eructavit cor meum*, number forty-four of the Vulgate text. *Eructavit*, as the poem is known, was written after Philip Augustus became king, and since the author makes no mention of the fall of Jerusalem when speaking of the Turks, it was probably concluded before the catastrophe of 1187. This would place the probable time of its composition in the years of Marie's early widowhood and regency. There is no claim that Marie requested the poem, but in the dedication and conclusion the poet addresses the countess directly and presents the work to her. He presumed to give the countess personal and spiritual advice, including the comment, rare in mediaeval works addressed to wealthy patrons, that she should avoid excessive generosity. This suggests that the author was familiar with the countess and was in a position of some religious responsibility, but there is nothing in the poem to indicate a positive identification of this spiritual adviser, who certainly need not have been a regular member of the court.[51]

Eructavit is artistically superior to Evrat's *Genesis*. The verse is clear and flows smoothly, and the metaphors, often extended, are picturesque and sharply drawn. In approach, however, the two poems are similar. Like Evrat, the anonymous author of *Eructavit* presented a Biblical text with an extended allegorical and moral gloss. His method was that of an exegete, quoting a Latin verse and then adding a paraphrase and commentary in French. Like Evrat, he took his material from a number of different commentators, and his most impressive talent lay in the skill with which he combined what might have been random comments into a unified presentation.[52]

The Forty-fourth psalm was held to symbolize the marriage of Christ and the Church. Saint Jerome used it as a text for a letter to the noble lady Principia, and the French poem with its comments on earthly marriage was probably considered especially suitable for a woman. It is a joyful psalm, part of the liturgy of Christmas morning, and the French paraphrase was built on a theme of divine love and joy. This emphasis on love and joy brings the vocabulary and phrasing of the poem close to that of secular love literature, reminding us of the interplay to be found between secular and religious material.[53]

Gace Brulé. One lyric poet belongs on the list of those who wrote something at Marie's command. The knight Gace Brulé began one of his poems with the statement that the countess of Brie had commanded him to sing.

[50] Evrat's presentation of the story of Tamar (fols. 118 v°-129 r°) illustrates these points about his outlook and his use of allegory to explain the text of Scripture.

[51] *Eructavit*, ed. T. Atkinson Jenkins, Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, 20 (Dresden, 1909). On *largesse* see ll. 7–14. For dating and discussion of the poem, see Jenkins' introduction. His attribution of the poem to Adam de Perseigne is discussed below, pp. 582–584.

[52] The sources have been studied by George F. McKibben, *The Eructavit; The Author's Environment, his Argument and Materials* (Baltimore, 1907).

[53] Particularly joyful is the commentary on "Afferentur in laetitia et exultatione" in ll. 1753 ff. The phrase "joie de la cort," so important in Chrétien's *Eric et Enide*, occurs in l. 34.

Bien cuidai toute ma vie
Joie et chançons oblïer,
Mais la contesse de Brie,
Cui comant je n'os veer,
M'a commandé a chanter,
Si est bien drois que je die,
Cant li plaist a conmander.[54]

In official documents Marie was always called countess of Troyes, but since she held part of Brie as her dower, the title countess of Brie could be used in a poem (when it helped the rhyme and meter) as properly as countess of Champagne. The argument which dates the poem and identifies the countess as Marie and not Blanche of Navarre seems to me reasonable but not entirely conclusive.[55]

Gace Brulé was one of the most prolific poets active at the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century in northern France. His poems, almost all about love, are usually addressed to a male audience of "companions" or "lords" or dedicated to a circle of noble men. They do not convey a feeling of personal passion, and, in endlessly celebrating the love of his lady, Gace gives the impression of writing to please his courtly audience. His great popularity in his own day is hard to understand critically when one reads through a book of his lyrics, but the same could be said for most modern song writers. His commonplace thought and expression are not so obvious, of course, when the lyrics are sung.

The fact that he wrote one song at the command of the countess of Brie does not make Gace Brulé Marie's court poet, or even indicate that he ever visited her court. The poem itself is a piece of polite and conventional flattery; its complaint that the countess did not return or even recognize his love was the sort of praise which a writer could tactfully offer to any lady. Gace's poems were usually not very witty, but the one line attributed to the countess turns the song into a piece supporting the crusading movement, in which Marie's son became one of the leaders. Part of the author's complaint is that when he wishes to plead his case with his lady, she stops him by asking when he is going overseas, "Cant ireis vos outre mer?"

This song is attributed to Gace by the manuscript usually known as *C* and by the author of the *Roman de la Rose ou de Guillaume de Dole.* In opposition to this strong claim, manuscript *T* attributes it to the poet Aubouin de Sézanne, who is considered in a later section.

Richard the Lion-Hearted, when he was held in captivity by Henry VI in 1193, wrote a song in which he complained of the slowness with which his ransom was being collected. The song, which up to that point had concerned his vassals

[54] Holgar Peterson Dyggve, *Gace Brulé,* Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki, XVI (Helsinki, 1951), Song LXV, ll. 1–7, p. 396.

[55] *Ibid.,* pp. 18–23. Except for the matter of Marie's dower, noted by Mme Lejeune (*Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale,* I, [1958], 325, n. 51), this model edition provides all the factual information given here on Gace Brulé. It is only fair, however, to warn the reader that Peterson Dyggve's statements about dating and identifications are sometimes surmises placed on top of probabilities. Robert Fawtier's opposing argument that Gace and Thibaut IV of Champagne were contemporaries has not yet been effectively refuted. See his "Thibaut de Champagne et Gace Brulé," *Romania,* LIX (1933), 88–92.

and subjects, closes with an address which modern editors give as follows:

> Contesse suer, vostre pris souverain
> vos saut et gart cil a cui je me clain
> et par cui je sui pris.
> Je ne di pas de celi de Chartain,
> La mere Loöys.[56]

This may be translated as "Sister countess, may he to whom I appeal, and through whom I am made prisoner, save and guard for you your sovereign worth. I do not speak of her of Chartres, the mother of Louis." Marie of Champagne and Alix of Blois and Chartres were Richard's half-sisters, and were at that time the only sisters who were countesses. The final two lines are clear enough in denying any concern for Alix, who was the mother of Louis of Blois, but the address to Marie is less easily understood. As it stands the text asks that someone to whom Richard appealed and through whose actions he had been captured might protect Marie. The poem as a whole is addressed to Richard's barons, and it is hard to see how these lines could apply to them or to such men as Henry VI or Philip Augustus. The editors might, however, have adopted another version of the text in which the third line is given as "por ce que je sui pris."[57] This change permits one to translate the passage as, "May he to whom I appeal because I am captive save and guard for you your sovereign worth," suggesting that the appeal is addressed not to any earthly potentate, but to God. In either case, we do not know why Richard should favor Marie over Alix, but the implications of the poem seem to be political rather than literary.

Gautier d'Arras was the author of two romances, *Eracle* and *Ille et Galeron*. *Eracle*, which concerns us here, is the entertaining and edifying story of a young man divinely endowed with a talent for judging the value of stones, women, and horses, who eventually became emperor and recovered the Cross from pagan hands. A sub-plot is devoted to the amorous adventures of an empress who, against the advice of Eracle, was too closely guarded by her jealous husband. The clear moral of this episode is that jealous confinement will drive even the virtuous wife astray. Gautier began his romance with praise of Count Henry's brother, Thibaut of Blois. He acknowledged broader patronage before he reached the end, where he stated that he had put his work into rhyme for Thibaut and also for Countess Marie and then praised Baudouin of Hainaut, who had led him to complete the work.[58] The composition is often dated about 1165, but there is not enough evidence to justify such precision.

Frederick Cowper has devoted much of his scholarly life to the study of Gautier d'Arras and his works, and has pointed out the likelihood that the poet was a well-known officer of the same name at the court of Flanders. This Gautier d'Arras,

[56] Karl Bartsch, *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français*, 12th ed. by Leo Wiese (reprinted New York, 1951), song 43, ll. 37–41. More variant readings are given in Hans Spanke, *Eine altfranzösische Liedersammlung*, Romanische Bibliothek, 22 (Halle, 1925), #CIX, pp. 201–203.

[57] Spanke, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

[58] *Oeuvres de Gautier d'Arras*, I: *Eracle*, ed. E. Löseth, Bibliothèque française du moyen âge, VI (Paris, 1890), ll. 1–94 and 6548–93.

a member of the family of the castellans of Arras, appeared in over one hundred documents beginning in 1160; he probably died or retired after 1184. His fiefs, his wife and children, and his court offices are known and show that he was an important and trusted member of the higher nobility of Flanders. This identification seems to me solidly based and entirely convincing.[59]

Professor Cowper's attempt to date the composition and associate it with Provins is neither so judicious nor so convincing as his identification of the author.[60] It is his thesis that Gautier's description of Rome as the setting of the story is really a lightly veiled picture of Provins and its May Fair. It is quite possible, of course, that Gautier's description of Rome was based on the urban life of his homeland, but the particular links which Dr Cowper cites with respect to Provins are not sound. His argument begins with Félix Bourquelot's description of the way the dome of Saint-Quiriace dominates Provins and reminds travellers of Rome, but he passes over the information that the present monstrous dome was built to replace the original tower which burned in 1662.[61] It is difficult to understand what connection Dr Cowper sees between Gautier's twelfth-century poem and the piece of the Cross and the Rose of Sharon which Thibaut IV brought back from Jerusalem in 1240. A round tower is prominent in *Eracle* and Dr Cowper says that the great square and octagonal fortified tower at Provins "presents substantially the appearance of being round." It is easy to disagree with this judgment. Dr Cowper's suggestion that the two feast days of the poem were Pentecost and Trinity Sunday is reasonable, but he is not justified in saying that they occurred "*just* before Saint John's Day" (italics mine). This statement is derived from the lines:

> Un cerisier ot fait planter,
> Dont ele souloit presenter
> Le dame un present chascun an,
> Devant le feste saint Jehan. (ll. 4236–42)

Such a general comment, which applies to every year as well as to the one in question and which does not say how close to the feast the present was made, provides no reason for searching for years in which Trinity Sunday fell on the Sunday before Saint John's Day, and the suggestion of 1166 or 1177 as likely dates of composition therefore has no basis.

