2007-02-28

Hidden Doublings: A Context for Understanding Jean d'Arras's Mélusine ou la Noble Histoire de Lusignan

Kathryn Rimmasch
Brigham Young University - Provo

HIDDEN DOUBLINGS: A CONTEXT FOR UNDERSTANDING JEAN D'ARRAS'S MELUSINE OU LA NOBLE HISTOIRE DE LUSIGNAN

by

Kathryn Rimmasch

A thesis submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of French and Italian

Brigham Young University

April 2007

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Kathryn Rimmasch

This thesis has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

_____	_____
Date	Jesse D. Hurlbut, Chair
_____	_____
Date	Nicolaas Unlandt
_____	_____
Date	V. Stanley Benfell

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the thesis of Kathryn Rimmasch in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

Date	Jesse D. Hurlbut Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

Date	Corry Cropper Graduate Coordinator

Accepted for the College

Date	John R. Rosenberg Dean, College of Humanities

ABSTRACT

HIDDEN DOUBLINGS: A CONTEXT FOR UNDERSTANDING JEAN D'ARRAS'S MELUSINE OU LA NOBLE HISTOIRE DE LUSIGNAN

Kathryn Rimmasch

Department of French and Italian

Master of Arts

At the end of the fourteenth century Jean d'Arras rewrote a popular folktale. The tale told how Mélusine, a fairy who was serpent from the navel down every Saturday, married a knight and founded the fortress of Lusignan. In his introduction to the tale Jean d'Arras presents the ideas of four authority figures to convince the reader that fantastical things are possible and that his work should be taken seriously. These authority figures are David, Aristotle, Paul and Gervaise de Tilbury. It is the contention of this thesis that Jean d'Arras presents these figures in his introduction to provide context and serve as doubles for characters in the narration as well as convince the reader to take the work seriously. Through his allusion to Tilbury, Jean d'Arras establishes a context and a doubling for the story-line which he so

repetitiously tells. Through his allusion to David we see a doubling for Raymondin, who in fact bears the name of earthly king, a position which David held in archetype. Through his allusion to Paul we see a doubling for Geoffrey à la grande dent, enfant terrible who becomes a responsible leader. And finally we suggest that Aristotle is a type for Jean d'Arras himself, who is presenting to his reader a methodical study of the telos of earthly kings. The thesis contains a discussion of these four individuals, how they were viewed in the late fourteenth-century and what the implications are for reading the text with them in mind. When viewed in the light of these comparisons the text can be seen, not only as a fantastical story, but as political commentary. Jean d'Arras glorifies the Duke of Berry, his patron, by connecting him to a supernatural being, but he also suggests throughout the narration, that the true justification for nobility and political power is not a supernatural connection, but a practical ability to deal with earthly affairs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to:

☺Dr. Hurlbut, my committee chair for being willing to go along with a fantastical text, for advice and help in research and for much patience, diligence and attention to detail in helping me improve my drafts.

☺My other committee members, Dr. Unlandt and Dr. Benfell, for their insightful input.

☺Gretchen Rimmasch and Chris Cornwall for hours spent scavenging the Harold B. Lee library to get me materials while I was away.

☺The University of Wyoming's Coe Library, for access to resources which contributed greatly to my research.

☺Marianne Rimmasch, for not making fun of me for just reading all day.

☺And to my parents for their support and encouragement.

I couldn't have done it without you all. Mille fois merci!

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction……...1

Chapter 2: Gervaise de Tilbury: A Context for Understanding Fairies……...31

Chapter 3: David as a Doubling for Raymondin……51

Chapter 4: Paul as a Doubling for Geoffrey à la Grand Dent…….…….73

Chapter 5: Aristotle: The Final Cause of Kings…….…..93

Chapter 6: Conclusion……..113

Bibliography…….....117

Chapter 1: Introduction

In his seminal "Essai sur Mélusine: Roman du XIV ^{e} siècle par Jean d'Arras" Louis Stouff accuses said Jean of being a fumbling erudite not quite equal to the task of writing good literature. According to Stouff, "Il l'est à la manière de son temps, semant à plaisir les contradictions, les incohérences, les étourderies, les absurdités" (22). Stouff justly criticizes Arras of confounding Mélusine and Raymondin's ten sons, of being careless about the chronology of the story, which would seem to leave certain of the sons at adulthood by the age of six, of *invraisemblance* within the narratives of the crusading sons and in general of being too heavy. "Il sent l'université et la justice, la pratique et la scholastique. C'est un défaut des écrivains d'alors " (26). In the end, the sole merit that Stouff finds in Arras's style are the images he leaves us of an idealized world which only partly resembled the tumultuous era he lived through. According to Stouff, "Les peintures de Jean d'Arras sont vivantes, soit qu'ils nous fasse assister à des scènes militaires, soit qu'il nous montre les opulents bourgeois, fiers et jaloux de leurs libertés, inexpungables dans leurs bonnes villes solidements fortifiées" (29).

Perhaps Jean d'Arras did excel in evoking the idealized images of his day, but in an era saturated in allegory was any image without a message? Perhaps Stouff underestimated Jean d'Arras's ability to conceive of or convey an original message within the framework of a complicated folk tale. Of the things he criticizes, Stouff seems particularly annoyed with Jean's introduction, which to his view is heavy handed, and haphazardly assembles a group of authorities, some of whom are misrepresented. "Jean d'Arras est pédant...Il se plaît à citer Aristote et ne l'entend pas toujours. Il se tue à écrire d'obscures digressions sur le monde invisible, sur la croyance qui est due aux 'choses

fées' et sur cet assemblage singulier et immuable des sept arts libéraux qui constitua la somme de la science au Moyen Age. Que Jean d'Arras sorte de ce fatras, on ne le reconnaît plus" (26-7). Stouff seems doubtful that anything Jean d'Arras himself added in this introduction serves any meaningful purpose beyond allowing Jean to display his own education.

Many of the charges Stouff lays against Jean d'Arras cannot be refuted. It is possible, however, that a different take on Jean's introduction could reveal that he does intend for the reader to draw some significant meaning from the "fatras" of his complicated text. First it may be significant to recognize the underlying structure of paradox within the work (Pickens 48-75). Next, looking at the authority figures he presents in his introduction, in a new way may change the way one reads the text. He cites King David from the Old Testament, Aristotle, a Greek philosopher, Saint Paul the apostle from the New Testament, and Gervaise de Tilbury, a thirteenth century writer. Viewing these figures as adding meaning through their own histories and ideas may reveal that rather than having succeeded at creating an unwieldy work solely capable of pleasing the reader through its flow of images, that Jean d'Arras has actually created a layered text where images from competing cultures reinforce each other. The combination of these layered images, as seen within the text's underlying emphasis on paradox, creates an overall meaning which is, in many ways, contrary to the project which Jean d'Arras himself sets forth.

Jean writes "au plaisire de [s]on treshault, puissant, et redoubté seigneur, Jehan, filz du roy de France, duc de Berry" (111). The story was very popular. Nobles requested manuscripts, eleven of which remain (Vincensini, "Introduction" 42). Adaptations of the

work were made in German, Flemish, Danish, Spanish and Swedish, the first being published in Geneva in 1478 (Clier-Colombani 23-24). One must assume from the wide popularity of the story, that Jean d'Arras pleased not only his patron, the Duke of Berry, but also the rest of the nobility of Europe, who in many cases made an effort to find their own links to the illustrious fairy. Those who could not claim her as an ancestress imitated her wealth through sumptuous feasts. She was at times represented in different *entremets* on such occasions as well (Stouff, 12-13). Despite Jean d'Arras's success in glorifying the Lusignan house through its connection to a supernatural being, and in glorifying the position of all nobles by association, this thesis will suggest that at another level Jean d'Arras represents a questioning of the glittering world of elevated and heaven-blessed nobility which he describes. We would argue that the text suggests the futility of supernatural origins and reinforces the idea espoused by many and stated by Gervaise de Tilbury, a twelfth century author whom Jean d'Arras cites in his introduction, that there are "two kinds of power," kingly and priestly, and that they should remain separate. In a subtle way Jean d'Arras's text topples the idea of the glorified King David, which had been thematically introduced into Europe through Charlemagne, and which some were trying to revive during the tumultuous era that was the late fourteenth century.

Perhaps before we redeem Jean d'Arras from Stouff's grave accusations and attempt to draw from his work a subversive layer of meaning, we should begin with a description of his text. In 1393 a certain Jean d'Arras, about whom little is known other than the fact that he appears to have been well-educated and well connected in society (Stouff 21-22), finished *Mélusine, ou le Noble Histoire de Lusignan* for one of the great book collectors of the day, Jean, Duke of Berry. The work was in prose and retold the

story of a fairy, Mélusine, who was the supposed ancestress of the Lusignan house. In his introduction Jean d'Arras informs the reader that as well as having the story from an earlier Latin work, it was a common tale among the people of Poitou, the region in which the fortress of Lusignan was situated. This claim seems to be corroborated by a later version retold from the same sources. He then proceeds with a discussion of the supernatural, in which he cites a number of authority figures who believe in supernatural phenomena. His intention in writing this introduction seems to be the convincing of the reader that the events of the story should be considered true. These efforts seem well merited when considering the fantastic nature of the tale, a summary of which we will present here.

Jean d'Arras starts his narration with the story of Mélusine's parents, Présine and Elinas. Elinas is the king of Albanie (probably Scotland) and a widower. During a deer hunt he finds Présine alone in the forest by a fountain. He is so enchanted both by her physical beauty and the beauty of her voice that he asks for her hand in marriage. She grants it as long as he promises never to see her in childbirth. Shortly after they are married Présine gives birth to triplets: Mélusine, Mélior and Palastine. Elinas has a son from his first marriage, Mataquas, who has no love for Présine. At the birth of the three daughters he sees an opportunity to divide his father from her. He tells his father of the incomparable beauty of the three babies and encourages him to go see them. When Elinas enters the room where Présine is still in her child-bearing bed, she reproaches him for having broken his promise and leaves immediately. She takes her three daughters to the *Île Perdue*, the home of her sister, where they will remain.

From the *Île Perdue* Mélusine and her sisters are able to see the mountains of Albanie and when they are old enough Présine tells them of their heritage and what they have lost. The daughters are angry that their father should have betrayed their mother and decide on revenge. They travel to Albanie and enclose their father in the mountain Brumbloremlion in Northumberland. When Présine hears what they have done she is angry and curses them. Mélusine will be a serpent from the navel down each Saturday, but may live a normal life, if she can find a husband who will agree either never to see her on Saturday or never to reveal her condition to others. Mélior is banished to the Chateau d'Epervier in Armenia and Palestine protects a family treasure in Spain.

At this point Jean d'Arras shifts to the thread of Raymondin's life. He is a knight and a younger of the many sons of the Count of Forez. Later in the narrative, we will learn that Raymondin's father has had an experience similar to that of Elinas. Before the father's marriage to the sister of the count of Poitou he was the companion of a mysterious lady whom he had met in the forest. Raymondin lives with his uncle, the Count of Poitou where there are riches enough to support him. Raymondin is a favorite of his uncle, Aymeri, and one day in a boar hunt they end up separated from their comrades and alone at night in the forest. Aymeri, who is versed in the stars, tells Raymondin that an adventure is about to begin, in which, if a subject were to kill his lord, the subject would become the most rich and powerful lord his linage had yet known. Raymondin thinks his uncle is raving and cannot see the sense in what he suggests. At that moment, however, the boar they had been hunting, and which is quite large, bursts from the forest upon them. In his effort to defend himself and his uncle against the boar Raymondin kills not only the boar, but also the count.

Scared of what the consequences must be for this accidental death, Raymondin grieves for his uncle and begins to wander in the night. He comes across a fountain where three women are sitting. One of them, Mélusine, addresses him. She informs him that she knows of his predicament and that next to God, it is she who will best be able to help him out of the complicated situation. She promises that she can help him if he will take her as a wife. When he is willing she also makes him promise never to attempt to see her on a Saturday, but assures him that she will do nothing on that day which would sully his honor. She also tells him that she is a daughter of the king of Albanie, but no more about her history or origin. He agrees to the marriage and she tells him what he should do to make those at court believe that it was the boar alone that caused the death of Aymeri. Raymondin follows her advice and things go exactly as she suggests; he is never suspected or accused of killing his uncle. When Raymondin is free of any guilt or obligation he returns to Mélusine who instructs him on how to gain an inheritance.

He goes to his cousin the new Count of Poitou and asks for as much land as can be enclosed by the skin of a deer. His cousin freely grants this. Raymondin then buys a hide and has it cut into one long thin strip, as Mélusine has instructed him. The hide encloses an area of about a square mile, part of which includes the fountain where they met. Their marriage is celebrated in the very spot and is sumptuous and rich beyond anything those of the region have seen. Mélusine's numerous servants and abundant wealth, which impress all that behold them, seem to have appeared out of nowhere. Due to the marvelous nature of the celebrations, the Count of Poitou and others question Mélusine's origin, but Raymondin replies impatiently that if he is content with his wife then there should be no cause for the others to question her.

When the marriage is achieved Mélusine begins to build. She builds the fortress of Lusignan and many more fortresses at the rate of about one a year. She also sends Raymondin to reclaim some land in Brittany which was wrongfully taken from his father. He is successful and their domain grows. Mélusine brings with her great wealth and prosperity, enough that her subjects wonder where it comes from. Mélusine and Raymondin have ten sons, the first eight of which have peculiar birthmarks. The first, Urien, has a face that is short but wide and one red eye and one green eye. The second, Eudes has one ear that is larger than the other. The third, Guy has one eye that is higher than the other. The fourth, Antoine has a lion's paw on his left cheek, which by his eighth birthday, has not only become furry but has also grown claws. Renaud, the fifth, has only one eye, but an eye so piercing that he can see things from a very great distance. The sixth, Geoffrey, has a tooth so large that it sticks out of his mouth and resembles a boar tusk, because of which he is referred to as "Geoffrey à la grande dent". The seventh, Fromont, has a patch of fur, like that of a mole, on his nose. Horrible, the eighth has three eyes, one in the middle of his head. Only the last two sons, Thierry and Raymond, are born without any monstrous birthmarks.

Jean d'Arras's text spends quite a bit of time on the exploits of these ten sons. The first and third sons, Urien and Guy, when they are of age, go to their parents and declare that as there cannot possibly be enough inheritance for ten sons. They ask permission to go out adventuring to find their fortune. They have heard that the King of Cypress is besieged by Saracens and they express a wish to help him. Mélusine gives them her blessing, and they do as they have planned. Through their adventures, they each become kings, Urien of Cypress and Guy of Armenia. Their military prowess in

defending these two nations is rewarded when the king of each nation dies leaving only a daughter to inherit the crown. The next two sons, Antoine and Renaud express a similar desire to seek their fortune outside of the Lusignan lands and are also granted permission by Mélusine to do so. They come to the aid of the Duchess of Luxembourg whose husband has died, but who is being pursued against her will by the King of Alsace. The Lusignans successfully defend her and she marries the elder of the two, Antoine. Not long after, they hear that the king of Bohemia is besieged by Saracens and they go to his rescue. After the death of the king of Bohemia, Renaud is married to his daughter, becoming king. There are lengthy battle narratives as part of the telling of the stories of these four sons. This section of the tale may be considered a significant part of the story in view of the fact that Jean d'Arras is trying to convince the reader of the truth of the tale and that there were in fact Lusignans who ruled in Cypress and Armenia beginning in the twelfth century. The link to the house of Luxembourg should also be seen as important since it was one means by which the tale glorified the Duke of Berry, whose mother was Bonne of Luxembourg.

While all of the sons who end up with kingdoms or duchies are praised for their prowess, the sixth son, Geoffrey is undoubtedly considered the most renowned warrior of all the sons. When he comes of age he spends his time traveling between the territories of his family members acquiring glory through his marvelous feats of arms and his defense of their lands. Fromont, the seventh son, is without any kind of military career. He is pious and eventually becomes a monk. Horrible, the eighth son, has three eyes, is ferocious, and will be put to death on Mélusine's orders. The last two, Thierry and Raymond, who lack the disfiguring birthmarks of their brothers, inherit their father's

domain. Because they are young for much of the storyline they are not discussed extensively in the text.

Raymondin and Mélusine have a happy, prosperous life and Raymondin is very faithful about keeping his promise. He never questions the vow she required of him until his brother, the Count of Forez, tells him that there are rumors that Mélusine is being unfaithful. Raymondin is worried that his brother is right so he bores a hole in the door of Mélusine's bath and looks in. When he sees her in her half serpent form, he is instantly repentant. He realizes that she has been faithful and he is afraid he will lose her. He does not mention the incident and neither does she. He assumes that she is unaware of the transgression, although the reader is told that she well aware. Since he does not make her condition public she does not reproach him.

At a certain point in the story, Fromont, the pious son, wishes to become a monk. Although both parents give him permission, his brother Geoffrey is not pleased with the decision. When Geoffrey hears that his brother has entered the abbey at Maillezais he goes there to bring him away. When he will not come, Geoffrey burns the Abbey with all the monks still within, including Fromont. Geoffrey, who does feel some regret as the abbey burns, leaves it straightaway for Northumberland, where the people have asked him to deliver them from the persecutions of a giant. When news of this fratricide reaches Raymondin, he is outraged and publicly denounces Mélusine, calling her a false serpent. He blames her for Geoffrey's action, saying that nothing good has come from her womb but Fromont, who is now dead. At this public denunciation, his promise is broken and Mélusine, although she is sorry to leave him, transforms into a giant flying serpent. She gives him instructions to forgive Geoffrey, to have Horrible put to death and to care for

the younger sons and to leave them certain lands. She tells him that she will return three days before someone of their lineage will die and three days before the fortress of Lusignan will change hands. Later instances in the story will confirm reports of banshee-like visitations before Raymondin dies and before certain conquests of the fortress.

Geoffrey in the meantime has killed the giant at the mount Brumbloremlion in Northumberland. There he has found the tomb of his grandfather Elinas and read the story of Présine and Elinas, including Mélusine's crime against her father. When Geoffrey returns, his father forgives him and gives him the rule of his lands in the Poitou region. They both make pilgrimages to Rome in order to seek forgiveness of their respective sins. The abbey at Maillezais is rebuilt, and Raymondin retires to a mountain in Spain to live as a hermit. Geoffrey is described as a fair and generous ruler, who not only takes care of his lands but maintains close ties with his family members and is very respectful of the authority of the church.

Near the end of the text Jean d'Arras tells of an incident in which Geoffrey is confronted with a disturbing matter. In reviewing his accounts he finds that a certain amount of money is paid each year to an unknown person to maintain an ornament on the "le tour Poitevin." As long as it is paid the ornament is left unharmed, but when it is not, the ornament is destroyed and must be replaced. Geoffrey resents this infringement on his sovereignty by an unknown source and instead of having his men leave the money in the tower at the appointed time, he goes himself. There he finds himself in conflict with an unseen knight, who appears to be some kind of *genie du lieu*. They arrange for combat at a given time and Geoffrey is victorious. After his victory he is instructed by the knight that the tribute which was paid was done so as part of Raymondin's penance. He tells

Geoffrey that it will no longer be necessary as long as Geoffrey builds a hospital and a chapel where prayers can be said for Raymondin's soul. Geoffrey does this, and the region is effectively freed of the need to pay tributes to any supernatural beings.

Jean d'Arras concludes his tale by telling of some later apparitions of Mélusine, including one which informed the English occupant of the Lusignan fortress, a certain Creswell, from whom the Duke of Berry captured the fortress, that it would soon change hands. Mélusine visits him while he is in bed with his mistress, in the form of an enormous and brilliant serpent that then appears as a lady wearing out-of-date clothing. Although Creswell himself can not interpret the visitation, which frightens him, his mistress, who is from the region, tells him that it is Mélusine who comes before misfortune and that he must accept that he will soon be forced to relinquish the fortress.

Jean d'Arras seems to be very thorough in his task of glorifying his patron. The Duke of Berry was himself a descendent of the house of Luxembourg, which claimed a link to the famous fairy whom Jean d'Arras describes in such a positive light. In addition to this, Jean d'Arras upholds the Duke of Berry's claim to the region through the appearance of Mélusine to Creswell, his predecessor. Not only does the author provide a narrative full of glory and honor, he also begins with a philosophical discussion about the nature of the story and whether or not it should be accepted as true. He makes an earnest effort to convince the reader that the facts of the tale should be considered true, and that in viewing them as such, the readers are not dupes but can count themselves among individuals as illustrious as King David and Aristotle. He concludes the romance in the same way he begins it, by assuring the reader of the truth contained in the narrative.

A decade or so after Jean d'Arras's romance, a version of the story was written in verse, which version was later translated into German, beginning the dissemination of the story throughout Europe. Either late-medieval or Renaissance versions of the tale exist in almost every major European language. Part of the recent interest in Mélusine includes the finding and translating of versions of her story from languages as diverse as Welsh and Polish. Mélusine was a popular and powerful literary figure almost continually from the late-fourteenth century on. In the words of Jean-Jacques Vincensini, "son éclatant souvenir n'a jamais cessé d'étenciller" ("Introduction" 7). And this shimmering memory led to works beyond simple retellings. The original French versions of *Mélusine* can be seen as the literary ancestors of such famous characters as Andersen's Little Mermaid, la Motte-Fouqué's Undine and Giroudoux's Ondine. The legend was not only a preoccupation of writers, but of artists and musicians, inspiring sculptures, paintings and operas. Although Mélusine may not have gotten the same kind of attention from modern scholars as some of her counterparts in medieval romance and folklore, she has remained a haunting personality in European literature inspiring the likes of Paracelsus, Goethe, la Motte-Fouqué, Giraudoux, Nerval, Breton, Zola, Balzac, Proust, and A.S. Byatt to name a few.