Moreover, Dr Cowper's most important source of information about Provins, Bourquelot's *Histoire de Provins* (1839), is imprecise in its dating, and it is unlikely that many of the practices identified by local historians as mediaeval occurred in the twelfth century. And if Gautier was really "a good publicity man," as Dr Cowper suggests, would he have failed to make specific reference to the church of Saint-Quiriace-de-Provins when he referred to its patron saint?

[59] There are recent summaries of information about Gautier in the introduction to Cowper's edition of *Ille et Galeron* (Paris, 1956), and William C. Calin, "On the Chronology of Gautier d'Arras," *Modern Language Quarterly*, XX (1959), 181–196.

[60] "Gautier d'Arras and Provins," *Romanic Review*, XXII (1931), 291–300.

[61] Lucien Morel-Payen, *Troyes et Provins* (Paris, 1910), p. 132. There is a picture of the great tower at Provins on p. 125.

Neither the witness lists of charters nor Gautier's poem provide any evidence for associating the author with Provins. The date of the poem has not yet been precisely established. Countess Marie was only mentioned in passing, while Gautier praised his two other patrons extensively. The significance of the two lines relating to the countess should not be exaggerated.

Maître Simon Chèvre d'Or. The only author known to have written at Count Henry's request is Simon Chèvre d'Or (Capra Aurea), a canon of Saint-Victor of Paris. Simon composed a series of short poetic epitaphs for St Bernard (d. 1153), Hugues de Mâcon, bishop of Auxerre and formerly abbot of Pontigny (d. 1151), Suger of Saint-Denis (d. 1152), Count Thibaut of Blois (d. 1152), and Pope Eugene III (d. 1153). According to the heading given in the manuscript, these poems were written at the command or request of a certain Count Henry.[62] The Count Henry who would commission epitaphs for Thibaut the Great and the friends of his family was obviously Henry the Liberal. Presumably the poems were written shortly after the deaths they commemorate and in the early years of Henry's rule. The establishment of the identity of Simon's patron also allows us to conclude that the count of Champagne was the Count Henry who commissioned one of Simon's longer and more significant works.

Simon wrote three Latin poems treating the Trojan War. The shortest was probably the first and related only the adventures of Paris and the siege of Troy. The second was a more extended work of 430 lines which amplified the first and added a summary of the *Aeneid*. It was this second poem which Count Henry commissioned. It is probable that Simon wrote this poem for Count Henry before 1163, that is, within a decade of the composition of the epitaphs.[63] The third poem doubled the length of the second by adding a few episodes and some rhetorical embellishments. A note at the end of this manuscript states that Simon wrote an *Iliad* when he was not yet a canon, and that after he became a canon he wonderfully corrected and amplified it.[64] The manuscripts identify Maître Simon only as a canon of Saint-Victor, and no trace of him has been found in the records of that distinguished congregation.[65] Possibly at one time Count Henry appointed Simon to one of the prebends at his disposal, but there is no evidence of it.

Jehan le Nevelon or Jehan le Venelais. Among the most popular of the classical adventures was the story of Alexander, told in various versions in Latin and the

[62] The epitaphs are printed in Migne, *P.L.*, CLXXXV, 1251–1254, from a manuscript from the abbey of La Charité (Hte-Saône). The heading there reads: "Versus magistri Symonis, cognomento Capra aurea, canonici Sancti Victoris Parisiensis summi et celerrimi versificatoris, quos composuit precibus comitis Henrici." An eighteenth-century antiquary saw another manuscript which gave the same information in its similar heading, but which stated that the epitaph for Hugues de Mâcon was written at the request of the monks of Pontigny. See Abbé Jean Lebeuf, *Dissertations sur l'histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Paris*, II, (Paris, 1761), 262–263. Neither of these manuscripts has been identified.

[63] "Explicit Aurea Capra super Yliade rogatu comitis Henr[ici]." The date is established from external evidence. See André Boutemy, "La Geste d'Enée par Simon Chèvre d'Or," *Moyen Age*, LII (1946), 254.

[64] Boutemy, "La version parisienne du poème de Simon Chèvre d'Or sur la Guerre de Troie," *Scriptorium*, I (1946–47), 286.

[65] Fourier Bonnard, *Histoire de l'abbaye royale de . . . St. Victor de Paris*, I (Paris, 1904), 139, n. 1.

vernacular. A cycle of adventures was created, including two tales about the vengeance taken on Alexander's murderers. One of these, the *Venjance Alixandre*, was introduced with this praise of a certain Count Henry:

> Encor sera il bien du conte Henri loiez.
> Cil est sus tot le mont de doner enforciez,
> Sages est et cortois, preus et bien afetiez,
> Et aime les eglises et honore clergiez.
> Les povres gentils homes n'a il pas abessiez,
> Ançois les a trestouz et levez et hauciez,
> Et donnees les rentes, les terres et les fiez;
> En cuer de si haut home n'ot ains si grant pitiez,
> Ja ses pers de doner n'ert mes apareilliez,
> Des le temps Alixandre ne fu tel, ce sachiez;
> Quanque Diex a el monde li fust bien emploiez.[66]

This praise is very similar to a number of eulogies of Henry the Liberal, leading various editors and commentators to conclude that the poem was presented to the count of Champagne.[67] The problem of attribution and dating is complicated by a double reading of the name of the author, editors having the choice of Jehan le Nevelon or Jehan le Venelais. A number of men with the former name have been recorded, including the archdeacon of the cathedral chapter of Arras between 1181 and 1193. The name of Jehan le Venelais is unknown.[68] Neither name appears in the witness lists of the court of Champagne. Count Henry's interest in Simon Chèvre d'Or's *Iliad* supports the suggestion that the *Venjance*, an adventure story of antiquity, was also presented to him. It is likely that the author was not a familiar of the court of Champagne, and he may never have had any personal contact with Henry, if indeed the poem was written for him and not for some other count.

Count Henry of Champagne was the most renowned count of that name in his generation, but care must be exercised to avoid attributing to him more than his due. Among his contemporaries and neighbors were Count Henry of Bar, Count Henry of Grandpré, and Count Henry of Namur and Luxemburg. The recipient of the praise of the *Venjance Alixandre* was identified at one time as that Count Henry of Luxemburg who became Emperor Henry VII.[69] The *Venjance* was probably written toward the end of the twelfth century, and if this is correct Henry of Champagne is the most likely candidate. Proper caution must always be observed in making attributions, as J. R. Williams did when he noted that "ad comitem

[66] Jehan le Nevelon, *La Venjance Alixandre*, ed. Edward B. Ham (Princeton and Paris, 1931), ll. 46–55.

[67] Edward C. Armstrong, *The Authorship of the Vengement Alixandre and of the Venjance Alixandre* (Princeton and Paris, 1926), pp. 43–45.

[68] On the disputed reading, see Ham, *Textual Criticism and Jehan le Venelais* (Ann Arbor, 1946). He discusses the case for Jehan le Nevelon in the introduction to the edition cited above in n. 66. George Cary, *The Medieval Alexander*, ed. D. J. A. Ross (Cambridge, England, 1956), p. 31, shows the relationship of the *Venjance* to the other Alexander material of the period.

[69] For criticism of this view see Bateman Edwards, *A Classification of the Manuscripts of Guï de Cambrai's Vengement Alixandre* (Princeton and Paris, 1926), pp. 2–3.

Henricum" is found in the margin of one of the poems of Gautier de Châtillon, who dedicated his Latin *Alexandreis* to Archbishop William of Reims.[70]

III. AUTHORS OF LETTERS ADDRESSED TO COUNT HENRY

Most mediaeval letters have survived in collections made for later reference, instruction, or edification and enjoyment. The selectivity of time has been most harsh to that highly personal or ephemeral correspondence which was never recopied. The letters we have today show us that their writers looked upon their compositions as destined to have a large audience: the authors, who often kept drafts for future publication, probably expected letters sent to a court or religious congregation to be read aloud and perhaps preserved. This expectation of a large audience may explain why those letters discussed in this section often sound like contributions to the editorial pages of a newspaper. Simple business letters written without literary pretentions are not considered here; the dedicatory letters of Nicolas de Clairvaux and Pierre de Celle have already been considered.

Guido de Bazoches, one of the foremost Latin authors of Champagne, produced a collection of verse, a collection of letters, a personal apology or defense against his detractors, a tract on geography, and a world history which included his own experiences on the Third Crusade and was used by the later historian of Champagne, Albéric de Trois Fontaines. Most of the poetry and extracts of other works have been published, but Guido still awaits the full-scale treatment which will establish him as he deserves in the history of mediaeval Latin literature.[71] He came from the noble family of Bazoches, who were major vassals of the counts of Champagne and held the office of *vidame* of Châlons-sur-Marne. Guido was one of the canons prominent in the administration of the church of Châlons. He accompanied the expedition of Henry II of Champagne in 1190 and gave a place of honor to Henry I in his world history.[72] The fullest statement of his respect and admiration for Henry the Liberal, however, is to be found in his letters.

From the state of the unique manuscript it is difficult to determine whether portions of more than two letters to Henry have survived.[73] Letter XV of Guido's collection is a eulogy which compares Henry to the sun in an extended and involved metaphor. The burden of the letter is to thank Henry for some unspecified but important favor which the count had publicly given to the author. Guido concludes most of his letters with a poem for his correspondent, and this letter ends with a gracious little poem of gratitude.[74]

[70] See his article cited above (n. 31), SPECULUM, XXXII (1957), 741 and n. 50.

[71] Carter G. Jefferis, in his "Guido de Bazoches," University of California (Berkeley) doctoral dissertation deposited February 1948, was unfortunately unable to make use of unpublished materials. For a convenient summary on Guido see Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1911–31), III, 914–920.

[72] "Palatinus Campanie comes Henricus florebat in Francia, quin potius illa per illum . . . " Paris, B. N. ms. lat. 4998, fol. 63 v°. This passage was quoted almost exactly by Albéric de Troisfontaines, *MGH SS*, XXIII, 847.

[73] The manuscript of these letters, possibly corrected by the author himself, is in the National Library of Luxemburg. The two letters to Count Henry are on the folios now numbered 45–49. Portions of the second letter are printed by W. Wattenbach, "Aus den Briefen des Guido von Bazoches," *Neues Archiv*, XVI (1891), 79–81.

The next entry, labeled number XVI, is also addressed to Count Henry. It is interrupted at the end of the first folio, leaving a break where at least one leaf is missing. The continuation has been copied in a different hand and also breaks off at the end of a leaf. The content shows that the continuation is addressed to Henry the Liberal, but there is no way to determine if it truly continues the first part or is a section of another letter. The first part is largely occupied with a denunciation of one of Count Henry's knights who had attacked and devastated a religious house of the Parisian monastery of Saint-Martin-des-Champs whose care had been committed to Guido. If a letter of Alexander III refers to the same event, this passage shows that the letter was composed about 1171.[75] The second section is devoted to genealogy. With a great show of learning, Guido traced Henry's ancestry along different lines to Clovis, Charlemagne, Henry I of Germany, Robert of France, and William the Conqueror. One wonders if Guido had been commissioned to produce this genealogy or if the idea was his own. The genealogy of the house of Champagne had its political importance, for by the marriage of Henry's sister Adèle to Louis VII the blood line of the Carolingians was united with that of Hugh Capet. Most of the genealogy stands the test of modern criticism and demonstrates considerable historical knowledge, though the relationship with Henry of Germany was based on an erroneous identification.[76]

John of Salisbury's letter to Henry provides our surest evidence of the count's own theological and literary interests. Fortunately, John's lengthy epistle contains a review of the circumstances which led to his writing. In 1165–66 the noted English scholar and supporter of Thomas Becket was exiled from England and was staying at Reims with his old friend Pierre de Celle. He was there sought out by a certain Albéric de Reims, also called Albéric de la Porte de Venus, who came accompanied by several learned men to pose some questions on divine letters and

---

[74] Quo candore nivem, quo munere floris aprilem,
Qua potero tamen luce iuvare diem?
Set iuvat ora tuis michi laudibus esse minora,
Nilque tuis laudes addere posse meas.
Hoc tamen, hoc unum, si quid valet amplius addi,
Addi posse nichil laudibus adde tuis.
Te tua poscenti semper manus obvia talem
Esse vel a tali reddit abesse parum.
Talem te probitas morum probat esse tuorum
Et genus et genere mens generosa magis.
Talis es et talis dici credique mereris.
Talem te vatum multa talia canit. (fol. 47a)

[75] In a letter of 11 July 1171 or 1172 the pope wrote to Archbishop Henry of Reims: "Conquerente nobis G. Catalaunensi canonico accepimus quod Wermundus miles, nepos archidiaconi, ipsum et homines villae de Alneto, irrationabiliter depraedatus, eis damna gravia irrogavit." See Migne, *P.L.*, cc, 838–839). One place which bore the name *Alnetum* is Annet-sur-Marne, near Meaux, which was a priory of St-Martin-des-Champs. See L. H. Cottineau, *Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés*, 2 vols. (Mâcon, 1939), *s.v.*

[76] The genealogy is printed with notes by Wattenbach, *loc. cit.*, pp. 79–81. It is an open question whether Guillaume le Breton had the lineage of Adèle de Champagne in mind when he called her son "Karolide" in his *Philippide*, ed. H. François Delaborde (Paris, 1885), prologue, l. 28.

philosophical matters on Henry's behalf. John stated that he was astounded and had refused to believe in the sincerity of the mission until Pierre de Celle, then abbot of Saint-Rémi-de-Reims, had told him that Henry was not given to joking in these matters and had testified to the great pleasure which the count took in discussing literary subjects with learned men. John added that Pierre, whom he called Henry's most faithful and devoted friend, had whispered in his ear that Henry took such pleasure in his studies that he often displeased those whom affairs had brought to his court, "vos inde saepissime imperitae multitudinis offensam contrahere, quia vos a studendi exercitio nequeunt revocare, et pro arbitrio suo negotiorum et tumultuum procellis immergere."[77]

The queries which Henry directed to this learned visitor show something of the intellectual and literary matters which interested the count. These are his questions, of which John answered only the first three:

1. What do you believe to be the number of books in the Old and New Testaments?
2. Who were their authors?
3. What is the Table of the Sun seen in the sand by the philosopher Apollonius, mentioned by Jerome in his letter on Holy Scripture to the priest Paulinus?
4. What are the centos of Vergil and Homer mentioned in the same letter?
5. What is the source and meaning of the oft-quoted statement, "Those things which do not exist are more God-like than those things which do exist" (*Deiformiora sunt ea quae non sunt, quam ea quae sunt*)?

The third and fourth questions arose from a well-known letter on Scripture by Saint Jerome, and the first two may also have been suggested by this letter, which comments on each of the books of the Bible and their authors.[78] As far as he went John answered clearly and simply, treating the questions as those of a novice and not of an intellectual equal. The third and fourth questions do indeed show that Henry's knowledge of classical literature was not deep. The first two questions may also have been a request for simple information which should have been easily available to Henry, but on the other hand they may have been asking for John's personal opinion about a matter on which patristic authors did not agree. The fifth question, however, shows that Henry's queries were not all superficial. The statement about which the count wanted more information is philosophically sophisticated and may have been derived from the writing of John the Scot (Eriugena).[79] That such a doctrine was a subject of discussion at the court of

[77] *P.L.*, CIC, 124. The full letter is on cols. 123–31.

[78] Saint Jérôme, *Lettres*, ed. Jérôme Labourt, 6 vols. (Paris, 1949–1958), III, letter LIII, pp. 8–25, esp. 9 and 16.

[79] The word *deiformis* and its derivatives are rare. John the Scot used it to translate θεοειδής and ἀγαθοειδής in *De caelesti hierarcha* of Denis the pseudo-Areopagite; see P. G. Théry, "Scot Érigène traducteur de Denys," *Bulletin du Cange*, VI (1931), 246. Although I have not found the phrase quoted by Count Henry in John the Scot's work, it may well have been derived from his theology. *De caelesti hierarcha*, which greatly influenced John, is ordered by the degree to which its subjects are "deiformis" or "in Dei similitudinem;" in his own *De divisione naturae* John distinguishes between the classes of "ea quae sunt et quae non sunt" and says that insofar as inferior beings are unable to know them, God and the celestial orders are in the class of non-being. See Migne, *P.L.*, CXXII, 1049–50 and 413–414. I am indebted for the suggestion that the quotation in question might be in the work of John the Scot to Prof. P. O. Kristeller.

Champagne indicates that Henry was a serious student of affairs not usually cultivated by laymen. The letter gives no sign of personal or literary familiarity between the two men. John did not know Henry's interests from personal experience and controlled his amazement only after Pierre de Celle's explanation.

Herbert of Boscham. Further evidence of Count Henry's interest in Biblical and doctrinal matters is provided by a letter from another English scholar, Herbert of Boscham, who served for a time as personal secretary to Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury. The text of Herbert's letter has been preserved in a late copy which omits any address or explanation of the circumstances of its composition.[80] The letter discusses a complicated question of Biblical criticism which arises from different lists of the women who were present at the Crucifixion, since the Gospel of John names three Marys and that of Mark has the name of Salome in place of one of the Marys. These texts have been the subject of heated discussion since they were used in the fourth century by Helvidius to question the virginity of the mother of the Lord. Saint Jerome replied to Helvidius in an extended tract which dealt with these passages, and they have naturally received many other commentaries.[81] Herbert's own discussion of the identity of Salome and the three Marys begins with Jerome, cites among others Bede, Origen, and John Chrysostom, and concludes with the tradition related by a certain brother named Master William who knew a church dedicated to the Three Marys.

Although we do not know why Herbert of Boscham wrote this letter to Count Henry, it is reasonable to assume that he, like John of Salisbury, was answering a question posed by the count. Herbert was an able Biblical commentator who had a command of Hebrew.[82] His service to the exiled archbishop of Canterbury brought him to the neighborhood of Henry's domains and to the count's attention. In 1166–67 Herbert wrote a number of letters pleading Becket's case which were to be sent in the name of various French dignitaries. This activity explains why a letter supporting Archbishop Thomas, written in the name of Count Henry of Troyes to Pope Alexander, was included in a collection of Herbert's correspondence.[83] Perhaps the little Biblical commentary was a gracious return by Herbert for the help which the count had rendered his patron.