While Mélusine herself never disappeared from the stage of French Literature, for a period of time Jean d'Arras romance was seldom read or treated. Although we are suggesting in this thesis that Louis Stouff was perhaps severe and shortsighted in his treatment of Jean d'Arras, we must recognize that the attention which he gave the work, in many ways, marks the beginning of serious scholarship with respect to it. The version of Jean d'Arras text which he published in 1932 is the version through which most

readers have had access to the text. His essay on the work, critical though it may have been, laid a foundation for future research, not only by providing a context within which to begin to examine the text but also by discussing many of the issues that would later be seen as significant to understanding the text's meaning and significance.

Stouff discusses the sources of the text in terms of legends and literature, including in his essay a selection from Tilbury's *Otia Imperialia* (44-88). Focusing mainly on legends surrounding Mélusine, Tilbury's work, and the *chroniques* of the fourteenth century, he barely scratches the surface of the corpus of similar tales found in works anterior to Jean d'Arras's, but lays the foundation for what may be considered the largest field of study focusing on Mélusine. The search for Mélusine's origin or archetype in myth, legend, and early literature has been the preoccupation of many scholars; more than seem to be interested in a specific reading of any one Mélusine text from the later Middle Ages.

Since the story does in fact come from a folktale many feel that truly understanding the tale requires that one understand the function of the tale as a myth; one must search out Mélusine's original identity through myth. In the early seventies Laurence Harf-Lancner addresses the complications of understanding who a fairy from a medieval tale "really is" in her work *Les Fées au Moyen Age*. She begins with a discussion of fairies in medieval literature and their apparent descent from two differing female models from antiquity: the Fates and nymphs. The Fates controlled the destinies of men, but were not connected with desire. Nymphs were often involved in amorous adventures, but had little connection to destiny. The fairies which people the literature of the Middle Ages seem to be a combination of the two, not only being the key to a hero's

destiny but satisfying his carnal desires as well (17-18). Interestingly, most scholars seem to see Mélusine as leaning in one direction or the other, more nymph than Fate or more Fate than nymph.

Harf-Lancner discusses the figure of the nymph, describing them as generally sylvan creatures and linking them to the Celtic and Indo-European tradition of a mother-goddess, symbolized by the Earth and connected to fertility, abundance and regeneration (18). Those who are interested in Mélusine's origin as linked to folklore and mythology consequently tend to see her as more nymph than Fate, and it is this version of her which is perhaps the most commonly accepted. It is an idea that is supported by a number of tales found in the Celtic tradition which have similarities to the legend of Mélusine.

Mélusine is seen as being analogous to such figures as Rhiannon and Macha, supernatural women who brought prosperity to their husbands until they were betrayed, leaving behind posterity. Jean Markale, one of the strongest proponents for viewing Mélusine as the mother-goddess, in his book *Mélusine ou l'Androgyne* (1983), not only connects Mélusine to Rhiannon, Macha and other figures from the Celtic tradition but links her to such pivotal characters in Greek mythology as Pandora, Medea, Eurydice and Lucine. He sees in Mélusine the original androgen, earthbound and indissolubly linked to fertility. In a discussion of the possible origins of the name, Mélusine, he suggests that we can see the name as a juxtaposition of the Greek "melos" and "leukos", black and white. He follows,

> A ce compte, Mélusine serait la Blanche-Noire. C'est une hypothèse mais elle n'est pas plus absurde que les autres. Et elle a le mérite de définir très exactement la double nature de la fée poitevine, à la fois humaine et

> animale, mâle et femelle, diurne et nocture, bonne et mauvaise, donc blanche et noire. Etant la synthèse des deux notions, elle est à l'image de la Totalité. Et elle est alors l'image parfaite et ambivalente de la Déesse des Origines. (130)

As the phallic female she is singularly capable of regeneration and represents nature in a triumphant state. Within the tradition of folklore and mythology Raymondin's betrayal of Mélusine often takes on the color of the devastation of a traditional culture by a dominant and oppressive Christianity, the replacement of a matriarchal system with a patriarchal. Some feminists even view Mélusine herself as a talisman par excellence for representing what women should be, freed from the constraints of an oppressive system and allowed to generate that abundance that they alone possess. Those who espouse this view sometimes see Mélusine as similar to Lilith from the Hebrew tradition; Adam's first wife who rejected the patriarchal system offered her and became an ambiguous figure, free but feared. This feminist view of Mélusine corresponds as well to some of her representations in literature. In *Arcane 17* André Breton sees her as the woman-child, victim of man's aggression and the world's only chance at redemption. In her novel *Possession*, A.S. Byatt represents her as the mother-goddess and a type for the story's main character, a strong and independent female.

Although still dealing, to a certain extent, with folklore, the examination of stories coming from medieval collections of natural phenomena tends to cast Mélusine in a less positive and triumphant light. Such stories can be found in the works of Gervaise de Tilbury, Walter Map, Geoffrey d'Auxerre, Vincent de Beauvais, and Giraud de Barri. Those who focus on these works seem to see Mélusine not only as more nymph than fate,

but as diabolic. There are a number of tales in these collections, usually more than one tale in each, which share important similarities with the legend of Mélusine. These tales range from stories in which the supernatural wives are fairly innocuous to stories in which the wives consistently avoid certain portions of the Mass, and when forced to remain for the dispersion of holy water must flee, sometimes through the air and leaving disaster behind them. Some wives transform into serpents or dragons, others merely cannot bear what is holy. In general, however, the tales in these collections tend to suggest that the husbands are escaping some form of damnation when the true nature of their wife is revealed to them. The tales call into question the idea of riches and prosperity that come too easily. In these tales Mélusine and her counterparts are seen not merely as nymphs but also as succubae that indeed satisfy human desires, but at the expense of said human's soul.

There are also a number of romances and lays which have plots and themes quite similar to the legend of Mélusine. When examined in context with these tales Mélusine is seen as more of an equal balance between Fate and nymph, which is what Harf-Lancner suggests about fairies in lays and romances in general (17). Harf-Lancner pits Mélusine against Morgan and examines the differences between what she sees as two types of fairies. Those like Mélusine attempt to integrate into human society and leave behind posterity. Those like Morgan draw humans into the fairy world and leave behind only tales. Dividing the tales about fairy lovers this way emphasizes a point which has been of interest to many. Why is it that Mélusine, and fairies like her wish to integrate into society? What does Présine mean by suggesting that Mélusine and her sisters could have been happier had they allowed the human inheritance of their father to attract them more

than the supernatural inheritance of their mother? As early as the sixteenth century Paracelsus, a German alchemist, suggests an answer when he defines "Melusines" as repentant spirits looking for a soul through their connection with humanity. This view of things led to tales such as Undine and the Little Mermaid, in which the heroine is engaged in a pathetic quest to gain a soul. In this view, although the fairies are descendents of both traditions they can not entirely be considered Fates, since their ability to affect the life of the human they have chosen as a partner and their own fate is dependent on that human's faithfulness to a pact. In this sense they are helpless to control their own destinies.

Renewed interest in Mélusine in the nineties led to a number of readings which went beyond viewing her as the mother-goddess. Jacques Lecouteaux, for example rejects this idea that the fairy should be viewed as having her own destiny and suggests that she should be seen as the hero's alter-ego, a physical representation of *his* destiny. In this case she is perhaps a little more Fate than nymph. He sees a direct link between the story of Mélusine and the tale of Lohengrin, the swan knight. He sees them both as being representative of a physiological model in which the protagonists are meeting their own wishes and desires incarnate. In this model the protagonists always recognize at some level that such personifications are not representative of the real world, provoking a failure to comply with the vow they have made (192). Jean-Jacques Vincensini, like Lecouteaux, views the stories with a psychological or anthropological perspective and sees them as representing the process of individuation. Putting less emphasis on the fairies' integration into society, he focuses on how the human spouse is distanced from society and then reintegrated into it (*Narrations* 63).

Françoise Clier-Colombani deals with the topic of Mélusine's origins and analogues through a thorough review of Mélusine in image (found mainly in sculpture and illuminated manuscripts). The themes that she finds in image reflect those attributed to the different oral and written versions of the tale. Mélusine is often represented in sculpture as a siren, linking her to mythology and the seductive and dangerous form she and her analogues seem to wear as seen through some of the works of Tilbury, Auxere, Map and Barri. Images coming from illuminated texts, however, are more sensitive to the courtly aspect of Mélusine in her textual form and avoid representing her with the typical comb, mirror and unbound hair associated with sirens. She maintains her formal, courtly hairstyle even in images of her bathing. While she is not represented as a siren in these illuminations, she is represented in much the same way as other ladies who are spied on while bathing, notably Bathsheba. This connection suggests that possibly illuminators were sensitive to the theme of purification and cyclical renewal that has long been associated with women and bathing, especially in the Hebrew tradition.

Finding meaning in the Mélusine character through these examinations of her origin depends on the origins examined and perhaps on each scholar's own personal preoccupations. What is clear, however, is that there is no definitive answer to who Mélusine is or was in her original state. One cannot say that she *is* the Mother-Goddess, or that she *is* a succubus, or even that she *is* a water sprite attempting to gain her own soul. What is interesting to consider, is that Jean d'Arras may have been as aware as modern scholars of the varied traditions that Mélusine could be linked to and that he may have meant to make use of some of their implications.

Stouff also includes a section in which he attempts to tie the legend of Mélusine to actual history (89-119). Although the links may be few, they can be considered significant in understanding the text's desirability to the Duke of Berry. The linking of the text to historical events has also been of interest to folklorists who have attempted to match characters from the romance to actual historical figures. Although there are some interesting correlations made by folklorists in this area, for the purposes of this thesis, we will focus only on the general acceptance by scholars of the correspondence between Geoffrey à la grand dent and an actual twelfth century Geoffrey of Lusignan, who had the same nick-name and was in fact guilty of having burned down the abbey at Maillezais.

While the search for the origin of the legend of Mélusine and the search for historical correspondence between the tale's characters and real people focus on the legend in its general form, Stouff also treated some aspects which were specific to Jean d'Arras's work alone. He also lays a foundation in this area for some things that would later be considered important. He broaches the topic of the hybrid nature of the text, at least in its combination of romance and history, through a comparison of the text with some works from the chronicles of the same period. He matches sections of *Mélusine* to sections of *Méliador*, a fiction by Froissart but which has many of the attributes found in his chronicles. He concludes, and it is hard to disagree, that it is unlikely that Jean d'Arras was not influenced by Froissart and by the genre in general, making the work a mixture of romance and chronicle (58-71). The hybrid nature of the text has been of interest to a number of scholars especially in the last twenty years.

Vincensini, placing the text within its historical context, describes it this way, "Comme le fait la prose romanesque en cette période du Moyen Age, celle de Mélusine

mêle la chason de geste, le récit bref, le conte breton, la chronique, le livre de chevalerie et le traité morale" ("Introduction" 29). This hybridity is an aspect of the text which draws much interest. Kevin Brownlee sees Mélusine herself as a "master figure for the discursively and generically hybrid text as a whole" (77). Also emphasizing the fact that this was common of texts of the era, he sees a certain self consciousness in the text which is aware of what it represents as a hybrid text encapsulated in its heroine. Sara Strum Maddox sees something new in the hybrid nature of Mélusine's narrative structure, which follows not simply the tale of Mélusine or the tale of Raymodin, but crosses the two stories effectively giving them the equal status of protagonist, an uncommon occurrence among tales of supernatural spouses (17). Laurence de Looze sees the hybrid nature of the text as underscored by a tension between the old law of Judaism, also represented in the Germanic laws with an emphasis on action, and the new law of Christianity, which privileged charity and a focus on intention. Mélusine is banished due to Raymondin's lack of ability to abide the new law and leaves as a mark a footprint in stone, representing the old law and history as it is recorded, marked by actions and emptied of intentions (135). Donald Maddox sees the epilogue as a sort of metalepsis which serves to make the main part of the narration into a useable past. He suggests that the epilogue serves to transform the fiction of the narration into an actual functioning and juridical based history (267-287). Marina Brownlee views the hybrid nature of the text as a juxtaposition of allegory and myth, which she sees as creating an intentional interference which Jean d'Arras uses to focuses on the human rather than supernatural origins of his patron (239). As can be seen, the examination of hybridity in Jean d'Arras' *Mélusine* has lead to a number of different conclusions about the text. Perhaps such hybridity is simply

representative of an era in literature. The hybrid nature of this text, however, which is mirrored by the hybrid nature of its protagonist, has been an area of rich literary interpretation, distinguishing Jean d'Arras' text from other tellings of *Mélusine* and from other tales from the same era.

Finally Stouff focuses on the didactic nature of the novel and considers it "un livre pour l'éducation des princes" (119). He has not been alone in his consideration of the political advice which Mélusine gives her sons, which leads to her being linked to the Lady of Lake from the prose Lancelot (Baumgartner 190). This thesis will suggest that Jean d'Arras may have meant to infuse even more political advice into the text than the advice which is readily apparent in Mélusine's sermons. It is possible that the entire text is a contemplation of how government should function.

Other aspects of Jean d'Arras's romance have been examined as well. Not all readings require that Mélusine be seen in a universal or original light. In the seventies, long before the sudden interest that would lead to specific readings of Jean d'Arras's text, Jacques Le Goff takes a more historicized view of the text. He describes Mélusine as being "la fée de l'essor économique medieval" (600). He notes that the heroes of the tales in which supernatural wives are involved are never the sons of kings, rather they come from lower levels of nobility, in his terms "les milites"(601). "Des milites ambitieux, désireux de dilater les frontières de leur petite signeurie. Voilà l'instrument de leur ambition: la fée. Mélusine apporte à la class chevalresque terres, châteaux, villes, lignage. Elle est l'incarnation symbolique et magique de leur ambition sociale" (601). Mélusine is not an eternal deity but an incarnation very specific to the late middle ages. Emanuelle Baumgartner also argues for reading the text within its historical context and

not applying to it mythic universals. Baumgartner sees the work as an early "historical romance" in which Jean d'Arras, although he gives specific and accurate details about geography, blurs the reality of history by presenting places in states that do not allow them to be linked to a specific and recent past. The result is that the story does not appear as blatant fraud, but is projected into a vague enough past that it can be accepted as an interpretation of what might have happened, before what is well recorded.

The reading which we propose, as most readings of the text to date have been, should be seen as a layer which the author provided in addition the pragmatic function of the text. In a pragmatic sense, many of the questions a reader could ask about who Mélusine is and what her story means are easily answered. Claude Lecouteux provides an insightful idea when he says "La raison d'être de l'interdit et sa transgression" (191). When lamenting Raymondin's betrayal Mélusine bemoans her fate, saying that if he had not betrayed her she "eusse vescu cour naturel comme femme naturelle et feusse morte naturelement et eu tous mes sacremens, et eusse esté ensevelie et enterree en l'eglise de Nostre Dame de Lusegnen" (694). From a pragmatic point of view the transgression was necessary for exactly the reason that Mélusine points out; she was not entombed in Notre Dame de Lusignan and such an illustrious ancestor could not be bodily missing without a reason. In the same pragmatic sense there is a very easy explanation for Mélusine's hybrid nature. She is hybrid because the story is a hybrid of truth and fiction. There was, in fact, a Lusignan line which did have, a least for a period, dominion over the lands in question. The idea that this dominion was the result of a supernatural adventure thrust on a young knight who had no personal pretensions to power, however, seems to be pure fiction. Historians suggest that the real rise of the Lusignan house in the Poitou region

was quite the opposite, and was due not to supernatural intervention but to the persistent invasion of neighbors by members of the Lusignan house in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. As for their domains in Cypress and Armenia, their success in the Crusades surely was more linked to military capability than to some ethereal form of chivalric righteousness (Painter 27-47), and their control of Cypress resulted from a purchase rather than a conquest (Baumgartner 189). Certainly the Lusignan house was not the only to rise to prestige and prosperity in such a way. Pragmatically, just as Le Goff suggests, Mélusine was an elegant vehicle for masking the pretensions of nobles who sought to elevate their own status through means which might not have always corresponded to idealistic principles of chivalry. While the book seems to have been successful according to its pragmatic function, it is our contention that Jean d'Arras saw the story not only as a vehicle that could accomplish what his patron must have desired, but which could also convey some of his own opinions about the political issues of the time period.

It should also be acknowledged that the reading we propose is also allegorical. While some might argue that all medieval texts can and should be read allegorically, there are a number of characteristics of Jean d'Arras's text which justify the application of allegory to its specific case. There are a number of characters with names that indicate a specific characteristic or idea. Although they are not as blatant as the personification of abstract ideas that one might find in other medieval texts, they do indicate that the characters should be seen allegorically. We might also note the formulaic behavior of some of the characters, Mélusine, who builds and gives birth at such regular intervals for example. This formulaic behavior may also indicate that the characters and their actions should be interpreted in an allegorical way.

In order to investigate further the idea that Jean d'Arras in his scholarly way, was aware of the competing traditions that he seemed to be throwing hodge-podge into his text, we propose to take a better look at the authority figures which he puts forth at the beginning of his fantastical story. Although the small introduction which Jean d'Arras provides for the story is often commented on in passing, it is rarely examined. Two notable exceptions are the treatment it is given by Rupert Pickens and Jean-Jeacques Vincensini. Vincensini, in the introduction to his edition and translation of Mélusine, seems to agree with Louis Stouff that Jean d'Arras is merely scraping things together in his introduction. On the topic of authoritative introductions to romances in general he states "Certains clercs sourcilleux reprochaient la frivolité trompeuse des fictions. Pour défendre son oeuvre et garantir la veracité de son propos, le romancier, depuis le XII^{e} siècle, en appelle aux autorités" ("Intoduction" 24-25). He consequently sees nothing significant in the introduction beyond Jean d'Arras's attempt to defend himself against critical readers. He notes, however, that in citing Aristotle, Jean d'Arras is making a tenuous link which perhaps pushes the limits of Artistotle's theories. He suggests also that the real element which holds together the argument is an underlying Augustinianism, crystallized in the idea that nothing happens by chance and that all events can be seen as the judgments of God ("Introduction" 26). While there is certainly truth to what Vincensini suggests, one might also wonder why Jean d'Arras does in fact choose to cite Aristotle, whose theories are possibly being applied loosely and not Augustine, whose theories seem to match his intent exactly, and who was also a well-respected figure within the scholastic world of the fourteenth century and was even quoted in sections of

the *Otia Imperialia* that Jean d'Arras alludes to. This thesis will suggest that perhaps he had a specific purpose in doing so.

Pickens's argument, which may be seen as central to our discussion of the texts puts forth the idea that Jean d'Arras, in evoking Aristotle and St. Paul is placing his text and the argument set forth in the introduction in the classical dialectic tradition, creating very early in the text what he terms a "poetics of paradox" (54). Picken's definition of paradox consists, in its many varieties, basically in a frustration of expectations. According to Pickens, within Jean d'Arras' text, the truth is always found in paradox. He identifies a number of different versions of paradox which occur throughout the text. The theme of wonderment, a simple version of paradox, is emphasized repeatedly throughout the tale. The contrast between a common view or *doxa* and its opposite, *para-doxa*, is also a common occurrence. He gives the example of the Count of Forez, who when he is informing Raymondin that some believe that Mélusine is cheating on him, tells him both that it is commonly believed that she is unfaithful, but that some think Mélusine is merely some sort of fairy doing penance. Of course the truth is found not in the common belief, but in the less common belief. He notes as well the use of oxymoron, where contrasting feelings are expressed by certain characters in the tale, and hypomone, where meaning is suspended and something unexpected happens. The prime example of the latter is Geoffrey's reaction to Fromont becoming a monk. Finally, he discusses paradox in the Aristotelian tradition where it is meant as a pedagogical device. He suggests that Raymondin's betrayal of Mélusine is a failure to accept and find truth, as represented by paradox (48-75). In all the cases there is an expectation on the part of the reader or the character which stands in the way of their seeing the truth. If Raymondin accepts the

commonly held view of Mélusine as an unfaithful wife than he will not be able to see her for what she truly is, a fairy. If Geoffrey behaves according to normal expectations and accepts his brothers ordination, then the tale itself is frustrated and cannot come to it's right conclusion. If the reader accepts the expectation created by the author in the introduction, that all of the facts of the story are true and that neither the tale nor its purpose should be questioned, then s/he is unable to see any significant meaning in the text. This treatment of Mélusine adds some significant ideas to our discussion. First it suggests that Jean d'Arras's use of Aristotle as an authority figure was deliberate and that it does in fact add to the meaning of the text. Secondly it suggests that there may be a significant amount of meaning in the text which is contrary to the *doxa* or common opinion which may be formed by a surface reading.