Philippe de Harveng, first prior and then abbot of the Premonstratensian monastery of Bonne-Espérance near Cambrai, was the author of a handbook on the training of the clergy, a commentary on the Song of Songs, some verse, saints' lives, and other pieces. One letter in his collected correspondence is directed to a

[80] British Museum, Royal MS. 6 E III, fols. 250^{b}-251. Gerald I. Bonner, Assistant Keeper of Manuscripts at the British Museum, kindly sent me photostats and a description of the manuscript. The letter does not appear in Herbert's *Opera Omnia*, ed. J. A. Giles, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1845–46).

[81] Jerome, *De Perpetua Virginitate B. Marie adversus Helvidium*, *P.L.*, XXIII, 193–216. Helvidius was also challenged by Augustine and Isidore.

[82] Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, pp. 186–195.

[83] Herbert also wrote letters in the name of Bishop Etienne of Meaux and of Mathieu, precentor of Sens, who appeared often at Henry's court. See J. C. Robertson, ed., *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, (London, 1875–85), VI, 38–44, 140–143. About this time Pope Alexander III recommended Herbert to the bishop of Troyes to fill the office of provost left open by the resignation of William of Champagne. See Jules Mathorez, "Guillaume aux Blanches-Mains," *Revue des Archives Historiques du Diocèse de Chartres*, 1912, p. 197.

layman named Henry. The existing text has no more informative address, but all commentators agree that it was written to Count Henry of Champagne.[84] The father of the person addressed is praised for his liberality, which would apply to Thibaut the Great, who supported both Saint Bernard and the founder of the Premonstratensian order, Saint Norbert. The letter lauds its subject for his learning, which surpasses that of other counts, for his support of the clerical order, and for his foundation of collegiate churches. Everything in the letter accords perfectly with what we know of Count Henry the Liberal and is similar to other eulogies which he received. But we are not justified in going beyond the letter to say that Philippe de Harveng was one of Henry's counselors.[85] Nothing in the letter suggests a personal relationship or that the author had even seen the count. Perhaps Philippe wrote in recognition or in hope of some particular liberality, or perhaps his letter shows only that he felt it beneficial to praise the uncommon learning and clerical orientation of a layman.

IV. AUTHORS WHO WROTE ABOUT THE COURT

The historian's search for references to Henry and Marie in contemporary writing produces a harvest rich in number though limited in what it reveals of their character and daily life. The rulers of Champagne were important and powerful people, and the authors of their day wrote about them either from hope of favor or simply because the subject was naturally interesting. Collectors of *exempla* related anecdotes about them, chroniclers recorded their deeds, and poets mourned their deaths or heralded their names. This section is not a catalogue of mediaeval references to the count and countess; it records those contemporary authors, not discussed elsewhere, whose comments on Henry and Marie are of greatest literary interest. It should be noted, however, that any princely family might have been the subject of similar references, and that these accounts and allusions were not the product of the literary interests or patronage of the count and countess.

Walter Map, the English courtier and author, attended the Third Lateran Council in 1179. On his way to Italy from England, Walter enjoyed the hospitality of Count Henry and conversed with him, as he reported later, about the proper limits of generosity. In this instance, since we know the reason for the journey, we can see that literary concerns were not responsible for bringing a famous author to Henry's court. This visit may have been the occasion for an exchange of anecdotes with a local raconteur, since both Walter and Henry's clerk, Maître Etienne, related scurrilous stories about Saint Bernard which seem to be versions of the same tale.[86]

Pierre Riga, who later wrote a versified and moralized version of the Bible in Latin, came from the region of Reims. In 1165, when Pierre was a student in

[84] Philippe's works are collected in *P.L.*, CCIII; the letter to Henry is in cols. 151–156. For a discussion of the abbot's life and works see G. P. Sijen, "Philippe de Harveng," *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, XIV (1938), 37–52, 189–208.

[85] As John Mahoney does in *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, XXXI (1955), 167.

[86] Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. M. R. James, pp. 225–226. See above, n. 25.

Paris, Adèle of Champagne, Count Henry's sister, bore a son to Louis VII and thereby assured succession to the throne. A poem on the birth of this child has been attributed to Pierre Riga, who had previously written a collection of verse for the archbishop of Reims. This poem concludes with an account of the way in which gifts were presented when the joyful news was announced, and pays special attention to the pre-eminent generosity of a Count Henry. Everything accords with the reputation and position of Henry the Liberal, and the assumption that the audience would understand this as a reference to the count of Champagne is safe.[87]

Guiot de Provins. Both Henry the Liberal and his eldest son are mentioned in passing in an extended poem by Guiot de Provins. Guiot was a successful poet who traveled widely in courtly circles. He eventually left the world and entered monastic life, first at Clairvaux and then at Cluny. Around 1206 he wrote a long composition, known as his *Bible,* which contains a list of great lords whom he had known and who were then dead. Over eighty lords are mentioned, including Count Henry of Champagne, "li plus larges hom dou mont," and young Count Henry, who went overseas.[88] It should be noted again in passing that these references do not show that the counts of Champagne were particular patrons of the poet.

Huon III d'Oisy, castellan of Cambrai and viscount of Meaux, was one of the great vassals of the county of Champagne. Around 1189 Huon wrote two poetic compositions, one clearly a crusading song and the other a strange piece called the *Tournoiement des dames.* This poem recounts the events of an imagined tournament held near Lagny in western Champagne at which all the contestants were noble ladies of the north of France. The theme of the poem is apparently political satire on behalf of the crusade. The countess of Champagne, identified by the date of composition as Marie, appears briefly in the tournament and performs in an honorable fashion.[89] Huon's two major offices show the close feudal ties between Champagne and Flanders and his poetry illustrates some of the literary talents and interests to be found among highly placed laymen.

Conon de Béthune, a pupil in song-writing of Huon d'Oisy, wrote vernacular verse for courtly audiences. In one well-known song Conon wrote of the criticism he had received from Queen Adèle and her son King Philip because his language was that of Artois. The poet was particularly sensitive to this reproach, he said, because people from Champagne, including the countess, were present. At one time or another Conon could be found at a number of northern courts and he is listed as a vassal of Champagne in one of the registers of the fiefs of the county. The poem cited here does not show that Marie was a patroness of the author; her

[87] H. François Delaborde, "Un poème de Pierre Riga sur la naissance de Philippe-Auguste," in *Notices et Documents publiés pour la Société de l'Histoire de France* (Paris, 1884), pp. 121–127. On Pierre see Manitius, *Geschichte,* III, 820–831.

[88] *Bible,* ll. 324–325 and 349–350 in *Les Oeuvres de Guiot de Provins,* ed. John Orr (Manchester, 1915).

[89] Alfred Jeanroy, "Notes sur le *Tournoiement des dames,*" *Romania,* XXVIII (1899), ll. 82–89, p. 242. On the identification of Marie see H. Petersen Dyggve, "Les dames du 'Tournoiement' de Huon d'Oisi," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen,* XXXV (1935), 72.

role in the poem is simply that of an important visitor to the royal court, which Conon was also attending.[90]

Verse by anonymous authors. Three poems or songs honoring the house of Champagne in this period have been preserved in collections which do not identify their authors. Two of these are funeral elegies, one for Marie and Henry II, who died within months of each other, and the other for Henry the Liberal. The third calls for support for the crusading movement, laments the fall of Jerusalem, and hails Henry II of Champagne for alone sustaining hope in the Holy Land. All three of these poems are of mediocre quality and conventional in their praise. Marie is called a model widow and Henry the Liberal is lauded, as usual, as an exemplar of generosity. The author of the elegy for Henry I regrets that Philip Augustus was not goverened by his uncle, to which cause he attributes the troubles of the kingdom.[91]

V. AUTHORS WHOSE ASSOCIATION WITH THE COURT IS DOUBTFUL OR ERRONEOUS

Andreas Capellanus. The identification of Andreas Capellanus, author of the celebrated treatise *De Amore*, as the chaplain of Countess Marie is so commonly repeated that it is easy to forget the uncertain nature of the evidence and the doubts of a number of critics. The present discussion is not intended to assert that the author Andreas was not or could not have been Marie's chaplain, but simply to show that the question is still open.

Within the text of *De Amore* Andreas refers indirectly to himself as chaplain of the royal court. The incipit of MS. C (thirteenth century?) calls the author "Andreas capelanus [*sic*] regis francie" and the explicit of F (fifteenth century) repeats this statement. The incipit of D (fourteenth century) identifies him as "magister Andreas francorum aulae regie capellanus;" it concludes with the statement: "editum a magistro Andrea regine capellano." Another mediaeval tradition, demonstrably unreliable, identifies Andreas as the chaplain of Innocent IV. The weightiest evidence, therefore, places the author at the royal court of France.[92] If we could find a chaplain named Andreas attending the king or queen about the time *De Amore* was composed, we could reasonably think the author had been discovered.

Since *De Amore* contains a letter dated 1174, this year is the *terminus a quo*.

[90] *Les Chansons de Conon de Béthune*, ed. Axel Wallensköld (Paris, 1921), song III, p. 5. For Conon's vassalage see Auguste Longnon, *Documents relatifs au comté de Champagne et de Brie, 1172–1362*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1901–14), I, #2594. On the strength of this song Gaston Paris (*Romania*, XII [1883], 523) wrote of Marie , "C'était pour lui que Conon de Béthune, entre 1186 et 1190, composait ses premières chansons."

[91] These three poems are printed by C. L. Kingsford, "Some Political Poems of the Twelfth Century," *English Historical Review*, V (1890), 319–320, and 324–325.

[92] In one of the dialogues a lover supports his proposition by saying that "amatoris Andreae, aulae regiae capellani, evidenter nobis doctrina demonstrat." *Andreae Capellani De Amore*, ed. E. Trojel (Hanover, 1892), p. 148. This is the only edition with a full critical apparatus. The information given by the manuscripts is reviewed in this edition, pp. xxi-xxxi. Trojel's conclusion about the author is on p. xli.

The *terminus ad quem* may be surely placed at 1238, since in that year Albertano da Brescia made use of Andreas' work. Evidence for making these limits more precise is not entirely conclusive, but the most comprehensive dating of *De Amore* by its references to Hungarian affairs places its composition between 1186 and 1196.[93] At no time in the period between 1150 and 1250, however, has a chaplain named Andreas been identified at the royal court. There is nothing surprising about this absence of information, since the royal notaries did not ordinarily list witnesses in their charters, and we have less data about the minor personnel of the royal court at this time than we do for courts, like that of Champagne, where witnesses were recorded.

Seventy years ago Pio Rajna pointed out that Countess Marie of Champagne, who plays a prominent part in *De Amore* and about whose judgments the author claims personal knowledge, had a chaplain named Andreas.[94] He suggested tentatively that Marie's chaplain may at some time have served at the royal court, where he composed his book. A number of scholars have taken the correlation of name and date and the apparent appropriateness of the employment as sufficient proof that the elusive author has been identified. This line of argument is quite possible, but it is by no means conclusive, and some scholars have not accepted it.[95]

The name of the "Andreas Capellanus" cited by Rajna appears in nine of Countess Marie's charters between 1182 and 1186. In these years of relatively scanty charter evidence nine appearances are enough to establish that this André was a regular and probably important member of the court. Since his name does not appear after 1186, while those of other chaplains do, it is reasonable to suppose that he died or left Marie's service about that time. The title "dominus" which he was given a few times and his consistently high ranking among the witnesses show that he was a priest, but we know nothing else of his life or background. The other court chaplains about whom we have any information held modest or humble positions in the social order (one was the son of a serf) and advanced in ecclesiastical preferment through the influence of the court. There is no way to determine whether André and his colleagues had similar careers.[96]

[93] Andreas referred (p. 62) to a Hungarian king who had long, round thighs and broad, flat feet. Alexandre Eckhardt shows convincingly that this was Bela III (whose skeleton measures almost 6′ 3″) in *De Sicambria à Sans-Souci* (Paris, 1943), pp. 113–124. Arpad Steiner in SPECULUM, IV (1929), 92–95, placed the composition before 1186 on the grounds that a prudent author would not comment unfavorably on the looks of a patron's relative by marriage. But why believe that brothers-in-law were protected from humorous sallies at either the royal court or that of Champagne? Andreas praised the Hungarian king's virtue if not his beauty. The more general limits of time are discussed in Trojel's introduction, pp. v-ix.

[94] "Tre studi per la storia del libro di Andrea Capellano," *Studj di filologia romanza*, V (1891), 258.

[95] In the introduction (p. 17) to his influential translation, *The Art of Courtly Love*, Parry accepted the view that the author was Marie's chaplain and questioned the claim that he was a royal chaplain. Manitius, *Geschichte*, III, 282, identifies the author only as chaplain of the French king.

[96] Five of the charters are printed: Lalore, *Cartulaires*, I, pp. 101–103; *ibid.*, V, p. 58; and A. Harmand, "Notice historique sur la léproserie de la ville de Troyes," *Mémoires de la Société . . . de l'Aube*,

Since we know so little of Marie's chaplain, his possible identification as the author of *De Amore* would not materially advance our understanding of the book. If correct, it would show that he was a priest without telling us anything of his personal standards. It would support the author's claim of personal knowledge about Marie. But since the book was probably written about 1186 when the chaplain André no longer appears in court records, we could not assume that the author wrote for Marie. Such an opinion as "it is clear that Andreas, like Chrétien, wrote his book by direction of the countess," goes beyond what is justified by our evidence.[97]

Because Andreas referred to certain noble ladies by name, *De Amore* has been used as historical evidence, particularly to show that Eleanor of Aquitaine assembled a court of noble ladies at Poitiers and that Marie visited her there.[98] This conclusion is based on a series of judgments about amatory affairs which Andreas records under the names of such ladies as Marie, Eleanor, the countess of Flanders, and Ermingarde of Narbonne. But the form of presentation is that of a legal case book, which may include decisions made at various times and places. Nothing in the text indicates that Marie and the other ladies visited Eleanor in Poitiers or came together anywhere else. Even if these "judgments" were actually delivered, they are not evidence of continuing contact between Eleanor and Marie.[99] In addition, there is the distinct possibility that Andreas was not recording anything which actually happened.

Literary historians have not been able to agree about the meaning of *De Amore*. One school of thought accepts it as a serious book, an "exposition of courtly love;" another considers that Andreas wrote "tongue-in-cheek" descriptions of actual courtly practices without any intention of condemning them; a third school sees *De Amore* as a humorous and ironic condemnation of concupiscence not concerned with "courtly love" at all.[100] As long as this disagreement is unresolved,

---

XIV (1847–48), 531, 532, and 535. The other charters are all originals: Marne H 98 (1183); Aube 6 G 7, carton 2 (1185); Aube 9 H 21 (1186); and Marne G 1308 (1186). The charter of 1185 shows Andreas in the presence of Marie's half-sister, Marguerite, who married Bela III of Hungary in the next year. This material is discussed more fully in an article to appear in *Studies in Philology*, "The Evidence for Andreas Capellanus Re-examined Again." The suggestion that the author was a certain André de Luyères (made by John F. Mahoney in the same journal, LX [1958], 1–6) is there considered critically.

[97] Parry, *Art of Courtly Love*, p. 17.

[98] Amy Kelly, *Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950), pp. 160 and ch. 15, n. 5: "The clue to the presence of Marie in the court of Poitiers is the fact that André the Chaplain mentions her specifically as taking part with Eleanor in 1174 in judgments under the rules of the *Tractatus*." This is simply not so; the letter of 1174 (ed. Trojel, pp. 152–155) gives no indication of place or that Marie and Eleanor were there together. Charters of 1173, 1174, and 1175 show Marie in Champagne with her husband. Cf. her "Eleanor of Aquitaine and Her Courts of Love," SPECULUM, XII (1937), 5: "Nothing that we know of Marie's life precludes the assumption that she was in Poitiers in the period of question." Miss Kelly made very little use of charter evidence.

[99] I know of no other evidence for the statement of Gaston Paris, *Romania*, XII (1883), 523: "[Marie] était fille d'Alienor de Poitiers, et resta toujours en commerce avec elle."

[100] The three approaches in this order are expressed by Parry, *Art of Courtly Love*, esp. p. 19; W.T.H. Jackson, "The *De Amore* of Andreas Capellanus and the Practice of Love at Court," *Romanic Review*, XLIX (1958), 243–251; and D. W. Robertson, Jr, "The Subject of the *De Amore* of Andreas Capellanus," *Modern Philology*, L (1953), 145–161, and "The Doctrine of Charity in Mediaeval

De Amore, like Chrétien's *Lancelot*, will be an unsure guide to the literary attitudes or practices of feudal courts. Andreas' book is not a source of unambiguous historical evidence, but is itself to be interpreted in the light of what we know about mediaeval society and literature.

With good reason a number of modern historians have been unwilling to believe in the existence of actual "courts of love" as described by Andreas.[101] If Andreas' account contains imaginative elements, it is possible that he did not intend to give a serious presentation of the views of the women in question. Mediaeval chroniclers and collectors of gossip provide little evidence with which to test this hypothesis, but in the case of Eleanor of Aquitaine we are well enough informed to see that some of the decisions attributed to her may be ironic comments upon her own behavior. When Eleanor judged the problem of the woman who has to choose between a young man devoid of worth and an adult knight of complete probity, she decided, according to Andreas, that a woman would act less wisely (*minus provide*) if she chose the less worthy one.[102] The mediaeval audience would have been perfectly aware that Eleanor had actually rejected the love of her husband Louis VII, whom she compared to a monk, and had quickly married Henry Plantagenet when he was just nineteen and she was near thirty. In *De Amore* Eleanor also gives a judicial decision which condemns consanguineous marriage.[103] Again, it was well known that Eleanor's separation from Louis was pronounced for consanguinity after the marriage had been blessed by the pope, and that Henry was almost as closely related to Eleanor as Louis. These two cases may lead us to suspect that there is more humor or satire than faithful quotation in the decisions of women about whom we are less well informed.

It is very difficult to know what effect Andreas expected to create through the quotations he attributes to Countess Marie. Taken out of their strange context, some of the statements he puts in her mouth make good sense in terms of conventional morality, such as the judgment that it is improper for a woman to seek to be loved and yet to refuse to love.[104] Most crucial to an understanding of Andreas' treatment of the woman who may possibly have been his employer is the letter he attributes to her on the subject of love and marriage. This letter, supposedly written in 1174, says in part that love can have no potency between two spouses: "Dicimus enim et stabilito tenore firmamus, amorem non posse suas inter duos iugales extendere vires. Nam amantes sibi invicem gratis omnia largiuntur nullius necessitatis ratione cogente. Iugales vero mutuis tenentur ex

---

Literary Gardens," SPECULUM, XXVI (1951), 36–89. A book which surveys these contradictory opinions and suggests that "courtly love" "co-existed" with mediaeval Christianity is Felix Schlösser, *Andreas Capellanus* (Bonn, 1960).