Building on the idea, germinated through Picken's discussion of paradox, that there may be something to the text beyond what it presents as its surface and accepted meaning, it is our contention that Jean d'Arras is layering his use of the authority figures he presents in his introduction. Although they are effective in justifying the idea that fantastical things can be true, we would argue that Jean d'Arras chose them for a more subtle purpose than simply to make the tale seem believable. We would argue that they serve not only the rhetorical function of providing ethos, but the narrative function of serving as doubles. The conclusion of this discussion may also suggest that a number of repeated plotlines within the tale serve not only a narrative purpose, but also a philosophical purpose, as they become Jean d'Arras's own specific study of the telos of earthly kings. Although Jean d'Arras says he presents the ideas of these four people so that the reader will not question his tale, we would argue that he presents them so that the

reader will question not only his tale but also the implications it has for the real political question of government that was so vital to the time he lived in. Not only is the work dotted with instances where the truth is found in paradox, but the whole work is itself a paradox.

Doublings and triplings are a common occurrence in medieval literature and have a number of different functions. Sometimes a character is doubled simply to emphasize his or her supernatural or larger than life nature. It is common to find Celtic goddesses in trios for example, and there are a number of tripled characters in different Celtic and Breton legends. We might notice that Mélusine herself is a triplet. Her sisters, who occupy a rather small portion of the text, serve to reinforce her supernatural or divine nature. The kind of doubling that is most present in Jean d'Arras's *Mélusine,* however, involves a repetition of events or of similar characters. This kind of repetition serves to strengthen the storyline and reemphasize important points. The doublings in the narrative portion of Jean d'Arras's text start with the very first intrigue, which is Elinas's meeting of Présine; a relationship that will foreshadow the relationship between Raymondin and Mélusine, the story's main characters. The story that will take place between Raymondin and Mélusine is doubled not only by this introductory episode but also by the account of Raymondin's father and his mistress, the mysterious lady of the forest, as well. Raymondin's person is doubled in that of his eldest sons, who also gain lands and glory through profitable marriages. It is also doubled through one of his middle sons, who has a tooth resembling a boar tusk, recalling the boar hunt which lead to Raymondin's fortune. It is also notable that most of Mélusine and Raymondin's sons are discussed in pairs.

They adventure in pairs and find unrealistically similar fortunes. While they can be seen as doublings of Raymondin, they can also be seen as doublings of each other.

It is our contention Jean d'Arras begins his repetitive method of narration even before he enters the narrative part of the text, and that his introduction should not simply be viewed as a philosophical treatise meant to convince readers to take the story seriously, but also as an integral part of the narration itself. In this introduction, he introduces four people who serve as authority figures for the convincing of the reader that it is perfectly scholarly and acceptable to believe in "les choses dictes faees"(112). These four people are: King David of the Biblical Old Testament, from whom Jean d'Arras quotes a psalm; Gervaise de Tilbury, a writer from the twelfth century whose work *Otia Imperialia* retells a number of natural phenomena including a few stories which strongly resemble the legend of Mélusine; Saint Paul, from the New Testament, whose epistle to the Romans is evoked; and Aristotle, a philosopher from the fourth century B.C. whose theories on causality Jean d'Arras would link to the invisible world and to Mélusine's story.

We would like to suggest that Jean d'Arras presents through his allusion to Tilbury a context and a doubling for the story-line which he so repetitiously tells. Through his allusion to David we see a doubling for Raymondin, who in fact bears the name of earthly king, a position which David held in archetype. Through his allusion to Paul we see a doubling for Geoffrey à la grande dent, *enfant terrible* who becomes a responsible leader. And finally we suggest that Aristotle is a type for Jean d'Arras himself, who is presenting to his reader a methodical study of the telos of earthly kings. This thesis will proceed with a discussion of Gervaise de Tilbury, King David, Saint

Paul, and Aristotle. It will provide a general description of how they were viewed and understood in the Middle Ages followed by a discussion of how this may be reflected in the text and what Jean d'Arras might have wanted to suggest by casting his characters in the light of such well known figures. Jean d'Arras presents his authority figures in chronological order, working his way from the ancient David through Aristotle and Paul to an almost contemporary, Tilbury, establishing a kind of genealogy of authority. This thesis, however, will deal with them in a different order. We will start with Tilbury since his writings provide a context for understanding fairies and their function. We will continue with David and Paul, who serve as doublings for actual characters in the narrative. We will finish with Aristotle who provides a structure for understanding the purpose of the text as a whole.

Chapter 2: Gervaise de Tilbury: A Context for Understanding Fairies

Laissons les attuers ester et racontons ce que nous avons ouy dire et raconter a noz anciens et que cestuy jour nous oyons dire qu'on a veu ou paÿs de Poictou et ailleurs pour couleurer nostre histoire a estre vraye comme nous le tenons et qui nous est publiee par les vrayes chroniques. Nous avons ouy raconter a noz anciens que en pluseurs parties sont apparues a pluseurs tresfamillierement choses lesquelles aucuns appelloient luitons, aucuns autres les faes, aucuns autres les bonnes dames qui vont de nuit. Et de ceulx dit uns, appelléz Gervaise, que les luitons vont de nuit, entrent dedens les maison sans les huys rompre ne ouvrir et ostent les enfants des berceulz et bestournent les members ou les ardent, et ou departir les laissent aussi sains comme devant et a aucuns donnent grant eur en ce monde. Encores dit le dit Gervaise que autres fantasies s'apperent de nuit en guise de femme a face ridee, basses et en petite stature, et font les besoingnes des hostelz liberalment et nul mal ne faisoient. Et dist que pour certain il avoit veu en son temps ung ancien homme qui racontoit pour verité qu'il avoit veu en son temps grant foison de telles choses. Et dit encores que les dictes faees se mettoient en forme de tresbelles femmes, et en ont pluseurs hommes prinses pour moilliers, parmy aucunes convenance qu'elle leur faisoient jurer, les uns qu'ils ne les verroient jamais nues, les autres que le samedy n'enquerroient qu'elles seroient devenues; aucunes, si elles avoient enfans, que leurs maris ne les verroient jamais en gesin. Et tant qu'ilz leur tenoient leur convenance, ilz estoient regnans en grant audition et prosperité et, si tost qu'ilz defailloient, ilz les perdoient et decheoient de tout leur boneur petit a petit. Et aucunes convertissoient en serpens un ou pluseurs jours la sepmaine. Et dit le dit Gervaise qu'il creoit que ce soit par aucuns meffaiz secréz au monde desplaisans a Dieu pourquoy il les punist si secretement en ces miseres que nulz n'en a cognoissance fors lui. Et pour ce compare il les secréz jugemens de Dieu es asbismes sans fons et sans rive, combien que toutes choses sont sceues non pas par un seul, mais par pluseurs. Et voit on que quant uns homs n'aura oncques yssu de sa contree, qu'il a des choses veritables asséz prez de sa contree et region, que jamais ne vouldroit croire par l'ouir dire si'il ne le voit. Et quant de moy, qui n'ay pas esté gueres loing, j'ay veu des choses que pluseurs ne pourroient croire sans le veoir. Gervaise propre nous met en exemple d'un chevalier nommé Rogier du Chastel de Rousset, en la province de d'Auxci, qui trouva une faee et la voult avoir a femme. Elle s'i consenty par tel couvenant que jamais nue ne la verroit et furent grant temps ensemble et croissoit le chevalier en grant prosperité. Or advint, grant temps aprés, que la dicte fae se baignoit, il, par sa curiosité, la voult veoir et tanstot la fae bouta sa teste dedans l'eaue et devint serpente n'onques puis ne fu veue, et le dit chevalier declina petit a petit de toutes ses prosperitéz et de toutes ses choses. Ne vous vueil plus faire de proverbes ne d'exemples. Et ce que je vous en ay fait, c'est pour ce que je vous entend a traictier comment la noble et puissant forteresse de Lisignen en Poictou fu fondee par une faee et la maniere comment, selon la juste chronique et la vraye histoire, sans y appliquer chose qui ne soit veritable, et juste de la propre matiere. (Arras 116, 118)

Central to the scholarship relating to the legend of Mélusine and the specifics of each version of the story is the question of whether Mélusine is good or bad. The answer, which varies greatly from version to version, seems unclear even in Jean d'Arras's text. She is continually described as a devout Christian and a kind and just ruler. Despite the textual illustration of these characteristics in which she regularly builds monasteries and churches, lectures her adventuring sons on proper Christian behavior and generally rules in peace and prosperity, there is the disturbing reality of her hybrid body and the question of her sons' birthmarks. While the question of the birthmarks, which some scholars see simply as an indication of the larger than life status of Mélusine's sons (Victorin 535-546; Clier-Colombani, "Le beau et le laid" 79-104), may not be settled by an appeal to Gervase de Tilbury, it is possible that an examination of his *Otia Imperialia* can settle the question of Mélusine's disturbing supernatural nature. Although Jean d'Arras provides a great deal of information about what he seems to find useful in Tilbury's work in his preface, consulting the work itself provides deeper insight into what Jean d'Arras might have meant to communicate about fairies.

The *Otia Imperialia* was written by Gervase de Tilbury, apparently an administrator and jurist as well as an author who traveled extensively in his duties. It was written in the thirteenth century for the emperor Otto IV and was meant to entertain and instruct. He describes his own work in this way:

> Our lives are full of change and the shadow of alteration. So at one time the mind is buoyed up by happy circumstances, and at another it broods in sorrow; it is always moving, rarely at rest. Now it happens that in lucid intervals the imperial majesty sometimes feels the vexation caused in Saul

> by his troubling spirit banished or soothed by the sound of David's harp. Since therefore the best remedy for a weary nature is to delight in novelties and to enjoy variety, and since it is not fitting that such sacred ears should be fanned by the lying breath of players, I have decided to present something for your hearing to refresh you in the midst of your worldly cares. To be sure, I had promised myself long ago that, after the Book of Entertainment which I had composed at the command of my lord your uncle, the illustrious king of England, Henry the Younger, I would compose another book in recognition of his kindness. This was to be divided into three sections, and was to contain a description, at least in brief, of the whole world, and its division into provinces, naming the greater and the lesser sees. Then I intended to add the various marvels of each province. Their very existence is remarkable, and to hear of them should afford pleasure to a listener who is already informed of them and is able to appreciate such things. (15)

The work does in fact have three parts. Book One contains a discussion of the origin of the world and its creation through the story of Noah's Ark and seems to be traditional commentary on Genesis. Book Two contains the history and geography of the world and freely mixes traditions from the major cultures of the western world, juxtaposing, for example, certain occurrences in Greek mythology with their contemporary stories from the Bible. Book Three contains "marvels from every province, not all the marvels, but a selection of the total" (557.) Much, although not all, of Jean d'Arras's discussion of

fairies comes from this section which deals with marvels ranging from “people born with no heads” to “a remarkable beast which inhabits the Indian Sea”.

Although the *Otia Imperialia* can easily be classified as an encyclopedic *mappa mundi* as it does what the author indicates in describing the whole world as he knew it, and as form of entertainment, it is also often categorized with the *speculum* genre. According to S. E. Banks and J. W. Binns, in their introduction to a modern edition of the *Otia Imperialia*, these are “works which in a tradition going back to Augustine, were intended to ‘mirror’ both the way things were and the way they ought to be. The Mirrors of Princes range from offering personal advice to particular rulers to propounding in an abstract theory of kingship—though even the most theoretical works remain closely linked with the situation being addressed. Both of these elements are present in the *Otia*” (xlix). This classification should be taken seriously considering the fact that Tilbury starts his preface with the statement, “There are two kinds of powers, august Emperor, by which the world is governed, the priestly and the kingly” (3). Although our purpose at the moment is to discuss the context that Tilbury provides for understanding fairies, the political nature of his work may be of significance in a later discussion of how Tilbury may serve as a double, not for a character, but for the author himself. For the moment we will move on to fairies.

The sections of the *Otia Imperialia* cited in Jean d’Arras’s preface about fairies represent a diversity of interpretations as to whether fairies are good or bad. In a section dedicated to Lamias and Nocturnal Larvas (III. 86) Tilbury, couching much of his discussion on Augustine’s comments on spirits in *De Civitate Dei*, disribes different spirits and their respective natures, some being evil and others not. He also speculates on

the reason for their existence. First he indicates that they are allowed to take human form and to act only according to God's permission, being subject to God like the rest of nature (723). He then gives some examples. He tells of people traveling great distances in the night, of babies being taken from their beds, and of wine vats that are mysteriously empty and then later full again. He then informs the reader that when his opinion is sought in the matter of the truthfulness of these occurrences he refers to Augustine, who says that all such things should be attributed to divine justice because as it says in Psalms 103.4, "He makes his angels spirits and his ministers a burning fire" (qtd. in Tilbury 725). Not only does Tilbury use this particular quotation in this instance, but he will use it again in another chapter dwelling on the same question. Here he clearly introduces the idea that some of these unknown spirits could in fact be good. Of course this idea is followed by the idea that the "the mandate which works for good in good spirits, evil spirits use by his leave to mock and punish our weakness" (727). We see then that spirits are messengers for God, either rewarding the righteous or punishing the wicked. A discussion even follows of how some see these demons or spirits as intercessories between God and man, man being too lowly to approach God himself. Tilbury concludes the debate by quoting David, whom Jean d'Arras will quote in turn, who says that the judgments of God "are a great deep" (*Douay Bible*, Ps 35:7). In both cases the verse encourages the reader not to dismiss the stories s/he hears about fairies and their like, but to accept them as a part of the mysterious judgments of God. They do not fall outside the realm of a world governed by divine order, but serve as messengers, either to bless or to punish.

The possibility of seeing fairies as benevolent creatures and as creatures that dwell within the world as conceived by Christianity is central to the actual person who is described in Jean d'Arras's text. Although there are a few things which call in to question her virtue, notably the fact that eight of her sons have disturbing birthmarks and that two of the sons seem to have cruel dispositions as well, most of Mélusine's actions are considered benevolent and good. We might recall that in a number of similar stories found in the works of Tilbury, Map, Auxerre, Beauvais, and Barri; the supernatural wives consistently absent themselves from part of mass and when forced to stay are revealed as demons. This is not the case with Mélusine, who assures Raymondin several times that she is on the part of God and that she believes what any good Christian believes (164). Besides this, she is known as a good ruler who takes care of her people. Despite the fact that she scares many in her final departure as a flying serpent, she is much regretted by the people, "car elle leur avoit fait moult de biens" (706). Simply viewing Mélusine as some kind of lamia or siren sent to lure Raymondin into a trap to punish him for his sins is inadequate in view of the text itself. This implication is reinforced by Françoise Clier-Colombani's study of pictorial representations of Mélusine, in which she found that depictions of Mélusine in her bath which were part of the illuminated texts consistently represented her with the courtly hairstyle of the day and not with the traditional comb and mirror which typically represented the sirens (154). One could argue that the illuminators were sensitive to the fact that the tale was not dealing with the typical seductive siren and consequently chose to represent her in a different form. Tilbury provides the explanation that allows us to see that it is possible for the messengers of God, in the form of fairies, to be benevolent in their role as messengers of judgment.

Jean d'Arras cites a section also, where Gervase de Tilbury recounts a tale which resembles that of Mélusine in a striking manner. Although it is generally accepted that there did in fact exist some prior versions of the story of Mélusine, written in Latin and used by both Jean d'Arras and Coudrette, and that the story is in fact based on the popular legends of the Poitou region, Tilbury's telling of the story is seen as one of Jean d'Arras's sources for the main intrigue itself. The story which is told of a knight in Provence, Raymond of the castle Rousset, differs marginally from that of Mélusine and Raymondin. The knight in this case promises never to see his wife naked. Although he keeps the promise for many years and they live in happiness and prosperity, on impulse one day he wishes to see his wife in her bath. He is convinced that should anything bad have happened, it would already have done so and that the danger is gone. His wife tries to forestall him but is unsuccessful. When he draws back the curtain, she turns into a snake and disappears into the bath water, never to be seen again (89-91). The story is found in a chapter entitled "The Opening of the Eyes after Sin," which follows the chapter "The Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil." The context for the story is therefore the Fall of Adam. Tilbury states, "We must not fail to mention what Bede says in treating of the serpent which seduced Eve. He claims that the devil chose a particular kind of serpent with a woman's face, because like approves of like, and then gave its tongue the power of speech" (Tilbury 87). He then discusses the popular tradition that some women change into serpents and cites the story of Raymond of Russet as an example.

Within the context of Eden, some questions that we may pose about Mélusine herself may be easily resolved. Medieval scholars have identified a whole corpus of

stories with characteristics similar to those of the Mélusine legend and which Vincensini even refers to as "contes mélusiniennes." One of the common characteristics of these stories is that the mortal man who marries the fairy in the given story must make some kind of promise. In most cases this promise requires that either the knight himself or the public at large be ignorant of the fairy's true nature. In the case of the Celtic tales that precede Mélusine, their spouses were often forbidden to touch them with iron or to hit them, behaviors which would recall their true nature as horses. Knights from romances and lays were forbidden to tell others about their mistresses. In the case of Mélusine, Raymondin may never see her on a Saturday, although we know from Mélusine's discussion with her mother that she may retain her husband and her mortal life if he will choose not to make her nature known to others. At any rate it is clear that the link that Tilbury makes between this kind of tale and the metaphor of a loss of innocence or the gaining of knowledge found in the story of Adam and Eve gets at the foundation of the vow made in these stories. The breaking of the vow in the stories can be seen as equivalent to eating the fruit in the Garden of Eden. It is the act which leads to a loss of paradise and innocence.

If we choose to read the tale as analogous to the story of Adam and Eve, we should look at how the text provides a description of a medieval or a feudal Eden. The degree to which Jean d'Arras has represented Lusignan and the other lands governed by Raymondin, Mélusine and their posterity as a paradise is significant. In the first place Mélusine, seen as the strongest of the governing individuals and the initiator of the line, brings wealth with her instead of requiring it at the hands of new subjects whom she has wrongfully brought into her submission. She builds the fortress of Lusignan with the help

of expert workers that “nulz ne savoit dont cilz ouvriers venoient ne dont ilz estoient” (214). Not only does she not need to burden the people of the region to accomplish her works, but her workers also seem able to work in a marvelously fast manner. Everyone in the region marvels at her ability to produce such prosperity. Although the “sweat of [man’s] face” (Gen. 3:19) has not been avoided entirely, it has been eased considerably in Mélusine’s paradisiacal world.

It is also noteworthy that when her sons go to war she provides them with enough funds that they can take care of themselves and pay their men, avoiding the need to live off pillage in the lands which they go to defend. When her first two sons set out to help the King of Cypress defend his land against the Saracens, she gives them funds for themselves and their men for four years and a large stock of food as well (313). Not only does Mélusine instruct them not to be a burden, but when they have accomplished the task of defending Cypress, Urien, her oldest son, proudly declares to the king, “nous ne sommes pas venus par avoir du vostre, ne or, ne argent, villes, chasteaulx, terres, ne finances, mais pour acquerre honneur et destruire les ennemis de Dieu et essaucier la foy catholique” (376). Their intention is to help with no thought of material reward, and what they gain is a result of their prowess and modesty. This is in stark contrast to the reality which Jean d’Arras himself would have witnessed.

The period now classified as the Hundred Year’s War was a period of great political unrest in France. Although England did seem to enrich itself to a great extent at France’s expense, in many cases soldiers were not paid by their lords, who could not afford it, but were expected to take their wages from the spoils of war; a number of combatants lived off of pillage. Ideally one would imagine that the French nobility

would have a greater respect for its own people and that while within French territory their soldiers would be paid, but it was often not the case. For much of this century there were bands of *routières*, soldiers who were no longer needed but preferred maintaining the soldier lifestyle, where their fortunes could be made through force, to returning home. Although these forces were at times exploited by nobility who needed help in various wars, to the people of the countryside they controlled, they were a menacing force (Wright, 1-15). The chivalric idea of the knight who fought for the good of all and not his own gain was not a reality in Jean d'Arras's time. In her *Livre de Paix*, Christine de Pisan notes that the payment of soldiers is vital in conducting war properly:

> pour le fait de ses guerres bien maintenir et que plus voulentiers en tel cas soit servis de privéz et estranges que ses gens d'armes soit tre bien paiéz afin aussi que moins aient de excusacions de fouler le pays et grever les laboureurs et que quelconques droit ne les puits garder que puguis ne soient se pares leurs paies il ne prennent riens. (77)

Mélusine's lecture to her sons and the provisions she provides them serve not only to emphasize the paradisiacal environment which she creates, but perhaps serve as Jean d'Arras's own version of a Mirror for Princes as he paints a picture for his patron and the other nobility of Europe of what ought to take place in their chaotic world.

Le Goff sees Mélusine as the symbol of the ambitions of the rising middle class in late fourteenth-century France. She is "la fée de l'essor économique médiéval" (600). She provides the paradisiacal situation where the economy, as envisioned by the growing cities and their increasing trade, could flourish. Although many scholars see her as a representation of the mother-goddess associated with nature and the earth, she is a

decidedly urban fairy, encouraging construction and trade everywhere she goes. Although her line may someday diminish, while Mélusine is present, the feudal world is what it should be, with knights who seek nothing but glory, the welfare of their subjects and the defense of the Catholic faith and a political system which does not hinder the growing economic power of cities but in which cities are built and flourish under the reign of a sovereign who does not need to oppress them in order to maintain her position of power.

Of course this kind of Eden cannot last forever. Although a number of tales dealing with broken vows can be seen as retellings of Eden, Mélusine's specific tale has very interesting implications as far as the making and the breaking of the vow are concerned. Raymondin does not seem in the slightest suspicious of the ignorance that Mélusine imposes on him. She imposes it in a pleasant way. It is not only his means of escape from the consequences of the accidental murder of his uncle, it is his path to prosperity and greater glory than anyone in his line has ever known. Her warning to him at their marriage also bears a small resemblance to the warning given to Adam not to eat the fruit when he is told that in that day he would surely die (Gen. 2:17). She tells him,

> Et sachiez de certain que, se vous le tenéz desormais ainsi, que vous seréz ly plus puissans et ly plus honnouréz qui oncques feust en vostre lignaige. Et se vous faictes le contraire, vous et voz hoirs decherront petit a petit et la terre que vous tendréz, alors que vous feréz la faulte, se il est ainsi que vous le faciéz, ce que Dieu ne veulle ja consenter, ne sera jamais tenue par nul de voz hoirs ensemble. (204)

If he is not faithful to his promise, he will diminish and eventually lose his land and his prosperity; he and his heirs will be banished from the paradise Mélusine has created.

The text in question is not without precedence for seeing the fall of a noble house as analogous to the fall of Adam. In a moralized Bible made for Saint Louis in the thirteenth century one can read in Daniel the story of one of King Nebuchadnezzar's dreams in which he sees a beautiful tree which is large, has much fruit, provides shade and is a blessing to all. A messenger from heaven orders the hewing of the tree, and its destruction, save for a band of metal put around the trunk. Since the court astrologers are unable to interpret the dream the king turns to Daniel who informs him that the dream is about his own rule. Nebuchadnezzar has grown large and prosperous but is not righteous and will be driven from among men and deprived of his kingdom. The saving of the stump indicates that should he repent his kingdom will be returned to him. In the Toledo moralized Bible this particular dream is allegorized with the Garden of Eden. Nebuchadnezzar being driven from men, as represented by the hewing of the tree is representative of Adam and Eve being kicked out of the Garden. The hope that remains in the stump is symbolic of Christ's power to forgive man's sins (*Biblia de San Luis*, vol. 1 205v). It is clear that in the medieval mind the idea of a Lord losing his lands and his power, or his posterity losing them, is not far removed from the idea of the fall of Adam.

Raymondin however seems very happy to remain in a state of ignorance and for quite some time does not risk the fall. When Mélusine first appears and indicates that she can help him, he does not question her origin or her motives. When his cousin the new Duke of Poitou asks about Mélusine's origin, Raymondin replies that as long as he, Raymondin, is satisfied with Mélusine there should be no cause for others to question

her. He goes to Brittany to reclaim lands, merely on Mélusine's say so. He is contented in all things to follow her lead and to not ask questions. His first inclination to break out of this ignorance is when his brother the Count of Forez suggests that Mélusine is possibly being unfaithful during her weekly absence. Raymondin at this point bores a hole in the door of Mélusine's bath and sees her in her half serpent form. It is here that the discussion of the story as related to the idea of the serpent in Eden having the face of a woman becomes particularly interesting. Although he does not denounce her at this point, Raymondin has had, through his vision of the snake, his first temptation to question his paradisiacal reign and to take a more active role in seeking knowledge as opposed to ruling blindly.

Patricia Victorin, in a discussion of beauty and ugliness, suggests an interesting way of viewing Raymondin and Mélusine's son, Horrible, who has three eyes and is ferocious. She suggests that we can see the third eye as being a representation of the hole that Raymondin pierces in Mélusine's door. In her words, "L'enfant monstrueux et maléfique met à nu le désir de voir de Raimondin puisque l'un comme l'autre peuvent provoquer la fin de la fondation des possessions du lignage" (540). Horrible, who is perhaps their most dangerous son, will later be killed on Mélusine's order. She says "Beaulx seigneurs, gardéz, si cher vous avez vostre honneur et vostre chevance que, si tost que je seray partie, que vous faciéz tant que Horrible, notre filz qui a trois yeulx dont l'un est ou front, soit mort privement. Car sachiéz en verité que il feroit tant de maulx que ce ne seroit pas si grant dommage de la mort de xx^{m} que de la perte que on auroit par lui, car certainement il destruiroit tout quanque j'ay ediffié na jamais guerre ne fauldroit ou pays de Poictou ne de Guyenne" (700). Can this be seen as a natural consequence of

Raymondin gaining or seeking knowledge? As long as he is ignorant of Mélusine's state, and blindly follows there can be no evil in their little paradise. What Raymondin introduces through his voyeuristic act is the possibility of evil in their house, an evil strong enough to destroy everything that they have.

It is interesting also to examine the events that actually lead up to Raymondin's final denunciation of Mélusine. The incident is foreshadowed by and always linked to the burning of the abbey of Maillezais by Geoffrey à la grande dent. Due to their unusual birthmarks Raymondin and Mélusine's first eight sons are generally associated more readily with their mother than their father. Geoffrey is one possible exception, although he is often referred to as Mélusine's true heir. Geoffrey's distinguishing characteristic is that of his large tooth, for which he is named, which is large enough to resemble that of a boar. This tusk is an allusion to the opening incident of the Raymondin/Mélusine narrative in which Raymondin accidentally kills his uncle Aymeri, Duke of Poitiu. One can therefore see Geoffrey as a doubling of Raymondin. For the sake of this discussion let us consider not only Geoffrey, but all of Raymondin's sons as doubling him. The conflict that arises between the two sons Geoffrey and Fromont can then be seen as an internal conflict. It has often been noticed that of Raymondin and Mélusine's ten sons the three unmarried sons, Geoffrey, Fromont, and Horrible, play perhaps the most significant and strange roles in the story. Geoffrey is the most renowned of all of the sons but is often described as ferocious. He gets the most attention in subsequent retellings of the tale and in the rich corpus of pictorial representations of the legend. Although he does in fact inherit his father's domains and is considered the true heir of Mélusine, he himself is without heir and leaves the family lands to his brother Raymond, who becomes the count

of Forez. Fromont is the one son that Raymondin considers good when he publicly denounces Mélusine as a “tresfaulse serpente” (692). Despite this one appraisal Fromont is very different from his brothers whose merits are constantly enumerated. He has no physical prowess or military ability and chooses instead to become a monk so that he can pray for the welfare of his family. It is this decision which incites Geoffrey to anger and provokes him into burning the abbey with his brother and all the monks in it. Horrible is also a fairly unique individual. Although Geoffrey is often described as ferocious, he is nothing compared with Horrible, who “fu si crueulx que et si mauvais qu’il occist, ains qu’il eust quatre ans, deux norrices” (294). As has already been noted he will be killed on Mélusine’s orders.

The three brothers can be seen as allegorical representations of earth, heaven and hell. Associating Horrible with hell is no stretch considering that he is the most demonic of all of Mélusine’s progeny. Fromont, who desires nothing of the earthly exploits of his knightly brothers and wishes only to pray for the souls of his family members, is an easy connection to heaven. Geoffrey unlike the other characters in the story is linked to an actual historical figure not only in nature, but in the historical event of the burning of the abbey of Maillezais. Of this figure, Stouff says “Les chroniques s’accordent avec Jean d’Arras pour reconnaître à Geoffrey non seulment la dent mais l’humeur d’un sanglier. Il est le blasphème incarné. ‘Il n’y a pas de Dieu,’ est le cri de guerre du Geoffrey historique. ‘Par la dent Dieu’ le juron du Geoffrey fabuleux. L’un et l’autre ont le mépris et la haine des moines, quelle que soit leur robe” (94). Linked to a figure who saw no place for God and heaven and disdainful of the clergy, Geoffrey is constantly delivering his brothers and his father from earthly peril. Their lands and their subjects are his affair.

His tie to the world he lives in is clear. The conflict then is the internal struggle through which, if Raymondin chooses the path of knowledge he will fall and be firmly planted in the domain of earthly things.

Horrible does not play a real role in the conflict, perhaps because Raymondin in his own paradise does not recognize the real possibility of hell holding sway in his domain, a possibility of which Mélusine must later advise him. Geoffrey and Fromont are in direct conflict though. It is interesting that in the end, Mélusine, whom we see as being linked to knowledge, justifies Geoffrey, claiming that it was the judgment of God that the monks should perish. If this is true, how should we perceive Fromont's decision to become a monk? Is it possible to see his choice to become a monk as the actual provocation for the denunciation of Mélusine and the eventual "fall" of Raymondin? If the three sons are doublings of Raymondin then Fromont's taking monastic orders can be seen as Raymondin's desire to choose that path over the earthly one in an attempt to seek knowledge, but only of good and not evil. In response to that decision another part of Raymondin's character is not satisfied and chooses instead to remove his investment from heaven and genuinely to enter the world where there is knowledge to be gained of both good and evil. When Raymondin accuses Mélusine he is not simply accusing her of having born him unworthy sons, he is accusing her of having led him out of paradise through the temptation of knowledge. She cannot remain with him, no matter how repentant he is, because he cannot undo his choice to accept the world and the knowledge it brings.

At this point we must concede that we have argued that we can view Mélusine in two opposing ways. She can be seen as a benevolent being associated with divinity, and

one who brings with her the power to create and maintain Eden. She can also be viewed as having been the very serpent that leads Raymondin out of the Eden which she has created. If both arguments seem convincing in view of the text itself and the context which the *Otia Imperialia* provides for understanding it, how should we interpret this specific manifestation of Mélusine's hybrid nature? Is there anything new to be seen in viewing Mélusine as both the divine power that can create prosperity and the demonic power which tempts men to loose it? Mélusine has often been seen as a combination of good and evil, but these interpretations generally divide the good and the evil according to her human and fairy sides, the human being good and the fairy evil, at least the serpentine tail, the ultimate symbol of her fairy side, is always associated with evil. Our argument, however, has suggested that it is her very nature as a fairy which allows her to create a feudal paradise. Must we then see her fairy side as a hybrid itself? And what would that suggest about the judgments of God and the way in which Jean d'Arras may have viewed the story of the fall?

Jean d'Arras to a certain extent alludes to this kind of paradox in the incident which precedes Mélusine and Raymondin's first meeting. Raymondin and his uncle, Aymeri, Count of Poitou, are on a boar hunt. They end up alone in the forest at night. Aymeri is learned in reading the stars, a habit which Raymondin reproaches him saying "Il ne appartient point a si hault prince comme vous etes, mettre cure de enquerre de telz ars ne de telz choses, car comment qu'il soit, Dieu vous a pourveu de treshaulte et noble seigneurie et possesion terrienne, dont vous vous pouéz bien passer, s'il vous plaist, de vous donner courroux ne ennuy pour telz choses qui ne vous peuent ne aidier ne nuire" (152). At this early point we see that Raymondin is not at all inclined to question his or

anyone else's state in life. His uncle has what God has given him and there is no reason to waste time on matters that are beyond his control. His attitude is similar to that which will be expressed later on by Geoffrey when he hears of Fromont taking orders. He responds to the letter which informs him of the event with the following statement "Eh comment! Monseigneur mon pere et madame ma mere n'avoient ilz pas asséz pour Frommont, mon frere, faire riche et donner de bons pays et de bonnes forteresses et de lui richement marier, sans le faire moyne?" (680) As long as one has what one needs within the world they were designed for, what need is there to seek knowledge of other things? Aymeri is not content with this passivity and after saying "se tu savais la grant et riche et merveilleuse adventure que je voy, tu en seroies tout esbahiz!" (152) informs Raymondin that at this moment there is much that could be gained from a parricide. "Et l'aventure si est telle que, se a ceste presente heure, uns subgiéz occiot son seigneur qu'il deviendroit ly plus riche, ly plus puissans, ly plus honnouréz qui feust oncques en son lignaige, et de lui ystroit si tresnoble lignie qu'il en seroit mencion et remembrence jusque en la fin du monde" (152-4). This is the ultimate paradox of the tale, and a key moment since it treats the recurring theme of parricide in a decidedly unique way. How can a subject prosper from killing his lord? If we see parricide as reminiscent of the fall, through which, although he was not killed, God was removed from the physical presence of Adam and Eve, then perhaps Aymeri, and consequently Jean d'Arras, is suggesting that there was something to be gained through the fall, an idea not often expressed in the Middle Ages. Must we accept that Mélusine's fairy nature is a hybrid or is it possible to rethink either Eden or the serpent?

To the themes of Eden and the fall we will return later but it is clear than in citing Tilbury, Jean d'Arras gives us a rich background through which to examine Mélusine's fairy nature. If she is in fact a messenger of God as others fairies are, then she is not evil. And if she is the woman-headed snake which leads Raymondin from paradise into the real word, we see also that it is through her power that the paradise was possible. We note that the moralized Bible which represents Nebuchadnezzar's dream as a type of the fall of Adam, also admonishes him that he should repent so as to avoid the fall. Whether it is inevitable or not, Jean d'Arras conveys the idea that by being faithful to Mélusine, Raymondin is not being held captive by a succubus, but that he is simply enjoying the idyllic state of innocence which comes, the text might suggest, from viewing the works of God with wonder rather than trying to understand the good and evil available in the world. We need not, therefore, simply dismiss her as a demon sent to punish Raymondin for his crime, and yet we cannot forget that to a certain extent it is Mélusine who has lead Raymondin to his downfall. What Jean d'Arras may mean by his varied retellings of the Fall of Adam may be clearer after an examination of the story with respect to the other authority figures he presents.

Chapter 3: David as a Doubling for Raymondin

David le prophete dit que les jugemens et punicions de Dieu sont comme abysme sans rive et sans fons et n'est pas saige qui les cuide comprendre en son engin. Et croy que les merveilles qui sont par universel terre et monde sont les plus vrayes, comme les choses dictes faees comme de pluseurs autres. Doncques la creature ne se doit pas pener par oultrageuse presumption que les jugemens et fais de Dieu vueille comprendre en son entendement, mais y penser et soy esmerveillier et, en soy esmerveillant, considerer comme il saiche doubter et glorifier cellui qui si celeement juge. (Arras 112, 114)

David is the very first person that Jean d'Arras evokes in order to convince his reader that his tale is in fact true. He cites Psalms 35.7 in which David says that the judgments of God "are a great deep." We may remember that this verse was also cited by Gervaise de Tilbury in a discussion of supernatural beings. At this stage Jean d'Arras puts the reader on guard by suggesting that they do not have the power to understand God's works through their own intelligence and that the only way to comprehend some events is through wonderment. It would be presumptuous simply to disregard the story he sets forth merely because one does not understand it. The theme of wonderment is repeated throughout the text as all are amazed at Mélusine's ability seemingly to create wealth out of nothing, and as all marvel at the feats of the ten Lusignan sons. On the surface it would seem that Jean d'Arras wishes his readers simply to enjoy the story and accept it as one of the incomprehensible judgments of God that cannot be understand of their own human effort. It is possible that he also means for David to serve as a double, which despite the author's apparent desire for the reader not to question the work, will open a discussion that provokes the reader to question the proposed purpose of the work and its characters.

The story of David is found in the Old Testament in the books of First and Second Samuel and First and Second Kings as well as in the book of Chronicles. As Simone Maser, a Biblical scholar, reminds us, the story of David as found in the Bible is most likely recounted by scribes a hundred years or more after the events would have taken place (424), not unlike the history of Lusignan. David was the second king of Israel and his ascension to the throne is a story as complicated as that of Raymondin, in the *Romance of Mélusine*. The children of Israel, by tradition were lead, not by a king, but by a prophet, who was their spiritual guide. At a certain era in the history of Israel, the people asked Samuel, the prophet, to appoint them a king "to judge [them], as all nations have" (1 Sam. 8.5). Although God's response was to tell them all the wrongs that a king would eventually do them, they still desired one (1 Sam. 8.10-11), and so Samuel was instructed to choose Saul (1 Sam. 9.15-17). Initially Saul ruled with the favor of God and all went well. Israel was a prosperous and conquering nation. At one point however, after a conflict with the Philistines in which he was victorious, Saul grew weary of waiting for Samuel to arrive and make a peace offering to the Lord and decided to do it himself (1 Sam. 13.8-12). At this point his favor with the Lord began to wane. At a later point Saul was commanded to destroy the Amalikites, including not only the people but all of their flocks as well (1 Sam. 15.2-3). Instead Saul spared Agog, the king, and the best of the flocks (1 Sam. 15.9). At this point Samuel informed Saul, "Forasmuch therefore as thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord hath also rejected thee from being king" (1 Sam. 15.23).

David, the youngest son of Jesse, was chosen and anointed by Samuel to be the next king of Isreal, unbeknownst to Saul (1 Sam. 16.1-15). David was introduced into

court life when Saul sought someone who was skilled at the harp to play for him and remove an evil spirit which had been troubling him. David pleased Saul enough that Saul made him his armor bearer. After having been at court a short period, David killed the giant Goliath (1 Sam. 17.32-52) and was made a leader over Saul's armies (1 Sam. 18.5). David was very successful in war.

Although David was initially a favorite of the king, Saul began to be jealous of David's renown and to suspect that the divine appointment once given to him had been transferred to David (1 Sam. 18.12). At this point Saul began to make attempts on David's life. Since the Lord had chosen David, he was continually protected from Saul. Realizing that Saul would never relent, David fled from the court and eventually from Israel. Despite Saul's continual pursuit of him, David remained free. In a few instances Saul's efforts to pursue David backfired, leaving him in David's power. In these instances David always refused to harm Saul and reaffirmed his own loyalty to Saul, insisting that if Saul were to fall it would be by the Lord's doing and not his (1 Sam. 26.10). Finally Saul and his three sons were killed in a battle with Philistines (1 Sam. 31.5-6). When David heard of the event he returned to avenge them and was anointed king over the tribe of Judah. After a period of struggle between contending factions, he was anointed king of all of the tribes of Israel (2 Sam. 5.1-3).

David's own reign was somewhat complicated and in some ways mirrored that of Saul. Throughout most of his reign, he was favored of God and the territorial domain of Israel increased dramatically (2 Sam. 8.1-8). Although he, like Saul, transgressed against God from time to time, he was favored as long as he repented. His most serious transgression of God's law was in the taking of Uriah's wife, Bathsheba, which led to the

arranging of Uriah's death. Nathan the prophet, who had replaced Samuel, condemned this action, reminding David that the Lord God of Israel had given David everything and would have given him more. As a consequence of his actions David is informed that his kingdom will eventually be given away (2 Sam. 12.9-12).

David repented but Nathan's prophecy was fulfilled. David's son Absalom rebelled against him and initially was successful in wresting the rule of Israel from his father. David regained his kingdom, but from that point it began to decline in power and was continually in conflict. He chose Solomon as his successor. Solomon however married women from outside of Israel and through their influence was led into idolatry, for which the Lord took the kingdom of Israel from him posterity (1 Kings 11.11). Jeroboam succeeded Solomon as king of Israel, while Solomon's son Roboam only became king of the tribe of Judah. The line of David diminished greatly in importance except in its connection to the prophesied Messiah, which was foretold by Isaiah (Isa. 9.7; 11.1) and emphasized in the New Testament, in which Jesus' descent from David was seen as evidence of the fulfillment of prophecy.

David was viewed in a number of different ways throughout the Middle Ages. He was viewed as a type and shadow of Christ, an archetypal king, an example of repentance, and as an artist. In a review of David throughout medieval French literature Simone Maser points out to us how different works of literature tend to focus on different aspects of David. Much of the theological literature was influenced by early Christian writings about David. It is interesting that both in the Judaic and the Christian traditions David is valued to the point that his sin of adultery with Bathsheba is generally justified. Maser

comments on this justification, discussing a passage from the *Apologies of David* of St. Ambroise,

> Il continue en ayant recours à la méthode allégorique et finit par démontrer que le pardon obtenu par David grace à son repentir préfigure la redemption que le Christ obtiendra pour le monde grâce à son sacrifice. C'est anisi que nous sommes devant ce paradoxe qu'un adultère doublé d'un meurtre devient le symbole de la réalité salvatrice. Ce paradoxe a donné naissance à l'une des lois les plus étonnantes de l'exégèse doctrinale, la loi des significations inversées. (428)

David's sin is justified because it makes him an example of repentance. In this view, he was purposely lead into sin so that he could show men how to repent and so the power of Christ's sacrifice could be glorified through him.

Maser also discusses an etymological allegory suggested by Isidore de Seville, a seventh century archbishop famous for his etymologies. Seville interprets Bathsheba as meaning "seven wells", associating her with the Holy Spirit and making her a symbol for the Church, which makes possible the flow of "living waters." Seville derives Uriah from "or" meaning "gold", which represents that he is like Lucifer, glorious in the beginning, but who becomes a fallen angel.