[101] Cf. Paul Remy, "Les 'cours d'amour': légende et réalité," *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles*, VII (1955), 179–197.

[102] *De Amore*, ed. Trojel, pp. 278–279.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 279: "Satis illa mulier contra fas et licitum certare videtur, quae sub erroris cuiuscunque velamine incestuosum studet tueri amorem. Omni enim tempore incestuosis et damnabilibus tenemur actibus invidere, quibus etiam ipsa humana poenis novimus gravissimis obviare."

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

debito voluntatibus obedire et in nullo se ipsos sibi invicem denegare."[105] Was Andreas reporting what he thought Marie would actually have said or did say on this question? Was the letter intended to tell us anything of the state of Marie's marriage in 1174? By making the quotation did the author imply criticism or approval of the countess? The answers to these questions are presumably connected with the author's opinion of love, which he defines at the beginning of his book as passion or suffering, "passio quaedam innata procedens ex visione et immoderata cogitatione formae alterius sexus. . . ."[106] If Andreas considered love as here defined desirable, then he probably was presenting Marie as an open advocate of adultery, but if he considered such love as something to be avoided, he may have intended the quotation attributed to Marie as a veiled praise of marriage, which provides a remedy for love. It is worth noting that this letter echoes the Pauline doctrine of marriage, where marriage is permitted as a defense against fornication, and the point at issue is whether the quotation was intended to subvert or support that doctrine. Some help in treating these literary questions may be provided by other evidence about Marie and the court of Champagne.

Adam de Perseigne. In his edition of *Eructavit*, published in 1919, T. Atkinson Jenkins argued that the poem was written by the Cistercian abbot and author Adam de Perseigne, who preached a sermon at Countess Marie's deathbed. Jenkins thought the poet showed unusual familiarity with Marie and that in its theology, exposition, and attitude toward the Virgin Mary *Eructavit* is similar to known writings of Adam de Perseigne.[107] This attribution has no substance. The anonymous poem does not in fact suggest a particularly close relationship between its author and the countess, and even if it did, Marie's deathbed summons to Adam and his subsequent sermon do not demonstrate such closeness.[108] Jenkins freely admitted that there was nothing personal about the theology, exposition, and concern for the Virgin which he found in Adam's work and in *Eructavit*, since he called them characteristically Cistercian. He even noted that Adam gave a different application to the phrase "Eructavit cor meum" in prose works than the verse has in the poetical translation.[109] The similarities of ideas and texts which he cited are commonplaces, and he was not specific about details of expression.[110] While it is difficult to prove that Adam, of whom we know little, was not the author of *Eructavit*, it can be said that such a claim is unlikely.

[105] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[107] *Eructavit* (cited above, n. 51), pp. xiii-xviii.

[108] The account of Marie's summons and Adam's sermon is given by Thomas de Cantimpré, *Bonum Universale de Apibus*, ed. Georgius Colvernerius, 2nd ed. (Douai, 1627), I, vii, 7, pp. 31–32. Adam's sermon as quoted is thoroughly conventional and does not suggest a life-long connection. Marie could have known of Adam de Perseigne's reputation as a spiritual counsellor for women from her sister Alix.

[109] *Eructavit*, p. xvii and n. 3.

[110] The reader may study these citations in the introduction, p. xvii, nn. 2 and 3. Many phrases, ideas, and favorite verses were common to monastic authors, many of whom owed their style to St Bernard. I see nothing striking, for instance, in such matters as the statement that the Virgin conceived at the words *Dominus tecum* or in "a certain indelicacy" of expression.

The author of *Eructavit* set out to write a work of spiritual edification for a noble lady which she could understand in the vernacular. But when Countess Blanche of Champagne, Marie's successor, wrote to Adam de Perseigne to ask him for a copy of his sermons, he replied that the request would be praiseworthy if Blanche could understand Latin or if the sermons could be interpreted for her, but he warned her against translations by asserting that any expression of thought may lose its savor or structure in passing from one language to another.[111] In another letter Adam expressed his pleasure to Marie's sister, Alix of Chartres, at being able to write to her in Latin.[112] There is a large corpus of edifying works surely attributed to Adam and all of it is in Latin prose. It would be strange if an author with such an opinion of translation wrote one of the first French translations of a part of Scripture, and one which was particularly graceful and well-composed.

Jenkins noted that Marie had a chaplain named Adam, but avoided asserting that this man was Adam de Perseigne. Canon Jean Bouvet has been less hesitant and has based his recent biographical sketch of Adam de Perseigne on the assumptions that he was both the author of *Eructavit* and the chaplain of the countess.[113] For this reason we may consider what can be known of the life of Marie's chaplain. He was the son of a serf, Aceline, whom Henry II of Champagne gave to the lepers' colony of Deux-eaux near Troyes in 1188. He witnessed charters for Marie in 1188, 1189, and 1191;[114] since after 1187 witness lists were rarely noted, there is no significance to the small number of references. He became a canon of Saint-Etienne-de-Troyes and retained that position after Marie's death. A charter of 24 February 1201 (N.S.) recorded that one of the canons of Saint-Etienne who arbitrated a dispute was "dominus Adam Capellanus quondam Comitisse Trecensis."[115] The title "dominus" shows that he was a priest, and it is therefore likely that he was the priest and canon of Saint-Etienne named Adam who issued a charter in 1220.[116] Canon Bouvet feels that the word *rusticus* which Adam de Perseigne applied to himself is more than simple self-deprecation and is evidence that the abbot was born a serf. Other elements of biography are more surely contradictory. Adam de Perseigne became abbot of the important Cistercian abbey in 1188 at the latest, and in one of his letters he says that before he became a Cistercian he had been a canon regular and then a Benedictine monk. On the other hand, Marie's chaplain was presumably a member of the secular clergy

[111] *P.L.*, CCXI, 691–692.

[112] *Ibid.*, col. 686.

[113] The biography introduces his edition and translation of Adam de Perseigne, *Lettres*, Sources Chrétiennes, 66, to be published in three vols., I (Paris, 1960), 7–29. This sketch contains the information on the abbot given here.

[114] To the charters cited in Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, IV, 544, add one of 1191 printed by Charles Lalore, *Documents sur l'abbaye de Notre-Dame-aux-Nonnains de Troyes* (Troyes, 1874), #9, p. 13, and a charter of the bishop of Meaux of 1189 which refers to an action of Countess Marie, Seine-et-Marne H 492 (Cart. de Fontaines), fol. 4.

[115] Paris, B.N. ms. lat. 17098 (Cart. de St-Etienne), fol. 116 r°-v°. When Canon Bouvet wrote to me in 1957 for information about the chaplain, this was not among the refernces I was able to send him. Cf. his introduction, p. 7, n. 1.

[116] Cart. de St-Etienne, fol. 150 v°.

and was a canon as late as 1201. At that time Adam de Perseigne was one of the most influential churchmen in Western Christendom. Though an abbot could also be a canon of Saint-Etienne, it is inconceivable that a scribe would not have identified the abbot of Perseigne by his well-known title if he had occasion to name him in a charter.

The identification of Adam de Perseigne as the author of *Eructavit* and as Marie's chaplain is unconvincing. The former is based on a few similarities commonly found among clerical authors of the day, and the latter is in turn based on the first and supported by a common first name. Neither argument seems likely when all the available evidence is weighed in the balance.

Rigaut de Barbezieux. Because they have been more widespread and authoritative, the scholarly pronouncements on the troubador Rigaut de Barbezieux have had more serious effects than those on Adam de Perseigne. Rigaut's poems provide almost no biographical information and the mediaeval biographies and commentaries are vague in their chronology. Modern scholars therefore have had little material for dating or describing the poet's life, but their consensus has been to place his activity between 1175 and 1215.[117] In large part these dates were influenced by the *tornade* of one song whose text was established by Anglade as:

> Pros comtessa e gaia, ab pretz valen
> Que tot avetz Campanh' enluminat,
> Volgra saupsetz l'amor e l'amistat
> Que'us port car lais m'arm'e mon cors dolen.[118]

The countess who illumined Champagne and was honored by Rigaut could only be Marie, it was thought, and Gaston Paris even stretched the meaning of this passage to the point of asserting that Rigaut actually attended Marie's court, which was thus a link between the poetry of the north and south.[119]

We are fortunate that at last a meticulous article by Mme Rita Lejeune has placed the study of Rigaut de Barbezieux on a sound footing.[120] Working on the basis of all available information, Mme Lejeune has identified the poet as a knight of that name who was *viguiers* (*vicarius*) of the stronghold of Barbezieux in Charente, who appeared in charters between 1140 and 1157, and who had apparently died or retired from the world by 1163. Such a biography does not accord with a poem addressed to Countess Marie, and Mme Lejeune meets the problem head-on with the following argument. The *tornade* in question is found only in a few late manuscripts and is therefore of doubtful authorship; the reading *Campanh'* is itself suspect, being only one of a number of variants; and even if Champagne is the proper reading, it is more likely that the poet was referring to the Champagne de Cognac, which is next door to Barbezieux, rather than to the northern county.

[117] J. Anglade and C. Chabaneau, "Les chansons du troubadour Rigaut de Barbezieux," *Revue des langues romanes*, LX (1920), 227–228.