> A partir de ces données, l'episode de Bethsabée est ainsi reconstitué: David sur la terrasse tomba amoureux de l'Eglise qui se purifiait de toutes les impurtés du passé. Il l'enleva de sa maison d'argile pour la faire entrer dans la maison de méditation puis il tua le diable qui avait maintenu

> l'Eglise en servitude. Aimons donc David, le "bien-aimé" qui nous a libérés du demon! (Maser 430)

The theologians responsible for the moralized Bibles made throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries seem to have caught hold of this tradition started by Isidore de Seville and allegorize Bathsheba as a representation of the Church, and David desiring her after her purifying bath as a representation of Christ desiring a pure and clean Church. This particular interpretation can be seen both in the Toledo and the Vienna versions (*Biblia de San Luis* vol. 1, fol 120r; *Bible moralisée* vol. 1, fol. 45r)

Theological writings emphasized not only David's role as a penitent but also the importance of his link to Christ, genealogically and as a type. Augustine's writings focus on both the allegorical meaning of David's life and some of its literal meanings. Augustine saw both David's writings and his life story as prophetic, pointing in all ways to Jesus Christ and the New Law. Augustine moralized events from David's life to justify Christian doctrine (Maser 429). The same moralized bibles which justify David's taking of Bathsheba, also consistently allegorize him as Jesus Christ. Almost all that he does points in some way to the life and passion of the Savior (*Biblia de San Luis* vol 1. fol. 104r-122r; *Bible moralisée* fol. 39r-46r). In this tradition David is important, not because he was a successful king, but because he foretells the coming of the savior.

Tellings of David's story in medieval Norman translations tend to apply contemporary terms to David's world, using words such as "conestable" and "chevalerie". David is integrated into the medieval context by being described an ideal knight. This is reinforced by crusade accounts, where a link is made between righteous conduct and success. Maser notes, "David est dans toutes les consciences du Moyen Age comme l'élu

de Dieu qui prospère lorsqu'il suit les commandements de Dieu mais est châtié lorsqu'il pèche, un modèle à ne jamais oublier" (436).

David is mentioned and alluded to in different *chansons de geste*, where his example as a military leader and king is evoked. At times his example of sorrow is also important. In mourning Roland, for example, Charlemagne compares Roland to Absalom, Jonathan and Saul, three people that David mourned (Maser 438). There was also a tradition, even outside of literature, of comparing Charlemagne to David. Charlemagne, at least in tradition, viewed himself as God's lieutenant on earth and accepted David's suggestion that a king can only rule through moral correctness and through his loyalty to God. David was also present in medieval drama, although he played a small role in passions plays, usually being part of a long line of prophets presented by a person representing the Church. At other times he accompanies those in limbo who are waiting to be delivered from their prison by Christ's sacrifice and resurrection (Maser 441-442).

After having considered some literature which deals with David directly, it may be valuable to consider some of the literature which, although it made no overt reference to David, evoked him in a recognizable way. The Arthurian tradition which is part of *Mélusine*'s hybrid text is perhaps the richest source of allusions to David. We propose to discuss David in relation to both Arthur and Tristan from this Breton tradition. It is possible that by understanding them as models we can understand something of how Jean d'Arras might have constructed Raymondin as an image of David.

M. Victoria Guerin views the origin of the comparison between King Arthur and David, who were both numbered among the nine worthies, as coming from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* written in the early twelfth century (15). The

Historia Regum Britanniae tells the story of the Britons starting with the fall of Troy, from whence they were supposedly the descendents. This history is very similar to the history of the Britons that Gervaise de Tilbury presents in his *Otia Imperialia*. Although it is written as history and not literature, the Arthur story in this text already has a number of points in common with the story of David. Guerin points out that both Arthur and David were preceded by sinful kings, Saul and Vortigern. Their respective nations are threatened by invasion, by the Philistines and the Saxons. Both David and Arthur slay giants, and both unite their kingdoms and build great cities which are centers of wealth and culture, Jerusalem and Camelot. After a period of prosperity, both kings are betrayed by a son, or "nephew", Absalom and Mordred. They both survive the conflicts but give their lands to heirs who will not maintain their glorious traditions. A line of evil kings is the eventual result of both Arthur and David's downfall. Associated with both is the tradition that they would one day return, Arthur himself, and David through a messiah born of his lineage. Starting from this early point, Guerin reinforces the idea of seeing Arthur as a representation of David by highlighting further correspondences in Arthurian literature (17-20).

In discussing the similarities between Arthur and David in Monmouth's text she notes that it is normal for Christian kings to be associated with David. "There is a precedent for the association of a Christian king with David: Charlemagne was referred to in his own time and clearly saw himself as a new David, chosen by God and with religious as well as secular duties toward his people. It is not, then, surprising that Geoffrey should have replaced Charlemagne by Arthur in his concept of Britain as a new Israel" (20).

The comparisons between David and Tristan are made on much the same grounds. Although the texts do not specifically refer to David, there are a number of similarities between the two. John Richardson discusses the allusions to David in Gottfried von Strassburg's *Tristan*, which can also be found in the earlier French poems (90-92). Both David and Tristan are musicians, who please king and court with their ability at the harp. Both are handsome and initially are favorites of their respective kings. Tristan's encounter with Morholt is often compared to David's encounter with Goliath. They both face a foe who seems to be more than human and who compromises in some way their king's sovereignty of his own land. Their respective kingdoms are greatly served by their success in overcoming said foes.

Their prowess in battle is universally recognized; when returning from a battle Saul is enraged to hear the women singing of David's superior victories and in Béroul's version of Tristan, Tristan has no fear of the dukes which argue against him as long as he is allowed to challenge them to combat, which he knows he can win. In the opening scene, he also suggests that there is no lord who would be unwilling to employ him, because of his physical ability. The relationship between Tristan and King Mark and the relationship between David and King Saul is also highly suggestive. Both Tristan and David serve their lords in a faithful manner, especially in their younger years. David defeats Goliath and Tristan Morholt. David leads Saul's armies, and it is Tristan who undertakes the dangerous quest, in which he must kill a dragon, which secures Iseut as Mark's wife. As the stories progress, however, both go through periods of being accepted at court and of being forced into the wilderness because of their lord's jealousy. What was once an affectionate relationship in both cases becomes one of jealousy and distrust.

In many instances the key element which is viewed as similar in the stories is the sin of adultery. Tristan's uncontrollable love for Iseut is compared to David's passion for Bathsheba. While this is a logical connection, for the purposes of our comparison we are going to suggest that, at least in early versions of the Tristan story, seeing this as the strongest link between the two stories shows a lack of sensitivity to the many other similarities between the stories. In the first place it does not adequately deal with the relationship which David and Tristan have with the men they are robbing. After the death of Uriah, Nathan the prophet comes to David and tells him a parable about a man who has only one ewe which is robbed by a man who has much land and many flocks. David denounces the crime only to discover that the parable was about him. Surely there is a difference between a man taking what belongs to a humble subject, and a man taking what belongs to his liege. The second point that is not adequately explained by this comparison is the question of the potion and the fact that God always seems to be on the side of the lovers. While David is clearly guilty of adultery in the case of Bathsheba and, worse, of cold-blooded murder in the case of Uriah, Tristan is compelled by the potion and cannot be considered guilty in his actions because he has no power to control his love for Iseut. While God condemns David's behavior through the prophet Nathan, who foretells the downfall of David's house, he seems to aid Tristan and Iseut whenever they are in need.

To understand a possible analogy between David and Tristan it may be more fruitful to look at their relationships with their respective kings than at their relationships with their lovers. If we view Tristan as having something that belongs to his liege, we might ask ourselves what David had that belonged to *his* liege. At a certain point in his

reign Saul offends the Lord God of Israel and his divine appointment is revoked and given to David. One can see this as the origin of the complicated relationship which exists between David, who tries to respect Saul, and Saul, who is constantly trying to kill David. The complications in Tristan's relationship with Mark stem from the fact that Iseut's love, which was intended for Mark, is given to Tristan. Is it possible to view Iseut as a representation of the king's divine appointment? Mark's divine appointment whether by true accident or by destiny, is given to Tristan instead. Tristan and Iseut are upheld by God because it is Tristan who has been chosen. Mark's claim to Iseut comes from the law and not from heaven. At least some versions of the tale could be viewed as questioning the feudal system, in which the accident of birth makes some men rulers who have no heavenly appointment.

We can compare Raymondin to David in a manner similar to that which we used to compare David to Arthur and Tristan. The narration provides more evidences for a connection than the simple fact that Jean d'Arras evokes David in his preface. The first and most obvious connection perhaps, is Raymondin's name. It clearly evokes the idea of earthly kings through a phonetic allusion to "roi mondain." David was a common symbol for kings throughout the Middle Ages. Raymondin, like David is a younger son, who ends up at court and is favored by his liege. It should be recognized that there is a striking difference between Saul and Aymeri. The former is wicked, jealous, and unwilling to give up the right which God has taken from him. The latter is wise, learned in the stars and is much more willing to accept that his passing might be beneficial to Raymondin's destiny, than is Raymondin himself. His behavior suggests no hint of jealousy or reluctance to see Raymondin replace him. Despite this, we must recognize that as long as

Saul and Aymeri exist, David and Raymondin's respective fortunes are delayed. It is only after the death of their lords, a death which neither of them desires, that they can inherit the destiny promised them. The reign of Raymondin can also be compared to the reign of David. In both cases cities of great prosperity were established. Likewise, in both cases the territory they occupied expanded greatly, David through his own exploits and Raymondin's through the exploits of his sons. It is also significant that the expansion, in both cases, comes as a result of the adherence to a true religion, Judaism in David's case and Christianity in Raymondin's case. Through illustrated versions of both tales we see clearly that there is a link between the image of David spying on Bathsheba and of Raymondin spying on Mélusine. Although the circumstances of these voyeurisms, and the chain of events they triggered, were very different, they both led to the downfall of a noble family. While we cannot associate Raymondin with giant killing, his son Geoffrey kills two.

We must also remember that David was an example of repentance, which he took very seriously. His immediate reaction to Nathan's condemnation is not to justify himself, but to recognize his own guilt. After Mélusine informs Raymodin of the irrevocable consequences of his betrayal, Raymondin also immediately recognizes that he is in the wrong and pleads with Mélusine to forgive him saying, "je vous supply, en l'onneur de la glorieuse souffrance Jhesuchrist et en l'onneur du saint glorieus pardon que le vray Filz de Dieu fist a Marie Magdaleine, que vous me veuilliéz pardoner ce meffait et veulliéz demourer avec moy" (696). He even views his breaking of faith as a sin similar to that of adultery, as evidenced by his suggestion that the forgiveness he seeks is like the forgiveness given to Mary Magdelaine, who in medieval times was considered to be the

woman caught in adultery spoken of in the Gospels. The suggestion of adultery links him once again to David. Raymondin obeys Mélusine's last wishes and then concerns himself with his own repentance, making a pilgrimage to Rome and then retiring to a hermitage, leaving his lands to Geoffrey's care.

While the correspondences between Raymondin and David are not as tight or exhaustive as those between David and Arthur, there are too many for one to think that Jean d'Arras himself did not intend for a correspondence. Matthew Morris suggests that the very purpose of the *Romance of Mélusine* was the sacralization of secular powers similar to that which took place in the Carolingian dynasty when kings began to be hallowed by liturgy. "[Ernst] Kantorowicz points out that the hallowing of the king by the ordinary liturgy, begun by Pepin and continued by Charlemagne, was an attempt at reviving the biblical kingship of David" (59). He then discusses how the Capetians in later centuries made an effort to maintain the idea that the king held a sacred position through the promoting of the Charlemagne legend. He concludes, "The Capetians' valorization of Charlemagne's secular power by linking him to the Christian supernatural was only one type of sacralization attempted during the Middle Ages, however. Other dynastic families attempted to valorize their claim to power in the same way, but instead of creating links to the Christian God, they sought to derive power from links to supernatural beings of pagan origin" (60). In this view, being linked to a supernatural ancestor served the same function as being seen as God's lieutenant on earth. It gave a ruler an undisputed right to the throne.

Viewing Raymondin as David changes the way that we view Mélusine herself. Firstly, it means that we must accept Raymondin as more than a passive vehicle. We

accept him rather, as Lecouteux would suggest, as the true protagonist of the tale. The phonetic allusion to earthly kings found in his name becomes and essential part of his character, when backed by David. If Raymondin, like David, is an archetype or an "everyking," then Mélusine is a representation of his divine appointment. As Matthews suggests, her link to Raymondin serves the same purpose as Raymondin being anointed by the church. Just as David is a successful ruler as long as he respects God's laws and maintains a relationship with Him, as long as Raymondin is able to maintain his relationship with Mélusine and respect his covenant with her, he rules successfully.

As a woman who represents a divine anointing given to a king or ruler, Mélusine is not alone. We may remember the comparisons made between David, Arthur, and Tristan and note that in all three traditions the king has a very hard time actually ruling without the loyalty and physical presence of his queen. Iseut and Guinevere also function as symbols or guarantors of the king's authority. We may remember that in the Bible when Absalom rebels against his father, one of the symbols of his attempt to usurp his father's power is his sleeping with some of David's wives, and that when the Lord tells David that he will lose his kingdom one of the metaphors he uses is that of giving away his wives. At a certain level both the stories of Arthur and Tristan allow for a subtle questioning of the feudal system where kings are chosen by blood-lines and not by God. Tristan, who is a more valorous knight than Mark, does more to defend and secure Mark's lands than Mark does himself. It could be argued that Tristan deserves to be king and ends up with Iseut's love as a result. In some ways, we can see Tristan's existence as being a means of measuring King Mark's shortcomings. It is certain that Tristan's presence in his court creates problems between King Mark and the barons which owe him

allegiance. Arthur's loss of Guinevere is often linked to the negligence of his lands. In Chrétien de Troye's version, Arthur allows Guinevere to be taken by Keu, although he is well aware that Keu does not have the skills to defend her. Not only is he negligent in defending the rights of his people who are being held captive in a foreign land, but he allows a rashly made vow to compromise his queen and consequently his power. One could argue that Lancelot gains entrance to the queen's bed not simply because he is obedient to love but also because he is able to do what the king himself should have done with respect to his subjects and his wife. This liaison not only represents a valorization of Lancelot, but also a representation of Arthur's loss of his divine appointment. In the early versions of the Arthur story, it is his nephew Mordred who takes Guinevere. This usurpation occurs while Arthur is attempting to invade Rome. One could argue that Mordred's power to defy Arthur comes from Arthur's negligence of his own lands in favor of conquest.

The idea that Mélusine can be seen as a physical representation of Raymondin's divine appointment is supported by the fact that while she is with him, he makes his decisions based on her advice, but once she is gone he looks to Rome to tell him what he should do. While Mélusine is present she has the ability to answer and justify all things. Raymondin follows her commands even to the extent of having one of his own sons executed and of forgiving another son of a fratricide. He accepts all she says as being the voice of truth and reason. When she is gone, he turns to the Church for advice. As soon as Geoffrey returns from Scotland, he announces his intention to go on a pilgrimage to Rome. There he accepts the directions of the pope as to what he must do to repent of having betrayed Mélusine and request from the Pope an affirmation that his descision to

retire to a hermitage is correct. By replacing Mélusine with the Church in the function of providing justification and advice, Raymondin suggests that he saw his connection with Mélusine as a connection with heaven.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Tilbury suggests that fairies can be seen as executors of the judgments of God. Mélusine functions as a specific kind of judgment; she judges whether or not someone is worthy to rule. Mélusine's aspect as a judge is established in the text long before she meets Raymondin. When Mélusine and her sister learn of the treachery of their father it is Mélusine who convinces her sisters to follow her to Northumberland to punish him. She says "j'ay advisié, se il vous semble bon, que nous l'encoulons en la merveilleuse montaigne de Northonbelande, nommee Brumbloremllion, et de la n'ystra de toute sa vie" (132, 134). They enclose him in the mountain and return to their mother who in the end is not pleased by the results of their adventure. Although their mother seems angry with her daughters when she hears of their treatment of their father, she does not make any attempt to reverse the judgment. She punishes her daughters, but the text tells us that it is some time after the incident that Elinas dies, still enclosed in the mountain, and only then does Présine go there to bury him in a rich and noble tomb. Why does Présine not simply release him while he lives and let her daughters go in peace? Perhaps the answer is simple; Présine cannot reverse the judgment. Mélusine has already begun her career as the judgment of God by deposing a ruler who could not respect the vows he made. It is interesting also that when Présine informs her daughters of their respective curses that she refers to Mélusine's hybrid nature as a gift. The entire passage in which Présine punishes her daughters is suggestive of the fact that Présine sees Mélusine's main function as being that of a judge.

> Tu, Melusigne qui es l'ainsnee et celle qui deusses estre la plus cognoissans , c'est par toy, car je le sçay bien, que ceste dure chartre et prison a esté donnee a ton pere et pour ce en seras tu la premiere punie. La vertu du germe de ton pere, toy et les autres, eust attrait a sa nature humaine et eussiés esté briefement hors des meurs nimphes et faees sans y retourner. Mais, desormais, je te donne le don que tu seras tous les samedis serpente de nombril en aval. Mais si tu treuves homme qui te veulle prendre a epouse que il te convenance que jamais le samedy ne te verra, non qu'il te descuevre ne ne le die a personne, tu vivras cours naturel comme femme naturelle et mourras naturelment, et non contretant de toy ystra noble lignie moult grant et qui feront de grans et haultes prouesces. Et se tu es dessevree de ton mary, saiches que tu retourneras ou tourment de devant sans fin tant que le hault juge tendra son siege. (134, 136)

Why is it that Présine knows that Mélusine is the instigator of the incident? Could it be that she recognizes Mélusine's function as a judge? She also gives Mélusine a certain amount of hope that her fairy condition will not continue indefinitely, if she is able to find a husband who is willing to respect certain vows. Along with this hope she is told that she will be the ancestress of a noble line. Simply put, Mélusine will be released from her function as a divine judgment if she is able to find a ruler (remember we are told she will found a great line) who does not need to be deposed. So long as the mortal she is attached to remains worthy, she will not need to act as a judge in the negative sense. If Raymondin had died without breaking his vow, Mélusine would have been able to die as

a natural woman, because she would have been fulfilling her fairy function simply by remaining with him and providing him the power to prosper.

The vow that her husband must respect is also illuminated by the story of David, and perhaps also of David's sovereign Saul. Saul's divine appointment is revoked fairly early in his kingship when he oversteps his bounds by making a sacrifice himself and by disregarding the Lord's specific instructions concerning the Amalakites. David's appointment is not revoked to the same degree since he promised that he will hold his throne forever, but he is promised that his house will diminish after his reign. This judgment comes as a result of his taking of Bathsheba and the resulting murder of Uriah. In both cases it is possible to see the kings as having forgotten their place. Instead of being blindly obedient to heaven they believe that they can see and judge for themselves, doing what seems to be expedient or satisfying for their own situation. As kings they believe they can take what they want without waiting for the Lord to give it to them. They have disassociated their prosperity with their obedience and do not see the consequences of ignoring the laws of heaven in their actions.

The vow that Raymondin must make to Mélusine is one of enforced ignorance. This is reinforced by the recurring theme of wonderment throughout Jean d'Arras' text. Raymondin is simply expected to accept the mandates of heaven without question. When his ignorance has been removed he is still allowed to persist in his calling, until he openly questions the law given him and the information that it hides. In questioning heaven he is, as David and Saul, forgetting his place and disassociating his obedience from the prosperity he enjoys. He fails to see himself as a dependant and thinks that he can act and judge for himself. Instead of viewing all his prosperity and posterity as being a gift made

possible through his relationship with Mélusine, he views it as his own and sees her as being a negative influence which has invaded what is his. The result is that Mélusine must leave him, revoking his divine appointment and leaving him, almost instantly regretful, to pray for her soul for the rest of his days. In an interesting way, his retreat to a hermitage and devotions in behalf of Mélusine are really devotions in his own behalf, the desired result of which will be the return of his divine appointment in the hereafter.

There is a link between the fall of Adam and the fall of David, which interestingly enough at times is presented with the woman-headed serpent. Jesse trees were a common medieval representation of the lineage of Jesus Christ. They were based on Isaiah 11.1, where the Messiah is described as coming as a "rod out of the root of Jesse." Jesse is the root and is followed by David and then the rest of the lineage recounted in the gospels. Some Jesse trees, most often sculptures, show not only the tree growing out of Jesse, but below him and being crushed by the tree, the woman headed serpent (Clier-Colombani 248). Although this brings to mind the scripture which declares that the seed of the woman would have power to "crush [the serpent's] head" (Gen. 3.15), it also brings to mind the law of inverse meanings that was applied to the David story. If David was allowed to fall into a serious sin so that he could be an example of repentance and bring about the glory of the Messiah, is it not possible that Adam's fall from grace was also prefigured to bring about the glory of God? In this case, how should we view the woman-headed serpent that brought about the fall? Although it would be hasty to ascribe to Jean d'Arras the idea that the fall of Adam was in fact a good thing, it is possible that he sees it as something inevitable which in the end leads to a greater glory. Perhaps he suggests the same about all kings. The idea that lines were meant to fail and be replaced certainly

served the purpose of his patron, whose link to the Lusignan line was distant and based on legend and who effectively was replacing them. The inevitable failure of lines is linked, as well, to death and renewal, a principle associated with the idea of the mother-goddess that Mélusine is generally seen as representing.

It may also be significant to consider the connection which Clier-Colombani discusses between Mélusine's weekly bath and the monthly purifying baths of the Hebrew tradition (159-160). We have already noted that there is a similarity between how Raymodin is represented spying on Mélusine and how David is represented spying on Bathsheba. Bathsheba's bath we know to be a purifying bath, which metaphorically was linked to the idea of repentance and renewal. If we see Mélusine's bath in this light she becomes a comprehensive model for what we might suggest about Adam, David, Raymondin and all earthly kings. The image of her in her bath shows her in two forms. From head to navel she is the courtly lady, who represents her husband's divine authority; from the navel down she is the temptress who will lead Raymondin out of Eden. That being said, she sits already in a purifying tub, which for the people of the Middle Ages would have evoked not only the Hebrew tradition of purification, but the Christian idea of repentance and baptism. In a single image she is able to represent the totality of David's story.

While viewing the story within the context of Eden emphasizes both Mélusine's power to create a paradise and her active role in leading Raymodin out of that paradise, viewing it within the context of the Davidic tradition emphasizes Mélusine's role as a judge and as the physical representation of Raymondin's divine appointment as a king. The fact that Raymondin ultimately fails to maintain this appointment mirrors the story of

David and so many other historical and fictional kings who are cast in his light. In a period where claims to thrones were debated on many grounds, Jean d'Arras subtly points out the fact that even among the European lines it is common for a ruling family to fade into nothing. At the end of his work he alludes to Léon of Lusignan the last Lusignan king of Armenia, who died in exile in Paris. The Lusignans may be present in the text but they have faded from the world by the time it is written. David however provides a context of hope. Although his line may have failed for a time, it eventually brought about the Savoir. David allows Jean d'Arras to glorify the supposed posterity of Raymondin, because although they have failed there is always the hope that glory will return through the same line. This hope is evidenced by the idea that only someone from his house will be able to maintain the fortress of Lusignan for more than thirty years. Jean d'Arras is able to lay at the feet of the duke of Berry, both the justification of replacing another ruler, and the hope that he, through his Lusignan blood, might restore the glory of a region.

Chapter 4: Paul as a Doubling for Geoffrey à la Grande Dent

> …si comme saint Pol le dit en l'*Epistre aux Rommains*, que les choses qu'il a faictes seront veues et sceues par la creature du monde, c'est l'ome qui voit les livres lire et adjouste foy en atteurs, entendre les anciens, les provinces, terres et royaumes visiter. L'en treuve tant de merveilles, selon commune estimacion, et si nouvelles que humain entendement est contraint de dire les jugemens de Dieu sont abisme sans fons et sans rive. Et sont ces choses merveilleuses et en tant de formes et manieres diverses, et en tant de païs selon leur diverse nature espandues, que, sauf meilleur jugement, je cuide qu'oncques home, se Adam non, n'ot parfaicte congnoissance des euvres invisibles de Dieu, pour quoy il ne puist de jour en jour prouffiter en science et oïr ou veoir chose qu'il ne puist croire estre veritables, lesquelles le sont. Et ces termes, je vous met avant pour les merveilles qui sont en l'ystoire de quoy je vous pense a traictier au plaisir de Dieu mon Createur et au command de mon dessuz dit trespuissant et noble seigneur. (Arras 114,116)

Here, in his introduction, Jean d'Arras alludes to a comment made by Saint Paul the Apostle in the beginning of his epistle to the Romans. In verse twenty of the first chapter he says, "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." Jean d'Arras qualifies the idea that one can see the invisible judgments of God through physical manifestations by indicating what kind of person is actually able to make such connections. Those who read, understand the ancients, trust authors, and are well traveled are capable of understanding. Although he follows this qualification with the conclusion that those who do so will see so many marvels that they will conclude as David that the judgments of God are an incomprehensible deep, he has introduced the idea that education will in fact help one to understand the works of God. He repeats his discussion of Paul in the text's conclusion. He suggests that the tale may be hard to believe but especially for those who have not traveled beyond their own regions (816, 818). While the suggestion is a rather strong

devise for convincing readers to accept his tale, (if they don't they risk being seen as uneducated, inexperienced bumpkins), it may also serve as a model for understanding the work. By applying what one knows of other literature and other places, the meaning found in the *Romance of Mélusine* may be expanded. In this chapter we would also suggest that knowing more of Paul himself will help us to understand the invisible intentions of the author.

Saint Paul the Apostle is a figure from the New Testament. His given name was Saul of Tarsus, and he was a Pharisee who initially did not accept Christianity but "made havock of the church, entering in from house to house, and dragging away men and women, committed them to prison" (Acts 8.3). He persecuted the early Christians to the point of participating in the stoning of Stephen and in procuring permission to arrest a group of Christians in Damascus. On his way to Damascus, however, he was stopped by a bright light and a voice from heaven asking, "why persecutest thou me?" (Acts 9.4) When Saul asked who was speaking to him he was told "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" (Acts 9.5). He was then instructed by Jesus to enter Damascus and wait. After three days, spent waiting in blindness, a disciple of Jesus, named Ananias, came and restored Saul's sight. Saul was baptized a Christian and "immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues" (Acts 9.20). He was accepted by the leaders of the church and became as zealous in proclaiming Christianity as he had been in fighting it. Many of his travels are recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and a considerable portion of the epistles which make up the second half of the New Testament were written from Paul to groups of Christians in various lands. He is commonly associated with the opening of Christianity to the Gentiles, having been described by the Lord as being "a vessel of

election, to carry my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts 9.15). Paul himself suggests that Christianity is open to all when he says that all who convert are "no more strangers and foreigners;" but are "fellow citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God" (Eph. 2.19). His travels led him through much persecution; he suffered imprisonment and shipwrecks on more than one occasion. Popular tradition had it that Paul was martyred at Rome by Nero at the same time as Saint Peter.

Much like David, Paul is associated not only with a corpus of theological writing, but also with a significant narrative. Despite this, they have some very striking differences. While David comes from a pastoral background, having been a shepherd, Paul is associated with tradesmen, having been a tentmaker. When viewed within the context of the traditions which upheld them, Judaism and Christianity, David and Paul have opposite stories. While David starts out faithful and gives in to temptation later in life, Paul starts out as a fallen individual, who does not understand the true faith and the prophecies which have been fulfilled through the coming of Christ, but through repentance is raised to a state from which he never descends. David's psalms make him into an artist, while Paul's epistles establish him as more of a philosopher, or at least as one who is equal to the task of dealing with them. David, a key figure in the Old Testament, represents the old law, while Paul represents the new. David, the king, is a civil leader, who rules with the approbation of God, but Paul, the apostle, is a spiritual leader who cares for the welfare of God's kingdom, which is open to all, regardless of the political system they come from. Paul and David may also been seen as similar because they both replace a "Saul." David replaces Saul the first king of Israel. Paul's case is

significantly different since the replacing of “Paul” by “Saul” represents his own change of heart. Before his conversion he is known as Saul and after as Paul. It may be of significance to link the unique cases of this replacement of “Saul” to the old and new law. In the old law, as in David’s story, wicked kings are simply replaced. Because of David’s sin, he was promised that his line would diminish, although this fallen line eventually led to the Christ. In the case of Paul, a fallen man could actually change and be replaced, not by another man, but by a new version of himself. The miracle foreshadowed by the fall of David and eventual coming of Christ had already been realized. As noted above, David’s story is about a fall from grace, while Paul’s is about being raised to that state.

Saint Paul, like David, was also seen in a number of different ways throughout the Middle Ages. Most of the literature which concerned him was hagiographic in nature. As well as having some of his acts and a number of his epistles recorded in canonized scripture, there were a number of apocryphal accounts associated with him. *The Vision of Saint Paul* from the third century recounts a vision in which he is lead through heaven and hell.The work most likely had an influence on Dante’s *Divine Comedy* and further established Paul as a significant and holy individual. In the later Middle Ages he was featured in a number of mystery plays, recounting his conversion and martyrdom. He was often associated with Peter, tradition holding that both of them had been killed by Nero in Rome, and Paul being seen as Peter’s champion. Iconographically Paul was depicted with a sword and book referring to Ephesians 6.17 in which he suggests that the word of God is like a sword (Di Sciopo, 190).

The *Biblia de San Luis*, a moralized Bible from the thirteenth century which allegorized David as Christ, allegorized Paul in most instances as a clergyman (vol 3,

94r). In the most extravagant cases he is represented as a pope (vol. 3, 110r). That David and Paul represented different worlds is also evidenced by the fact that Paul was the patron saint of such tradesmen as tentmakers and ropemakers, based on his own reported trade. While David is a royal figure with divine authority whose nation is chosen and maintained based partly on the exclusion of other peoples, Paul is a tradesman with divine authority who bids everyone to be part of the kingdom of heaven.

The writings of Saint Paul also had a strong influence on the medieval philosophical tradition. Augustine was greatly influenced by Paul's epistles which were part of the impetus for his conversion. Judith Stark suggests that Paul's notion of the will greatly affected Augustine's reflections on the subject. Pickens, in his discussion on paradox notes "As demonstrated by Peter Lombard's *Sententiae,* as well as commentaries by William of Ockham and others, the Pauline text is one of the bases of traditional theological speculation, as it posits the means by which it is possible to gain knowledge of God" (53). This tradition seems to be what Jean d'Arras is indicating in his introduction. One reads in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, "For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made" (Rom. 1.20). Although Paul still emphasizes the fact that man cannot understand all of God's judgments, he suggests that one can understand "invisible things" or at least that God exists through physical manifestations of his power. While David's psalms evoke the idea of wonderment which is so prevalent throughout Jean d'Arras's *Mélusine,* Paul's epistles led to a tradition which attempted to understand the works of God in an intellectual way.

The Golden Legend, written by Jacobus Di Voragine in the thirteenth century, discusses Paul, much like David, as a magnificent example of repentance. About Paul's conversion it says, "And three reasons been assigned wherefore the conversion of Saint Paul is hallowed more than of other saints. First for the ensample, because that no sinner, whatsomever he be, should despair of pardon when he seeth him that was in so great sin to be in so great joy. Secondly for the joy, for like as the church had great sorrow in this persecution, so had she great joy in his conversion. Thirdly, for the miracle that our Lord showed when of one so cruel a persecutor was made so true a preacher" ("Conversion of Saint Paul"). Like David, Paul is meant to give men hope that they can also repent. But he is a more brilliant symbol of God's "merveille" than David because he changed so dramatically from a persecutor to a supporter. Isidore of Seville suggests "that the name 'Paulus,' taken by the Apostle after the conversion, means 'marabilis' and 'electus'" (Di Sciopo, 189). We note that this etymology is similar to that given by Jean d'Arras for Mélusine's own name, which the Count of Poitou tells us means "'merveilles' ou 'merveilleuse'"(218). Paul was commonly referred to through out the Middle Ages as the "chosen vessel," referring to the Lord's description of him in Acts 9.17 (Di Sciopo, 189).

Le Cycle de Mystères des Premiers Martyrs, which is thought to have been written in the mid fifteenth century, not long after the first versions of *Mélusine*, describes Paul as a knight and a champion. When he is presented to the twelve apostles they express their acceptance and wonder. Peter says, "Doulz Dieu, vous soiez mercïé, De si noble conversïon! Vostre nom soit gloifïé, D'avoir esleu tel champïon!" (95) And Thomas praises him saying "Or a Dieu .i. bon chevalier; Il na pas failly a eslire" (97).

The description of Paul as the champion of the Lord is used by Di Voragine as well, who quotes Augustine as having said as much ("The Conversion of St. Paul"), and seems to be an idea that would have been common at the time that Jean d'Arras was writing. Being seen as a knight and more specifically a champion is one characteristic which Paul has in common with Mélusine's son, Geoffrey. In a sense both are valorous knights who are more than content to defend someone else's kingdom. After his conversion to Christianity Paul spends his time preaching the Gospel, which not only subjugates him to the Lord Jesus Christ, but puts him in a secondary role behind Peter, with whom he is often associated in popular traditions. Geoffrey not only defends and delivers his father's lands, but his brothers' lands as well. He never expresses the concern, which prompted his old brothers to go adventuring, that there will not be enough land for them each to have their own fortune. Until he is given his father's lands, he is content in the secondary role of champion, rather than ruler.

Paul and Geoffrey are comparable in their zeal and their efficacy, whether they are doing good or evil. Both of them initially have a penchant for what could be considered cruelty. Although Geoffrey is praised throughout the text as being the most "redoubtable" of Raymondin and Mélusine's sons, he is almost always described as cruel. In discussing the birth of Mélusine's sons, Jean d'Arras already alludes to this saying, "Cil fu grans, haulx et fourniz et fort a merveilles, hardiz et crueulx" (294). It is easy to hear in this cruel demeanor an allusion to Paul, who, before his conversion, was a persecutor of the early Christians. He was so renowned for his campaign against the Chirstians that Ananias, even after being instructed by the Lord in a vision to receive Paul, expressed fear saying, "Lord I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath

done to thy saints at Jerusalem: And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name." (Acts 9.13-14). Ananias's fear of Paul is similar to that felt by a monk at Monserrat, who fears the visit that Geoffrey makes to his father near the end of *Mélusine*. After inquiring after Geoffrey's identity he says, "Ne me creéz jamais s'il n'est icy venus pour nous faire quelque male meschance. Sachiéz que je me mettray en tel lieu qu'il ne me trouva pas, se je puis" (742). In the case of both Geoffrey and Paul, their tendency toward cruelty is corrected by a conversion. Paul has a vision on the way to Damascus after the stoning of Stephen, and is converted, rather quickly, to Christianity. Geoffrey's conversion takes a little longer. He is almost immediately sorry for burning the abbey of Maillezais. After burning the abbey, he retreats some distance and looks back.

> Et, quant il vint aux champs, si se retourne vers l'abbaïe et voit les mischief et le dommage qu'il avoit fait. Lors se plaint et se guermente et se nomme faulx et mauvais, et se dit tant de laidure qu'il n'est homs qui peust penser, s'il ne le veoit ou ouoit. Et croy que, de fin ennuy, il se feust occiz de l'espee se ne feust que les .x. chevaliers y vindrent, qui bien l'avoient ouy dementer et plaindre. (684)

Although he is genuinely sorry at this early point, he does not fully see the need to change his nature until the rule of his father's lands is given to him definitively. It is at this point that he has serious regrets about his sins:

> Et moult redoubtoient Gieffroy pour sa fierté, mais pour neant le doubtent, car il les gouverna bien et doulcement. Cy vous lerray d'eulx et diray de Gieffroy , qui moult fut doulent de ce qu'il ot, par son pechié, ainsi perdu

> son pere et sa mere, car ceulx qui sont retournéz ne lui scevent a dire quel part il ala ne en quel region, dont remort conscience a Gieffrey. Et lui souvint comment il avoit ars les moynes de Malerés et l'abbé et son frere Fromont, sans raison, et que par ce pechié avoit esté sa mere perdue, puis lui ramembre de son oncle, le conte de Forests, lequel il fist saillir de la grosse tour de Marcelli le Chastel sur la roche et le fist tuer. Lors commença Gieffroy fort a penser a ses péchiez et dist bien que, se Dieu n'a pitié de lui, l'ame de lui est en grant peril et en voye de dampnacion. Lors entra Gieffroy en une chambre et commence a mener grant douleur et a plourer ses pechiéz, et la lui prist devocion d'aler a Romme confesser au Saint Pere (736).

He has already become a less cruel leader, but at this point is aware, as well, that he needs to repent of his sins. He leaves Thierry in charge of the lands and goes to Rome, ready to accept whatever penance the Pope gives him. As result of this visit he will rebuild the abbey which he burned.

Sylvie Roblin discusses Geoffrey's conversion as a sort of conflict between the natural and the supernatural within Geoffrey himself. She sees the boar, alluded to by Geoffrey's tusk, as a representation not only of Geoffrey's personality, but also of his own fairy or supernatural nature. She suggests that as the romance progresses, Geoffrey goes through an initiation process where he conquers his own fairy nature in favor of a Christian nature (276). She discusses Geoffrey's conversion, in which a pilgrimage to a supernatural tomb is replaced by a pilgrimage to Monserrat at his father's death, saying, "le récit merveilleux inscrit sur la table d'or portée par une Présine d'albâtre se voit

remplacé par la recitation religieuse des psaumes et des vigils des frères de Montserrat. Geoffrey a-t-il compris que la pérennité que le père mythique a trouvée dans l'art n'est pas l'immortalité desirable, que seule la mort chrétienne peut donner à obtenir et qu'obtient le père naturel? Le sanglier a-t-il été enterré avec Raymondin? Il semble bien" (277). The idea that the supernatural or boar-man is replaced by a Christian and gentle man is suggestive of Paul's conversion, in which he changes from a persecutor to one who patiently bears persecution.

Both Paul and Geoffrey are treated as individuals who, despite their cruelty, have a specific destiny related to the welfare of others and both are justified by a divine power. In response to Ananias's fears about Paul the Lord says, "Go thy way, for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts 9.15). His sins are forgiven because of his special abilities, which will be of use to the Lord in spreading Christianity. He has been specifically chosen despite his defects. Similarly, Geoffrey is first faced with a specific destiny in Northumberland, where he goes to slay a giant after having burned the abbey of Maillezais. He is greeted by the people with much anticipation.

> Sire, de ta venue devons nous louer le doulz Jhesuchrist, car sans toy ne pouyons estre delivé du merveilleux monstre, Gimaut, le jayant, par qui tout ce paÿs est destruiz.' Et Gieffroy leur repond: 'Et comment pouéz vous savoir que par moy en pouéz estre dsccombré?' Et ceulx ont respondu: 'Monseigneur, les saiges astronomiens nous ont dit que le jayant ne puet mourir fors par vous, et aussi nous savons de certain qu'il le

> scet bien, et se vous aléz devers lui et vous lui dictes vostre nom, vous ne vous sauréz si garder qu'il ne vous eschappe.' (708, 710)

True to the prediction, the giant is terrified when he hears Geoffrey's name, and after an intense struggle, Geoffrey succeeds in conquering him, liberating the country from his tyranny and freeing 500 knights who were being held captive by the giant. Despite his cruel nature, he serves very well as a "chosen vessel" in this case. He is also justified by a divine power, Mélusine, with respect to the sin of burning the abbey. When Raymondin cries out againtst the crime of his son Geoffrey, Mélusine justifies him by saying,

> Se Gieffrey, vostre filz, a fait son oultraige par son courage merveilleux et fort, sachiéz que de certain c'est pour le pechié des moines, qui estoient de mauvaise vie et punicion, combien que ceste chose soit incongnoissable quant a humaine creature, car les jugemens de Dieu sont si secréz que nul cuer mondain ne les puet comprendre en son entendement. Et d'autre part, monseigneur, nous avons asséz, Dieu mercy, pour faire et refaire l'abbaye meilleur qu'elle ne fut oncques et renter mieulx et plus richement , et y mettre plus de moines qu'il n'y ot onques. Et Gieffroy s'amendera, se plaist a Dieu et au monde. (692)

Although Raymondin's response will be to reject Mélusine's counsel and denounce her, the text tells us that he knows that what Mélusine says is "le meilleur selon raison" (692). Geoffrey should be forgiven because his actions not only correspond with the punishments of God, but also because they create the opportunity for the abbey to be rebuilt and inhabited with more monks that it has ever known, presumably with more sincere lifestyles. The idea that the abbey will be renewed through Geoffrey is similar to

the commonly held view that the early Christian church had been renewed through Paul. Much like Paul is forgiven because of the increase his specific talents will bring to the early church, Geoffrey is forgiven because of the amends he can make in increasing the faith and the community of Maillezais. Mélusine's argument not only justifies Geoffrey, but it also expresses the doctrine taught by Paul in both Romans and First Corinthians (1. Cor. 4.5) that God will "judge the secret of men by Jesus Christ" (Rom. 2:16). This allusion links Geoffrey to Jesus Christ as well as to Paul. This comparison may suggest that Jean d'Arras privileges Geoffrey among the characters in the narrative. David was merely a prefiguring of Christ. Raymondin, rather than being the true hero of the story, may simply be seen as a precursor to Geoffrey.

The conversions of Paul and Geoffrey mark a noticeable change in their attitude toward the Christian church. Paul becomes known as a devout Christian and is happy to suffer all manner of afflictions for the sake of the Church. Geoffrey, who at one point could not bear the idea of having a monk for a brother, not only goes to Rome to seek forgiveness from the Pope, and rebuilds the abbey of Maillezais but, at the end of the narration, builds a hospital and a chapel where prayers can be said for his father. He is sorry for his actions, and from the time that he returns from his pilgrimage, is no longer described as cruel, but as one who rules "doulcement" (736). Geoffrey's narrative seems to follow a progression similar to that of Paul, who starts out as a fallen individual and through repentance becomes a moral one.

There is also a similarity between Paul and Geoffrey in their nomadic behavior. After his conversion to Christianity, Paul was rarely at rest, traveling all throughout the Middle East and even to Rome in his efforts to spread Christianity. His epistles also

indicate that he spent a great deal of time traveling to visit, returning to visit, and writing to groups of Christians in many different areas. Geoffrey, in like manner, is constantly moving from the time of his adulthood. He defends the lands of his brothers in the holy land with more zeal and vigor than even they. He defends his father's lands as well, delivering the people from the tyranny of giants and usurpers. After his own conversion and pilgrimage to Rome, he makes the rounds once more to make sure that the lands of his family members are all secure.