[118] *Ibid.*, Song X, ll. 41–44, p. 284. I have not yet seen Rigaut de Berbezilh, *Liriche*, ed. Alberto Varvaro (Bari, 1960).

[119] In his introduction to *Le Roman de la Rose, ou de Guillaume de Dole*, ed. Gustave Servois (Paris, 1893), p. cxx.

[120] "Le Troubadour Rigaut de Barbezieux," *Mélanges István Frank*, published as *Annales Universitatis Saraviensis*, VI (1957), 269–295.

Rigaut de Barbezieux must therefore be dropped from the list of the court authors of Champagne, and with him disappears the only personal contact between Marie and the poets of the south.

Aubouin de Sézanne. Although the song "Bien cuidai toute ma vie" is attributed to Gace Brulé in two usually reliable collections, it is ascribed to Aubouin de Sézanne in another manuscript. Almost nothing is known of the life of this poet, but two charters of Thibaut IV of Champagne show that Aubouin died between 1221 and 1229. If he wrote the poem, which is unlikely, the countess of Brie addressed in it was more probably Blanche of Champagne than Marie. In any case we are left with one song and two attributions, so that if Aubouin de Sézanne should be added to a list of court authors then Gace Brulé should be removed.[121]

VI. CONCLUSIONS: THE LITERARY ROLES OF HENRY, MARIE, AND THEIR COURT

By the middle of the twelfth century many rulers read and understood Latin, or at least saw to it that their sons did. The contemporary monarchs Louis VII, Frederick I, Henry II, and William II of Sicily were all educated men who could make use of Latin. In France some of the families which ruled the great principalities had a tradition of learning. The dukes of Aquitaine and the counts of Anjou valued education; Philip of Alsace, count of Flanders, was praised for his literacy. Education was therefore part of the equipment of a man who took a position of great power seriously, and it is in this context that we are to understand the references to the learning of Count Henry of Champagne.[122]

Count Thibaut the Great provided his son with a tutor in his boyhood, and Henry showed himself to be an apt pupil. When Philippe de Harveng wrote to him as an adult, he congratulated the count on the solicitude of his father and on his own diligence as a student, which had been combined to produce his remarkable education: "Horum concursu scholarum disciplinam per annos aliquot prosecutus sub magistrali ferula, liberalem es scientiam assecutus, et juxta modum temporis et personae, tantis, ut aiunt, literis es imbutus, ut quamplures clericos transcendas in eorum nequaquam numero constitutus."[123] Both Philippe and John of Salisbury pictured Henry turning from the cares of administration to the solaces of serious literature, and there is much evidence of his reading in the classics and religious writing. A codex of Valerius Maximus copied at Count Henry's order is still in existence, and the literary correspondence which he received shows his interest in religious literature.[124] The count also commissioned

[121] The song is cited above, n. 54. For the few established facts about Aubouin see Auguste Longnon, "Chartes relatives aux trouvères Aubouin de Sézanne, Gilles de Vieux-Maisons, et Thibaut de Blaison," *Ann.-Bull. de la Société de l'Histoire de France*, 1870–71, pp. 85–90.

[122] On this subject see James Westfall Thompson, *The Literacy of the Laity in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1939), V. H. Galbraith, "The Literacy of the Medieval English Kings," in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XXI (1936), and a recent highly valuable article which cites Henry of Champagne specifically, Herbert Grundmann, "Litteratus-illitteratus," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XL (1958), 52.

[123] *P.L.*, CCIII, 152. On Henry's tutor see Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, 10.

[124] BN ms. lat. 9688: "Descriptum Pruvini, jussu illustris comitis Henrici. Willelmus Anglicus. Anno incarnati Verbi MCLXVII, indictione XV." See Léopold Delisle, *Cabinet des manuscrits de la*

Simon Chèvre d'Or to write a classical adaptation, and he may have enjoyed the *Venjance Alixandre*. As far as we know, Henry's literary tastes were conservative, and we have no evidence that he enjoyed current history, legal studies, romances, or French lyric verse.

Count Henry sought the conversation of men of letters, but he did not therefore give them positions in his court. He was on good terms with Pierre de Celle and a patron of Nicolas of Clairvaux, both of whom held ecclesiastical posts in the neighborhood of Troyes. He may have appointed a man with a reputation for learning as his chancellor, thereby strengthening his administrative staff. We have no proof that Maître Etienne was actually an author, and before his appointment the chancellor was apparently no closer to the count than other well-educated churchmen of the region. Henry commissioned Simon Chèvre d'Or to write epitaphs and a version of the fall of Troy for him in Latin, but preferment at the count's court or even in his domains does not appear to have been among Simon's rewards. Guido de Bazoches, a canon of Châlons-sur-Marne, wrote letters and a poem for the count and received some unspecified gift from Henry. The *Venjance Alixandre* was probably written for Henry of Champagne, but we are uncertain of the identity of its author and know nothing of the circumstances of its composition. In short, Count Henry's education was solid, his literary interests were serious, and he encouraged a few authors in their endeavors. As a literary patron he outshone many of his contemporaries, including the king of France, but his court did not come up to the example of either Henry Planteganet or of his own brother, Archbishop William of Reims.[125]

We have less information about the education of Countess Marie than of her husband. The name of her teacher, Alix de Mareuil, who was at one time connected with the convent of Saint-Pierre d'Avenay near Epernay, is recorded.[126] A line in the poem of Evrat implies that Marie could read French.[127] There is no direct evidence that she could read Latin, though some well-educated women could. Adam de Perseigne felt free to write to Marie's sister, Alix, in Latin because he knew that she had some knowledge of the language.[128] So far as we know, however, no author who addressed Marie in his work wrote for her in Latin, and the translations into French of Biblical texts and commentaries for her benefit suggest that her knowledge of Latin, if existent, was weak. The question of Marie's

---

Bibliothèque Impériale, 3 vols. and atlas (Paris, 1868–81), II, 352, and Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, III, 190 n. 3. In his letter to the count discussed above, John of Salisbury referred to "vester Vegetius" (col. 131). Since John was not familiar with Henry's intellectual pursuits, this may simply mean that he associated a military writer with the interests of a count.

[125] Cf. Charles H. Haskins, "Henry II as a Patron of Literature," *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Thomas Frederick Tout* (Manchester, 1925), pp. 71–77, and the article on William of Champagne by John R. Williams cited above, n. 26.

[126] It appears in the charter cited above, n. 9. See Louis Paris, *Histoire de l'abbaye d'Avenay*, I (Paris, 1879), 59 and 68–69. Alphonse Roserot suggested that Alix de Mareuil came from the house of Châtillon-sur-Marne in *Dictionnaire historique de la Champagne méridionale (Aube)*, 3 vols. (Langres, 1942–48), p. 45.

[127] See above, n. 45.

[128] See above, n. 112.

Latinity bears on the intended audience of Andreas' *De Amore*, for if Marie could not understand *De Amore* without the help of translation, there is little reason to think that it was written for her delectation. The obvious audience for a Latin treatise would be clerics and a few well-educated laymen, who might have found the first two books of *De Amore* amusing rather than instructive.

The statements of various authors show that Marie was one of the outstanding literary patrons of her day. Chrétien's *Lancelot*, Evrat's *Genesis*, and one song by Gace Brulé were written at her direct request; Gautier d'Arras was encouraged in writing his *Eracle* by the countess; and *Eructavit* was written specifically for her. Presumably these authors received suitable rewards for their labors, though there is nothing to show that any of them regularly attended Marie's court, and for the period before 1187 when witness lists are abundant negative evidence has some value. Andreas Capellanus may have been Marie's chaplain at one time, though the identification is far from sure. Unlike her husband's, Marie's known literary tastes were *avant-garde*. Gace Brulé was one of the first lyric poets writing in the vernacular in the north of France; Chrétien de Troyes was one of the great innovators in the creation of Arthurian romance; Gautier d'Arras, though a lesser light, was also a pioneer; and even the idea of translating Scriptural material into French was new and exciting in the twelfth century.

Can we move from the conculsion that Marie encouraged authors of the new genres in both secular and religious literature to the assertion that she was the propagator of doctrines which, to use the words of Amy Kelly, "undermine all the primary sanctions and are subversive of the social order"?[129] Gaston Paris thought so, and credited Marie with introducing into northern France the ideals of *l'amour courtois*, to which he called attention.[130] Such an assertion has a double basis: that Marie encouraged Chrétien to write a work which seemingly praised Lancelot, a knight who committed adultery with his soverign's wife, and that Andreas Capellanus, whether or not he wrote in Marie's service, quoted her as making pronouncements on love which seemed to advocate adultery and to elevate women to the rank of high priestesses of a cult of love. The reader who takes Chrétien and Andreas seriously and sees no irony or satire in their work may reasonably conclude that Marie was a great social innovator. Enough serious questions have been raised about the nature of the work of these two authors, however, that it is important to know if Marie's contemporaries came to the same conclusions about her social role as do some modern literary specialists.

If Marie's views on love were complacent about man's part in adultery, she would have been accepting the double standard of her society and would have attracted no particular attention. A man's fidelity was a matter to note, not his lapses, and the chronicler Gislebert de Mons reported with surprise that Marie's son-in-law, Baldwin of Hainaut, disdaining all other women, loved his wife alone, "although it is rarely found in any man that he should cleave so much to one woman and be content with her alone."[131] But if Marie actually favored and

[129] *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, p. 166.

[130] See above, n. 2.