We might also notice that Geoffrey, unlike most of the Lusignan sons, was not married. Some of the writings of Saint Paul suggest that he viewed a celibate life as preferable to marriage in the spiritual sense, and he was commonly viewed as being single. While David's greatest legacy to Christianity was his seed, which led to Christ himself, Paul's great legacy was the tales told about him and his writings. Geoffrey, although he may be the most renowned of Mélusine's children, contributes to the family only through the stories of his prowess, leaving behind no heirs to continue the family line.

There may also be an unmentioned tie between Geoffrey and Paul in the fact that it is Geoffrey who seems, more than any other character, to be Mélusine's equal. Sylvie Roblin explores the relationship between Geoffrey and Mélusine beginning with her contemplations on a crest which featured the two. She explains,

> L'imprimeur Lyonnais François Fradin, qui exerça entre 1497 et 1536, fit supporter son écusson de la famille de Lusignan, à destre par Mélusine en forme de sirène à queue de serpent et coiffée de son hennin, et à senstre par Geoffrey dit la Grant' Dent, couvert de son armure. D'un côté la

> serpente, de l'autre le sanglier, au centre Lusignan. Voilà un étrange blazon quand l'on songe que, si Mélusine est bel et bien la fondatrice de la lignée, Geoffrey n'est après tout que le sixième fils de la fée. Bien plus, la légende ne donne aucune descendence à ce personnage solitaire et terrible. (247)

She explores the relationship, suggesting that since Geoffrey is himself almost supernatural, an "être demi-fée" (249), that he threatens Mélusine's designs, which are to erase all signs of her supernatural nature.

> Cette presque parité d'essence fait de Geoffrey un danger pour Mélusine, qui tente, tout au long du roman, de détruire autour d'elle la trace de son ascendance merveilleuse: *le sanglier condamne la serpente*. Mais d'autre part, le sanglier, dévoilant la malédiction de la Mère Lusine, éclaire l'origine trouble de la lignée: *le sanglier est la conscience des Lusignan.* C'est cette ambiguïté, voire cette duplicité du personnage littéraire de Geoffroy qui permet de révéler le sens mythique du rapprochement de la serpente et du sanglier dans l'écusson de Fradin. (249)

Roblin's view of Geoffrey's conversion, which we discussed earlier, is suggestive of Paul in an overt way. A main point of her argument, however, that it is Geoffrey who has power to remove the serpent from the Lusignan line, suggests Paul in a more subtle fashion. In popular tradition Paul was seen as having power over serpents. The tradition comes from an account in Acts where after a shipwreck Paul found himself on the island of Melita. While making a fire, a viper came and "fastened on his hand" (Acts 28.3). Paul pulled the viper off and was unharmed. Popular tradition in some places even held that

people who were born on Paul's feast day had protection against venomous serpents (Di Sciopo 191). The Golden Legend also refers to Paul's power over serpents saying,

> At the Isle of Melita a serpent bit his hand, and hurted him not, and he threw it into the fire. It is said that all they that came of the progeny and lineage of that man that then harboured Paul may in no wise be hurt of no venomous beasts, wherefore when their children be born they put serpents in their cradles for to prove if they be verily their children or no. (Di Voragine, "Life of Saint Paul the Apostle")

One could argue that since it is Geoffrey's actions which lead to Mélusine's denunciation that it is Geoffrey who has power over the snake. This power would make him a likeness of Paul.

There is, perhaps a small complication in comparing Geoffrey to Paul after having argued (in Chapter 2) that Geoffrey should be seen as a representation of the earth, as opposed to heaven and hell. After his conversion Paul was concerned with spiritual things rather than earthly to the point that Di Voragine says of him, "He refused all prosperities that ever were or ever shall be on earth" ("The Life of Saint Paul the Apostle"). Despite this small difference, they both took care of their respective spheres, the earthly for Geoffrey and the spiritual for Paul, in a similar manner. Not only did they take care of their responsibilities with zeal and efficacy, they did not seek power outside of their respective spheres. Paul did not seek political power and Geoffrey never sought religious power. The connection between Paul and Geoffrey is as strong as that between Raymondin and David. One must assume that it was intentional and that Jean d'Arras meant to communicate something by it.

Geoffrey is, in many ways, a unique individual in the tale. He is one of ten brothers, four of whom follow the model of their father by marrying women who give them great power. Three of his other brothers follow a model typical to the time period, by inheriting land and marrying well. Geoffrey is not only unique in his bachelor state, but in his physical prowess, which is greater than any other character in the text. He is the son who is chosen to replace Raymondin. He is also the only character in the tale that corresponds in any serious way with a real historical figure. In Picken's view, we might see him as truth-bearing paradox found within the doxa of the narrative. As a unique individual he changes the meaning found in the text.

As the Lord of Lusignan, there is as sharp a contrast between himself and Raymondin as there is between David and Paul. One major distinction between the two is the right by which they rule. Despite Geoffrey's larger-than-life character, he becomes the Lord of Lusignan without a divine appointment. He inherits it through simple bloodlines. When he retreats to Northumberland, after burning the abbey at Maillezais, he finds the tomb of his grandfather Elinas. At this point, the earthly bloodline, which Melusine had effectively blocked by responding to her "nature fae" is restored. The discovery of the tomb and the assurance that his mother was the daughter of a king corresponds chronologically to Raymondin's betrayal of Melusine. A divine appointment is lost and what replaces it is an earthly form of legitimacy. What we have is the juxtaposition of two rulers who claim their right to rule through different means. Although the apparent purpose of the text is to glorify the Luisgnan house through its connection with a supernatural being, some of the tension between Raymondin and Geoffrey suggests that Jean d'Arras might actually prefer earthly claims to supernatural

ones. As in the tale from the Breton tradition that we discussed in chapter 3, Raymondin's ultimate fall corresponds to a certain amount of negligence that Geoffrey makes up for. He kills the giant Guerande, who is terrorizing Raymondin's subjects and reinstates a piece of domain in Ireland, which has fallen into the hands of local tyrants. The people themselves are very happy to receive Geoffrey's help. Like Lancelot and Tristan, he seems to overshadow his liege. Not only does he become the good and gentle leader of the Poitou region when his father retires, but he is the actual force by which all the family lands are defended and maintained.

If seen as Paul, Geoffrey is even more unique. He represents a symbol of the new law embedded in a story that relies on the old law for its justification. We have argued thus far that story should be understood as a retelling of the fall of Adam, and of the fall of David. Both of these tales are found in the Old Testament and prefigure the coming of Christ. As a character from the New Testament and Paul removes us from the frame of reference where kings are expected to be representatives of God and in which religion is a matter of national responsibility. Geoffrey's differences from Raymondin raise the possibility that David is not the only acceptable model for rulers. In citing Paul's epistle to the Romans in his introduction, Jean d'Arras not only provides us with Paul as a doubling for Geoffrey and justifies the existence of invisible things, he brings to mind a text which has much to say about the old law. The replacement of the old law by the new occupies a sizable portion of the epistle to the Romans. Paul's recurring message is that the old law is dead and that the new law replaces it. This means that no one is favored simply because they are part of a chosen people but because of their actions (Rom. 2). Within the context of Paul's epistle to the Romans the argument that anyone should be

seen as "chosen" simply for sharing a bloodline with a fairy seems outdated and void. A claim based on an earthly legitimacy but backed by a practical ability to govern is perhaps more legitimate than a claim based on a supernatural connection. It is the ruler's actions that justify him as much as his claim.

In some ways the causality associated with David was alive during Jean d'Arras's time. In 1348 and 1349, amidst the hardships of war with England, France suffered from a worse enemy, the bubonic plague. In response to the terrible death toll, Phillip VI, who believed God was punishing the French for their sins, outlawed blasphemy. Offenders lost first their lips, and if offenses continued, their tongue (Seward, 73-74). Although such reasoning worked well in narratives, it was not entirely effective in dealing with the actual problems of the day. We might recall at this point the words of Tilbury in his preface to the *Ottia Imperialia*, "There are two kinds of powers, august Emperor, by which the world is governed, the priestly and the kingly" (3). He continues with a discussion of the responsibilities of those two powers, reminding Otto IV that they should remain separate. He says, "the kingly power should know itself to be set alongside, not over, the priestly; to be its adjutant, not its commander; given to be of practical help, not exalted to exercise dominion" (3). What is suggested, of course, is that the nobility of Europe would be much better served by taking care of the earthly needs of their subjects and by leaving the question of spiritual matters to the church.

Jean d'Arras repeatedly tells his reader the story of rulers with supernatural connections who overstep their bounds and break their vows. Perhaps he is suggesting that when a ruler sees himself as having an appointment from heaven, it is inevitable that he will forget his place and want more than what is his. It is inevitable that he will betray

the power that supposedly put him on the throne. It is inevitable that he will fall from his exalted position. Geoffrey, on the other hand, seems to be preoccupied with the pragmatics of defending a kingdom and does not fall but becomes a better ruler as time progresses.

At the end of the text Geoffrey contends with a fairy knight over a tribute which is paid yearly in order to keep an ornament on top of the "tour Poitevine" from being destroyed. Geoffrey cannot accept that his sovereignty should be questioned even in this small issue and challenges the knight to combat. He succeeds due to his superior strength and courage. The fairy knight agrees to forfeit the tribute as long as Geoffrey agrees to build a chapel and a hospital. Poitou is at this point free from supernatural intervention and will prosper according to the decisions of its earthly governors. This last episode can perhaps be explained by an appeal to Paul who was faithful to the Lord not because it was the only way to maintain his own prosperity, but because it was his choice. King David, who must blindly obey heaven in order to maintain his prosperity, has been replaced by Paul who obeys willingly, but not blindly. Geoffrey becomes the model of a ruler who is a partner to the church. Instead of being their connection to heaven himself, he is to see that there are institutions where his subjects can find access to the spiritual care they need. He can then focus his efforts on the earthly affairs of seeing that an economy is well managed and that his subjects are free from oppression. Jean has glorified his patron, but has also subtly suggested that perhaps the glorification which comes from being associated with a supernatural lineage is not actually a sufficient justification for any person to claim the right to rule.

Chapter 5: Aristotle: The Final Cause of Kings

La creature de Dieu raisonnable doit entendre, selon que dit Aristote que des choses invisibles, selon la distinction des choses qu'il a faictes ça jus, et que par leur presence de leur etre et nature le certifie… (Arras 114)

Aristotle is cited in Jean d'Arras's introduction merely as a device to justify to the reader the marvelous or invisible. Vincensini sees the reference as indicating a statement Aristotle makes at the beginning of his treaty, *On the Heavens*, which we cite here with Vincensini's comments on what Aristotle means, "Le livre I du *Traité du Ciel* d'Aristote s'ouvre sur la distinction suivante: au sein des réalités naturelles, 'les unes sont des corps et des grandeurs [comme l'eau], d'autre possèdent corps et grandeur [les êtres vivants], d'autres enfin sont principes des êtres qui possèdent ces déterminations [la matière de l'âme]'" ("Introduction", 115). It would seem that Jean d'Arras is alluding to Aristotle's ideas on physics and sees the fact that he distinguishes the soul from the body as evidence of invisible things. We suggested in earlier chapters that it was David's and Paul's personal histories as much as the ideas that Jean d'Arras attributes to them that help us understand the text. We will treat Aristotle in a manner more similar to that which we used with Tilbury. While we will discuss briefly Aristotle's biography, we will suggest that it is Aristotle's philosophies that are more important in understanding Jean d'Arras's project, but that we must go deeper into his philosophies than the small reference which the introduction gives us. Aristotle serves as a double, not for one of the characters in the narrative, but for the writer himself.

Aristotle was a philosopher who lived in the fourth century before Christ. He was a student of Plato and himself delved into the whole range of scholarship available to him, treating everything from Physics to Aesthetics. Much of Aristotle's writings were well

known throughout the Middle Ages. Although Aristotle seemed to be one of Plato's favorite pupils, he formed his own school of thought rather than simply inherit Plato's position. In a very different setting we can see the question of inheritance and continuation which seems to have preoccupied Jean d'Arras. Although this small similarity exists we will focus rather on Aristotle's discussion of causality.

Early in his discussion of physics Aristotle deals with the question of causes. Marc Cohen, returning to the Greek word *aitia* (cause), suggests that it may be more useful for the modern reader to think of Aritotle's causes as explanations rather than applying to them the normal cause and effect relationship that a modern reader might assume. At the beginning of his discussion of causes, Aristotle tells us that "Knowledge is the object of our inquiry, and men do not think they know a thing till they have grasped the 'why' of (which is to grasp its primary cause)" (*Phys*. II.3). Explanations, as answers to 'why' questions, were very important to him. Aristotle goes on to tell us that there are four causes. Those causes are: 1. "that out of which a thing comes to be and which persists" which is called the material cause 2. "the form or the archetype, i.e. the statement of the essence, and its genera" which is called the formal cause 3. "the primary source of the change or coming to rest" which is called the efficient cause and 4. "in the sense of end or 'that for the sake of which' a thing is done" which is called the final cause (*Phys*. II.3). Cohen, having suggested that we think of these causes as explanations, restates the four causes as: 1. " x is what y is [made] out of". 2. "x is what it is to be y". 3. "x is what produces y". and 4. "x is what y is for". He then suggests that using the verb "to make" in place of "to cause" may make the specific causes more comprehensible and posits the example of a table to illustrate the four causes. "1. The table is made of wood.

2. Having four legs and a flat top makes this a table. 3. A carpenter makes a table. 4. Having a surface suitable for eating or writing makes this a table" ("The Four Causes"). We see that the causes help to explain something's existence, the first two based on the thing's attributes, the third on its origin, and the last on the purpose of the thing. As Aristotle's discussion continues, he notes how the different causes are applied differently to art and nature. Art, of course, represents what is man-made and nature represents what is not. The first three causes may be the same whether they apply to art or nature. The final cause however is different in the two cases. Although Aristotle argues that we could see them as similar, he confesses complications with that idea as well.

> A difficulty presents itself: why should not nature work, not for the sake of something, nor because it is better so, but just as the sky rains, not in order to make the corn grow, but of necessity? What is drawn up must cool, and what has been cooled must become water and descend, the result of this being that the corn grows. Similarly if a man's crop is spoiled on the threshing-floor, the rain did not fall for the sake of this in order that the crop might be spoiled but that result just followed. Why then should it not be the same with the parts in nature, e.g. that our teeth should come up of necessity the front teeth sharp, fitted for tearing, the molars broad and useful for grinding down the food since they did not arise for this end, but it was merely a coincident result; and so with all other parts in which we suppose that there is purpose? Wherever then all the parts came about just what they would have been if they had come be for an end, such things survived, being organized spontaneously in a fitting way; whereas those

> which grew otherwise perished and continue to perish, as Empedocles says his 'man-faced ox-progeny' did.
>
> Such are the arguments (and others of the kind) which may cause difficulty on this point. Yet it is impossible that this should be the true view. For teeth and all other natural things either invariably or normally come about in a given way; but of not one of the results of chance or spontaneity is this true. …Therefore action for an end is present in things which come to be and are by nature. (*Phys.* II.8)

In some instances the final cause of a thing must simply be its existence, but in other cases Aristotle is not afraid of ascribing a final cause to something natural.

If we accept that Jean d'Arras is exploring the definition of certain things and their causes through his narrative, these definitions should be the starting point of our analysis. So far we have suggested that Jean d'Arras has pointed us to the Garden of Eden, to King David and to Saint Paul in order to help us understand his work. Through these allusions he indicates that he may be working to understand the causes of (1.) man and (2.) his fall, (3.) kings and (4.) their fall, and perhaps also (5.) Christians. We shall examine each of these ideas within the framework of Aristotle's causes and through Jean d'Arras's text.

Because Jean d'Arras was working to glorify a noble patron, one of the sons of the king of France, and because his narrative seems preoccupied with kings and rulers we will start our examination of causality with them. Jean d'Arras, as one would expect from someone from his era, seems particularly interested in kings and rulers. Although Raymondin is never referred to as anything more than a lord, we have already noted that

his name evokes the idea of earthly kings. The land which he and his family had dominion over was larger than some kingdoms, and a number of his sons were kings in name as well as function. Mélusine was the daughter of a king as well. For the sake of our discussion let us assume that when we say king, we mean all earthly rulers, which for the sake of our story might include dukes, counts and other nobles as well. Here we may refer to Aristotle's question of art versus nature. Should kings be viewed as art or nature? In a pragmatic sense it seems more logical that they be viewed as art, but our discussion of Jean d'Arras's text may reveal that this is a question he wishes to examine.

When dealing with a table the four causes are all easy to identify. When dealing with kings it is more complicated, even in the case of the material cause. A simple statement like, "Flesh and blood is what a king is made of," answers the question on a surface level. In this view all men have the possibility of being a king. It is the formal cause which narrows things. The characteristics necessary for defining a king as represented in *Mélusine* are merely land and subjects. Raymondin's own fortune is evidence of this. After having agreed to marry Mélusine he is instructed on how to gain land. The small portion of land which his cousin thinks he is offering turns out to be more, at least enough for a fortress. The small portion of land which enables him to be lord is increased as Mélusine instructs Raymondin of family lands in Brittany which he can recover. With some of these lands come subjects, and other subjects seem to materialize, out of nowhere, to do Mélusine's bidding. The four adventuring sons, three of whom become kings, leave because there is not enough land for them all to inherit. While some characteristics of kings, such as military prowess, strength, loyalty and

fairness, may have been lauded in literature, in the end these could be the considered the formal cause of "good kings," but are not necessary for simple kingship.

The question of kings becomes even more complicated as one considers the efficient cause of kings. The many examples of kingship in *Mélusine* present multiple efficient causes. Elinas is the first king we come across in the story. We do not know much about him so we must assume that he is a king simply because his father was a king. Bloodlines are therefore the efficient cause of his kingship. As is evidenced by the Hundred Years War, however, this is not a sufficient explanation of what produces kings; nor is it sufficient with respect to Jean d'Arras's text. Raymondin, who we are considering a king, is a much more complicated example. First we must recall the adventure he had with his uncle Aymeri, whose death Raymondin accidentally caused. Aymeri's discussion of what he reads in the stars allows us to identify two efficient causes of kings. First we note that Raymondin's destiny is foretold by the stars that Aymeri reads. In this case it is the universe or destiny that makes kings. Viewing David as a doubling of Raymondin would lead us to replace the universe with God. If we see Mélusine as a representation of Raymondin's divine appointment, then the efficient cause of his kingship is God. God produces kings, choosing them from among other men and allowing them to triumph and prosper. Second Aymeri tells us that in order for Raymondin's fortune to be achieved, he, Aymeri, must die. This brings us to the morbid reality that what produces a king is actually the death of another king. This efficient cause is reinforced by the three Lusignan sons that will become kings themselves and also of Renaud, the son who becomes the Duke of Luxembourg. They all owe their positions to the fact that the kings of their respective countries died without heirs. In

these cases we could also see marriage to an heiress as being the efficient cause of some kings. We may also note that in some instances, when there is no heir, instead of God choosing the new king, it is the dying king who chooses, or sometimes the barons whom he leaves without leadership. Urien is crowned by the king of Cypress before his death (386). Guy is given the kingdom of Armenia, based on a request the deceased king made before his death and in accordance with the barons, by his brother Urien, who has inherited it from his wife's uncle. Interestingly, Urien is instructed to find someone else, who will be able to defend the lands, if he does not think that Florie will be a suitable match for Guy. Antoine is chosen to marry Christine of Luxembourg, by a council of barons, as is Renaud to be king of Bohemia. The efficient cause of kings has descended from being a heavenly decision to being an earthly decision. The adventuring Lusignans are chosen as suitable husbands for the orphaned heiresses because of their great success in battle. While their idealistic modesty and devotion to the Catholic faith heightens their valor, it is their effectiveness in battle which makes the kings and barons consider them at all. In this case we might view military prowess as being one of the efficient causes of kings. The question of what produces a king or a ruler was of course ever present during the Hundred Years war, where the question of who should occupy the throne of France was debated through warfare. If Jean d'Arras really does view Geoffrey as his ideal, then we may assume that Jean d'Arras would privilege an efficient cause which combined both a legitimate right to a throne through bloodlines and which elected them for their ability to defend their lands. Is it clear, however, that he does not view the question of what produces a king as a simple issue which should decided merely by blood.

The final cause is perhaps the most complex and ambiguous of Aristotle's causes with respect to all things. What is the final cause of kings as far as Jean d'Arras is concerned? In reminding us of David, Jean d'Arras also risks pointing us to what First Samuel suggests the Lord God of Israel views as the final cause of kings. In first Samuel chapter 8 the Lord instructs Samuel to try and persuade the people not to have a king set over them.