[131] *La Chronique de Gislebert de Mons*, ed. Léon Vanderkindere (Brussels, 1904), pp. 191–192.

defended the adultery of women of respectable station, she was affronting the lords and churchmen with whom she was in daily contact. The known or suspected infidelity of a noblewoman called forth the strongest reactions. Count Thibaut the Great was able to join the county of Troyes to his other domains because his uncle Hugues suspected his wife of adultery, repudiated her, and disinherited the son whom she bore.[132] When Count Philip of Flanders, who at one time negotiated for Marie's hand, suspected that his wife had committed adultery with Gautier de Fontaines, he put the young nobleman to death in a most unpleasant fashion.[133] In *Eructavit* a bride, after being advised to rise when her husband approaches, to forget her father and mother, and above all to love her husband with a pure love (*fin amors*), is reminded of the custom of the world about infidelity. When a woman deserts the love of her husband for another, the poet states, either through sin or through a mistake, even though she repents fully, her husband has no obligation to take her back, and in fact, she would be better off in the grave.[134] The very charge of immorality against a married woman was considered a serious affront to her husband's honor. The custumal of Champagne provided that if anyone made the baseless charge that an unmarried woman was a whore, he should pay the moderate fine of five sous, but if the same charge was made about a married woman in her husband's presence, the fine might be as high as sixty sous.[135]

If the doctrines implied by the "courtly love" interpretation of Chrétien and Andreas were openly proclaimed at the court of Champagne and disseminated in its literature, writers who did not accept them would not have passed them over in silence. It is therefore of considerable interest that Marie received no comment or criticism on this matter from any of her contemporaries. Pierre de Celle knew her personally, but all we learn from him about the countess is that she once so shrewdly flattered a visiting abbot at her dinner table that he forgot the business which brought him to court.[136] The Cistercian abbot Adam de Perseigne held clearly stated views on a married woman's proper subservience, but when he preached a sermon at Marie's deathbed, he spoke in conventional terms of human vanity and of the worldly pride of the great lady who found no pomp or honor in death.[137] The pious author of *Eructavit* himself praised Marie's piety and reproached her only for excessive generosity.[138] The list of orthodox authors who praised Marie could be extended, and the number of those who failed to comment upon her alleged scandalous theories is even greater. What impressed contempo-

[132] Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire*, II, 135–136.

[133] J. Johnen, "Philipp von Elsass, Graf von Flandern," *Bull. de la Commission royale d'histoire [de Belgique]*, LXXIX (1910), 418–420. This article answers the problems raised in *Revue des Langues Romanes*, XXXII (1888), 286–288, and *Romania*, XVII (1888), 591–595.

[134] *Eructavit*, ll. 1428–50, 1577–94.

[135] Paulette Portejoie, ed., *L'ancien coutumier de Champagne* (Poitiers, 1956), section XLII, pp. 198–199.

[136] *P.L.*, CCII, 552.

[137] Cited above, n. 108.

[138] *Eructavit*, ll. 1–14.

raries about Marie was the vigor and ability with which she exercised the power of her feudal position; chroniclers reported admiringly that she ruled Champagne *viriliter*.[139] Here we have her true inheritance from Eleanor of Aquitaine.

During Henry's life Countess Marie regularly traveled about the county with her husband, moving from one administrative center to another. Since only women of high rank were named as witnesses, we know almost nothing of her female retainers. Three men were attached to her personal service; a chaplain Dreux, a clerk Laurent, and a certain Nevelon, *miles comitisse*. Other men who witnessed her charters usually appeared also in those of her husband. All available information indicates that Marie played no important independent role in court life while Henry was alive. Many regular members of the court failed to return with Henry from his final expedition in the Levant, where he was defeated in battle, captured by the Turks, and ransomed by the Emperor Manuel. It is therefore not surprising that many new names appear in the witness lists of his widow's acts. The names showing continuity of court personnel are also frequent, and there is no evidence to show that Marie changed the nature of the court significantly while she was in charge of its administration.[140]

Besides revising and classifying the list of known court authors, this study of the available evidence from the court of Champagne suggests a reconsideration of two currently accepted views about the literary significance of the court. First of all, it questions the belief that the court of Champagne in particular served as a point of literary interchange between north and south.[141] The troubadour Rigaut de Barbezieux, we now know, had nothing to do with the court of Champagne or Countess Marie. There is no evidence to show that Marie ever saw her mother or communicated with her after Eleanor left the court of France when Marie was seven, and it is quite possible that at the royal court Marie was brought up to despise her mother. I have found no indication that there were southerners among the court personnel of Champagne. It is true that ideas and literary styles which have been labelled "southern" are found in Champagne, but they are also found in other northern courts, like those of the king or the count of Flanders. The travels of thousands of pilgrims, merchants, and knights were surely more effective than any activities of the countess of Champagne in bringing knowledge of the culture of southern France to the north. The literary connections of the court of Champagne were not with the south but with northern France and Flanders.[142]

Secondly, the evidence assembled in this paper does not support the opinion

[139] Chronicle of Tours, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. Dom Bouquet, XVIII, 293, and Annales de Rouen, *MGH SS*, XXVI, 500.

[140] See my dissertation, "The Court of Champagne," pp. 172–175 and 259–260.

[141] Cf. Alfred Jeanroy, *La Poésie lyrique des troubadours*, 2 vols. (Toulouse and Paris, 1934), I, 273–274.

[142] Chrétien de Troyes wrote for both Marie and Philip of Flanders. Huon d'Oisy was a vassal of both Flanders and Champagne. Gautier d'Arras was also a vassal of Flanders. The abbot of Bonne-Espérance near Cambrai wrote to Count Henry. The author of the *Venjance Alixandre* may have been an archdeacon of Arras. These instances show that the literary intercourse, like the political and the economic, was largely to the north.

that Marie's court was a center for "courtly love" as either a social or a literary phenomenon. "Courtly love" was sufficiently revolutionary to attract attention if it were advocated in any serious fashion. If Chrétien de Troyes and Andreas Capellanus truly and seriously reflect Marie's beliefs, then it must have been common knowledge that she was openly subversive of the position upheld by the men of her day. Yet none of the abundant letters, chronicles, laudatory songs, and pious dedications suggests that Marie or her court was in any way unusual or unorthodox. Modern theorists of "courtly love" owe us an explanation of these contradictions. My own inclination is to accept the suggestion of a few critics that the intentions of Andreas and Chrétien when they wrote about worldly love were conventionally moral and humorous or ironic.[143] Problems of sex and love were clearly common topics at a court such as that of Champagne, interesting both the worldly-wise and the morally sensitive. If Chrétien and Andreas were indeed ironic moralists, they used this interest to hold the attention of their audience. A sophisticated audience may well have enjoyed and understood such an apporach. This is not the place to raise all the questions connected with "courtly love," but the questions which are considered do have broader implications, for if "courtly love" is not to be found at the court of Champagne, where then did it exist?

It is important to know if a courtly audience was able to understand a sophisticated literary approach. At the court of Champagne about a third of the witnesses to court charters were clerics, and there was a small nucleus of churchmen, mainly canons, who traveled with the count and countess and attended them regularly. A somewhat larger body of laymen was regularly at the court and in the company of these churchmen. A courtly audience was therefore partly composed of clerics, who may to some degree have shared the literary interests and attitudes which they had learned in monastic and cathedral schools. The learning of the count and countess was probably even more important. We know that Count Henry read extensively in religious and classical literature. Marie's training was presumably not as deep, but her commissioning of Evrat's *Genesis* shows that she found allegorical exposition congenial. Obviously, few laymen had the educational advantages of the count and countess, but there is no reason to think that all courtly literature was written for an unlettered and unsophisticated audience.

Our evidence provides some slight indication of the ways in which one author who wrote for the court influenced another. Since a great court was a center where people came together, it would have been quite possible for authors to meet there to exchange stories and to discuss literary techniques. But if, as this study suggests, most authors spent comparatively little time at court, then the importance of direct personal contact was probably slight. An author who attended the court of Champagne and others like it would have had an opportunity to hear the recitation of works written by his contemporaries. In this way, for instance, Chrétien de Troyes may have heard the *Eracle* without necessarily meeting

[143] Cf. the articles of D. W. Robertson, Jr, cited above in notes 37 and 100.

Gautier d'Arras himself.[144] Less direct as an influence and yet still of importance was the knowledge which one author writing for the court would have of other courtly literature. When an author thinks of his audience, he thinks of the literary background and understanding which will be brought to his own work. The variety and complexity of the literature written for a court gave the mediaeval author, as it gives us, an indication of the literary sophistication of the audience. In this respect the court of Champagne was indeed outstanding. There one could find the classical reconstruction of Simon Chèvre-d'Or and the scriptural allegory of Evrat, the *fin amors* of *Eructavit* and (perhaps) the *amor mixtus* of Andreas Capellanus, the letters of Hebraic scholar Herbert of Boscham and of rhetorician Nicolas de Clairvaux, the fanciful adventures of Lancelot and of Eracle, the French lyrics of Gace Brulé and the Latin verse of Guido de Bazoches. By considering this courtly literature as a whole we may be better prepared to understand its individual parts.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

[144] Cf. Th. Heinermann, "Zur Zeitbestimmung der Werke Gautiers von Arras und zu seiner Stellung zu Chrétien von Troyes," *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, LIX (1935), 242. The relationship of common elements in the work of Chrétien and Andreas is not clear. See K. G. T. Webster, "The Water-Bridge in Chrétien's 'Charrette'," *Modern Language Review*, XXVI (1931), 73, n. 1.