> Then Samuel told all the words of the Lord to the people that desired a king of him, And said: This will be the right of the king, that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and put them in his chariots, and will make them his horsemen, and his running footmen to run before his chariots, And he will appoint of them to be his tribunes, and centurions, and to plough his fields, and to reap his corn, and to make him arms and chariots. Your daughters also he will take to make him ointments, and to be his cooks, and bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your best oliveyards, and give them to his servants. Moreover he will take the tenth of your corn, and of the revenues of your vineyards, to give to his eunuchs and servants. Your servants also and handmaids, and your goodliest young men, and your asses he will take away, and put them to his work. Your flocks also he will tithe, and you shall be his servants. And you shall cry out in that day from the face of the king, whom you have chosen to yourselves: and the Lord will not hear you in that day, because you desired unto yourselves a king. (1 Sam. 8.10-18)

This passage seems to suggest that the Lord, in a very practical way, sees the final cause of a king as being entirely selfish. A king exists to maintain and support his own prosperity and does so at the expense of his subjects. It is interesting to note that Tilbury cites this very passage in the preface to the *Otia Imperialia* as part of his complicated discussion of how kingly and priestly powers should remain separate, in which he makes it clear that kingly powers never rule over priestly powers. It is possible that Jean d'Arras wishes to suggest to the reader that in many instances, the final cause of kingship is not beneficial to all. This view might also lead us to ask if kings should be considered a part of nature, rather than art. Jean d'Arras is constantly evoking God as the creator of all things. One of the efficient causes he includes in his many examples of kingship is that of kings being made by God, an efficient cause which should be considered important since it is applied to the main intrigue of the text. If they are in fact produced by nature, then their reason for being is simply to be. To seek their own interests is to exist in the manner they were created to exist.

This initial reading is called into question by the details of Mélusine's and Raymondin's reign. Mélusine, using Raymondin as her vehicle, is able to create prosperity without depleting their subjects. In this case the final cause of the king is to be a vehicle for heaven to prosper a worthy people. In order to meet this end, the king is required to obey certain vows. Should the vow be broken, as in the case of Raymondin, he would be failing in his capacity as king. The existence of this final cause in the text opens our view to the fact that Jean d'Arras may have thought that kings did have a purpose beyond their mere existence.

The text does provide a number of instances where it suggests that the final cause of kings is simply the defense of lands and subjects. The four adventuring sons provide repeated proof of this idea. Before his death, the King of Cypress suggests to his daughter that a marriage with Urien might be very advantageous. He expresses his opinion saying, “Sachiéz que je mourray plus liement de ce que je suiz asseur que vous et mon paÿs seréz hors de doubte des Sarrasins, car vous avéz bon garant et tresvaillant prince et bachelereux qui bien vous garantira contre eulx” (386). When Urien is left the kingdom of Armenia by his wife’s uncle, he is instructed to find someone who “saiche le paÿs gouverner et deffendre des ennemis nostre Seigneur” (428). The suggestion is, of course, that he offer it to his brother Guy, who accepts it. While these first two instances represent a need, not only to defend a territory, but the Catholic faith as well, Antoine’s success in Luxembourg is mainly about territory. The King of Alsace, who himself tried to the take the lands of the Duke of Luxembourg when he died, in a very repentant manner, encourages the council of barons to find a suitable leader soon, so that territory will not again be disputed and will not be plundered by neighbors. He suggests Antoine as suitable choice saying, “Il fault que vous faiciéz tant que Anthoine de Lusignen prengne vostre damoiselle a moullier. Et si sera vostre seigneur et lors pourriéz vous dire tout seurement que vous n’avéz voisin ne marchissant si hardy qui osast prendre sur vostre paÿs une poule sans congié” (490). The maintenance of territory is vital to a king’s position. When the kingdom of Bohemia is left without an heir, the king of Alsace once again intervenes to make sure that the heiress has someone to protect her interests. After having consulted the council of barons on the matter, he addresses the heiress saying, “Ma belle niepce, Dieu mercy, voz besoignes sont en bon party et vostre paÿs est

delivré du dangier des Sarrasins par la puissance de Dieu et des deux freres de Lusegnen. Or fault regarder comment vostre terre soit gouvernee d'ores en avant a vostre honneur et prouffit et de voz gens" (536). In this case it is clear that as well as defending the land and subjects, the king is responsible also for advancing the interests of his family. This view clearly sees kings as existing for a reason, a reason which once again would have been called into question by the tumults of the Hundred Years War.

Mélusine's instructions to Urien and Guy, before they go adventuring, might also give us insight into what Jean d'Arras might have seen as the final cause of kings. Her speech is sprinkled, interestingly, with both the idea that a king should serve the people and that his real intent is to look out for his own affairs. Before her speech she gives them each a magic ring which will protect them as long as they "user[ont] de loyauté sans penser ne faire tricherie ne mauvaitié" (304). Then, after having instructed them to seek the help of their Creator in all things, she instructs them that they should be basically altruistic, saying,

> Et aidiéz et conseilliéz les vefves er les orphelins, et honnouréz toutes dames et confortéz toutes pucelles que on vouldrait desheriter desraisonnablement. Améz les gentilz homes et leur tenéz compaignie, soyéz humbles et humain au grant et au petit. Et, se vous veéz un bon homme d'armes qui soit povres et en petit estat de vesture ou de monteure, donnéz lui du vostre selon ce qu'il sera de value. (306)

She gives them some practical advise about power and economics saying,

> Et se Dieux vous donne adventure que vous conquestéz païs, si gouvernéz voz gens selon la nature dont ilz sont. S'ilz sont rebelles, gardéz que vous

> seignorissiéz sans riens laissier passer de vostre droit de seignourie et soiéz toujours sur votre garde tant que la puissance soit vostre, car se vous vous laissiéz sourmarchier il vous fauldroit gouverner a leur voulenté, mais toutesfoiz gardéz vous que, quelx qu'ilz soient, dur ou debonnaire, que vous ne leur alevéz nouvelle coustume qui soit deraisonnable. Car 'se peuple est povre, le seigneur est mendiz.' (308)

She even warns them about military strategy, suggesting that whenever they have the power to beat an enemy outright that they should do so and not contract treaties that their enemies could later go back on. Although much of the advice she gives should make them less oppressive rulers, it is still clear that the point of all their efforts is not merely for their subjects to prosper, but for Urien and Guy to prosper through correct treatment of the subjects they hope to gain. The final cause of the king in this view is to be an efficient manager of economics and war so that he can prosper through what he collects on his lands.

If Geoffrey is the ideal, then his actions may give us some insight into what Jean d'Arras thinks the final cause of kings should be. The final episode in which he does battle with a fairy knight may be very meaningful in looking for Jean d'Arras ideal final cause. For ten years, Geoffrey does not settle his accounts with his stewards and when he is asked to he replies,

> Comment...et ne faictes vous a nullui tort pour rente ne pour revenue que j'aye? Et quel comptes vouléz vous que je oye doncques quant vous et moy sommes tout aise et que mes forteresces sont bien retenues, et toutes mes besoingnes en bon point, et que vous me bailléz de l'argent quant j'en

> demande, et en donnéz ou je vous commande et me faictes finance de ce que je vueil avoir? Quel compte vouléz vous que j'en oye? Je n'en vueil autre compte ouyr ne je vous sauroie autrement encquerre. Et cuidiéz vous que j'aye cure de faire une maison d'or? Celles de pierre que monseigneur mon pere et madame ma mere me ont laissees me souffisent bien. (780, 782)

It is clear from this retort that Geoffrey is quite content to let his subjects prosper and to let his stewards take care of things how they know best. He does not view his position as one which should require excess wealth or luxury at hand so his subjects, but merely that he has what he needs. He is very willing to let his people do what they will with the rest. The result of course of this settling of accounts is the discovery of the tribute paid to maintain the ornament on the "tour Poitevine" and his eventual combat with the fairy knight. His settling of accounts does not lead to more demands on his part, but rather to him freeing the region of the need to rely on supernatural protection. What he builds to remove the tribute is a hospital and a church, representing the physical and spiritual needs of his subjects. As long as he provides a means for these needs to be taken care of he is free of the judgments of heaven. Jean d'Arras may mean to suggest that this is in fact the final cause of kings. They exist to defend their lands, allowing their subjects the security and freedom to prosper, and to make sure that there are outlets for their subjects to have their physical and spiritual needs met.

Jean d'Arras's text makes the reader contemplate, not only the causes of men and kings but also the causes of their respective falls from grace. The fallen king is a recurring motive in the text. We start with David, who although he never loses his

kingdom, sees his line dwindle to nothing. Elinas is deposed by Mélusine, in revenge for his betrayal of Présine. Raymondin looses Mélusine after breaking his vow and is told that his line will diminish from that time. Even the more successful kings seem to dwindle. At the end of the work Jean d'Arras returns to Mélusine's sister Mélior, who is the guardian of the adventure at the Chateau d'Epervier. He tells the story of a certain Guin, king of Armenia, a descendent of Guy, who was successful in his attempt at the adventure, which required a knight to stay awake and feed the castle's sparrowhawk for three days in a row. Those who were successful in staying awake were allowed to ask for anything as a boon, except for the lady Mélior herself. When Guion is successful he disregards the advice given him and insists that the only boon which he desires is to marry the lady herself. When he will not relent she tells him, "Fol roy, par ta musardie te mescherra. Toy et les tiens decherront de terre, d'avoir, d'onnour et de heritaige jusques a la .ix^{e}. lignie. Et perdra par ta fol emprise le .ix^{e}. de ta lignie le royaume que tu tiens, et portera cellui roy nom des beste mue" (804-6). The "roy nom des beste mue" to which she refers was undoubtedly Léon de Lusignan, the last Lusignan king of Armenia who had been exiled to Paris and died shortly before Jean d'Arras's romance was complete.

In dealing with the question of the causes of the fall of kings one might ask if there is any material manifestation of their fall; is there a material cause? Formally the fall of a king represents a change; a change that is removed from the king who is guilty of causing the fall. Its characteristics are that the king's future progeny will decrease "de terre, davoir, d'onnour, et de heritaige"(806). The fall affects the lineage more than the individual king himself, and requires that the lineage will eventually be deprived of the land and possessions that the transgressing king once held. Perhaps the material cause is

this lack of land and belongings. The efficient cause of the fallen king as seen through the text of Mélusine is the breaking of a vow. As we discussed in earlier chapters, the breaking of this vow generally corresponds with the king forgetting his place as a dependent of heaven and overstepping his bounds. Even Guion of Armenia is overstepping his rights when he asks for the one thing he is told cannot be granted him. The final cause of the fall of kings is their replacement, whether immediate or delayed. This final cause is in fact Jean d'Arras's proclaimed purpose. He describes the supposed origins of a family that many claimed distant ties to, but that all were seeking to replace in their own way. The old must make way for the new, and kings fall so that they can be replaced by other lines.

Since Jean d'Arras, through Tilbury, points us to the Garden of Eden, it seems reasonable that he means to extend his examination of Aristotelian causality to men as well as kings. How does one answer the question of man, the "why" without which Aristotle says that we will never really feel we know something? Because it is the most general of the cases at issue, it obviously has the most examples in the text. While it might be safe to assume that Jean d'Arras does not mean to question the material cause of man, which would be the same flesh and blood that made up kings, we cannot forget the tales protagonist and her hybrid form. Does Mélusine qualify as a part of mankind? Contemplation of how Mélusine falls into Jean d'Arras's vision of mankind leads to a questioning of what the efficient cause of man really is. Jean d'Arras is constantly evoking God as the creator of all things, suggesting him as the obvious efficient cause. Mélusine's own storyline, however, may call this obvious efficient cause into question. Mélusine's story can be seen as a progression through three very different physical forms:

woman, part-woman/part-serpent, and serpent. Although she spends much of the story either as a woman or a part-woman/part-serpent her final state is that of a flying serpent. If we were to deal with Mélusine alone, using Aritotle's causes, we might be forced to suggest that as a product of nature, her final cause is to become a serpent. Because that is what her progression leads to, we might see her banshee existence as her own personal destiny. Despite all her efforts to fight against it, it is unavoidable. If she is mirrored by Raymondin, on whom her destiny relies, can we see a similar progression in him? If Mélusine for much of the text should be seen as a hybrid of a natural and supernatural nature, is it possible that Raymondin, in some way, is himself a hybrid? Although he is an earthly king, his domain is the paradise that Mélusine has created for him. By maintaining his relationship with her, he delays genuinely entering the domain of mankind, which is a fallen state. He has a foot in both worlds, so to speak. Is it possible that the efficient cause of man is not simply God, who creates him, but the fall, which makes him what he actually is, a fallen creature in a fallen world? This reading would lead us to assume that Adam is not really a man until he eats the forbidden fruit, and Raymondin is not a man as long as he remains in Mélusine's half supernatural paradise. The recurring theme of parricide in the romance, emphasizes not only the efficient cause of kings, who require the death of a preceding king to come into existence, but of men, who require a separation from God to actually be what they are. This would force us to assume that man's fallen nature is, at least in Jean d'Arras's definition, part of the formal cause of man. This idea was well established in medieval thought, where man was thought of as being naturally carnal and fallen. This leads us to the all-consuming religious question: What is the final cause of man?

Examining the causes of the fall of man may give light to the question of what the final cause of man is. The material cause of the fall is, like the material fall of kings, a lack. It is a lack of immortality, a lack of paradise and a lack of ignorance of good and evil; it is mortality, and worldliness and knowledge of earthly things. Formally, it is a change from prosperity to poverty, from favor to disfavor, from immortality to mortality. The effective cause of the fall is Adam and Eve's partaking of the fruit and Raymondin's betrayal of Mélusine, in short disobedience to a specific vow which required some form of ignorance. In discussing the final cause of the fall we might remember our discussion of the law of inverse meanings which argued that David was allowed to be led into temptation to show man how to repent to add to the glory of Christ who would save all men from their fallen state. The final cause of the fall should be seen as the triumph of Christ. The fall existed so that God could be glorified through man's redemption. The reason for the fall was its reversal, a reversal which cannot take place until the fall has been accomplished and accepted. We might wonder at this point if there was not a double meaning to Aymeri's words when he said, "Et l'aventure si est telle que, se a ceste presente heure, uns subgiéz occioit son seigneur qu'il devendroit ly plus riche, ly plus puissans, ly plus honnouréz qui feust oncques en son lignaige, et de lui ystroit si tresnoble lignie qu'il en seroit mencion et remembrence jusque en la fin du monde" (152-4). When Raymondin kills Aymeri things fall into place for him to gain lands and power and become well known, but when he "kills" Mélusine, things fall into place for him to be forgiven and gain a heavenly inheritance. In the end, it is his betrayal of Mélusine which places him in "remembrence jusque en la fin du monde" (154). Had Mélusine died like a natural woman, would any story ever have been told of her? And if history had ignored

her, would it have acknowledged Raymodin? If we accept that the final cause of the fall is its reversal, we might suppose that the final cause of men is to be saved. As nature they exist for the sake of their own existence, which God desired to be eternal and glorious.

At this point we note, once again, that Geoffrey is a unique individual in the narration. While most of the other characters are exalted creatures waiting to fall, Geoffrey is a fallen creature, who will be forgiven. Perhaps part of his success as a ruler comes from the fact that he is not a founding king, with the hope of an eternal lineage, but the son of a king who has lost his divine appointment, and whose descendents will eventually lose their lands. Whatever pseudo-supernatural nature he has is stamped out by his earnest efforts to repent of his sins. He rules as a man. As man he can be saved, and become a good ruler.

Finally, through Paul, Jean d'Arras raises the question of Christians. Although it would be an oversimplification to ascribe to Jean d'Arras a proselyting intention, his contemplations on Christianity may serve as a means of questioning still further the intended project of linking a noble family with a supernatural being. While materially a Christian is still flesh and blood, Paul as represented through Geoffrey suggests that the formal cause of a Christian is that they have changed from a cruel to a gentle state; that instead of having fallen they have been lifted up. The effective cause of the Christian is repentance as accessed through the Church and made possible through the Lord Jesus Christ. One would assume the final cause of the Christian to be salvation. But perhaps this is the very question that Jean d'Arras puts to the reader. To finally free himself from the interference of supernatural beings in his land, Geoffrey builds a chapel and a hospital,

perhaps indicating that he has a responsibility to see that the bodies and souls of his subjects will be cared for. If this is the final cause of Christianity, why are so many Christian nations and Christian rulers seeking the glory and riches that would have been more fitting under the old law? Why do they not see themselves as fallen men who must seek to be saved rather than casting themselves as glorified David's who are merely waiting to fall? This speculation on Christianity is likely meant to be another means of understanding the political system, suggesting that rulers were selfishly resorting to out-of-date ideals and ignoring the real needs of their own situations.

An examination of the text through Aristotelian causality suggests that Jean d'Arras may have wanted to do much more that please his patron when he wrote his version of the Mélusine legend. It is full of contrasting examples of political leaders and questions the Duke of Berry's desire to justify himself through a supernatural connection. It quietly suggests that putting more attention into assuring the well-being of his subjects, even those newly acquired, might do more to justify the Duke than tracing imaginary genealogies.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

If we accept that there is truth to Picken's argument that it is in paradox that Jean d'Arras places the true meaning of his text, then we are justified in seeing Geoffrey, a unique individual, as the ideal, and in seeing a layer of questioning behind the clear *doxa* that any person linked to such a fantastic and splendid creature as Mélusine should feel not only gratified by the connection, but justified in their own claim to nobility and dominion. Harold Bloom, a twentieth century literary theorist, suggests that "the meaning of a poem is another poem" (Eagleton 183). In the Middle Ages, as evidenced by moralized works, the meaning of a story was often another story, or at least the meaning was dependent on the combination of the two. Jean d'Arras had been commissioned to rewrite an already existing tale, limiting the meaning that he could place in the text through his own plot twists. Despite this he seems to have found a way to create his own meaning by suggesting what other stories the main story should be combined with to make meaning. Although his introduction effectively defends the existence or truth of fantastical tales and works to convince the reader to take his story seriously, it also points to the kinds of commonplaces that could cause the reader to question the text's proclaimed purpose.

Jean d'Arras could easily have cited Augustine, cementing the argument that all things are an evidence of the judgments of God. In this case his reader would have had no reason to question the actual cause and purpose of the political leaders presented in the story. By leaving out Augustine and putting in Aristotle Jean d'Arras opens his text for deep philosophical consideration, the kind of consideration that leads one to try and define earthly rulers in terms, not only of their parentage, but of their purpose and

function in society. An examination of Jean d'Arras's text through this effort to understand what kings and rulers are suggests that glorifying kings as a product of nature is counterproductive to the well being of a country. It may be doubtful that anyone in the fourteenth or fifteenth century saw the text as being infused with speculations on what the correct role of kings and rulers was. It is possible, however, that *Mélusine* was meant to be a subtle sort of *speculum princii*, which would suggest to those reading it that the glorified king, as represented by David of Israel, did not sufficiently answer the needs of the time period. Amidst the myriad examples of kings and rulers much like David, he offers us Geoffrey. Geoffrey starts as a somewhat fallen individual but becomes the ideal leader. His superiority as a leader is characterized by his ability to take care of the physical needs of his lands while leaving the spiritual government to the church. Although he is not associated with the pageantry and glory that seemed to radiate around Raymondin and Mélusine, he appears to be the more responsible ruler. Behind the aesthetic gloss of gallant imagery, Jean d'Arras has placed a philosophical struggle which undercuts the images that he has so painstakingly painted. While he is faithfully glorifying his patron through a connection to illustrious ancestors he is quietly questioning exactly what those ancestors were, and whether or not they are sufficient models of political leadership. The model he seems to prefer is one in which the leader is solidly bound to earthly concerns and not a messenger from heaven. While there may be glory to be had from being connected to a supernatural being, it does not make one a sufficient leader. He seems to suggest that there is nothing practical to be gained through the pursuit of presenting kings as glorified beings with a heavenly mandate. Man is by definition a fallen creature and so should be governed by a king who is also a fallen

creature and can deal with earthly concerns. There is nothing truly useful about justifying nobility through glorified images that will inevitably prove impossible to maintain.

Jean d'Arras suggests, in his introduction, that the reader's greatest concern will be whether or not to believe a fantastical story. Reading the text as a study of rulers as defined by Aristotelian causes leads one to believe that the reader, especially if s/he is some kind of ruler, should be more concerned with understanding the roles the rulers play in the tale and consequently the roles that leaders should play in the real world. Perhaps Jean d'Arras's insistence that there is truth to his tale is an insistence that there is truth to his criticisms of kings and rulers. There is truth to the allegorical meaning which he presents, which if the readers have traveled, as he suggests in the introduction and conclusion, they will understand. True experience in the world will lead a reader to a similar conclusion as that of Jean d'Arras, that government is a practical and not a fantastical endeavor. It was not uncommon for scholars in that time period to offer their opinions and suggestions as to how a king or prince should have been attending to their responsibilities. It was usually done in a more overt manner, but Jean d'Arras's text provides ample evidence that he may have intended for his work to do the same. Louis Stouff may be right when he criticizes the work for being contradictory, complicated and repetitive, but it is also possible that what Jean d'Arras derives from this complexity is a philosophical study of government which would have been deeply meaningful in its time.

Bibliography

Alban, Gillian M. E. *Melusine the Serpent Goddess in A.S. Byatt's Possesion and in Mythology*. New York: Lexington Books, 2003.

Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. Ed. Jonathan Barnes. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984.

---. "Physics."*Internet Classics Archive*. Trans. R. P Hardie and R. K. Gaye. University of Adelaide Library. 2000. 7 Nov. 2006 <http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/mirror/classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/physics.1.i.html>.

Ashton, John. *Romances of Chivalry: Told and Illustrated in Facsimilie*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1890.

Aubailly, Jean-Claude. *La Fée Et Le Chevalier. Essai De Mythanalyse De Quelques Lais Féeriques Des XII^e Et XIII^e Siècles*. Paris: Librarie Honoré Champion, 1986.

Augustine, Saint, Bishop of Hippo. *The Confessions; the City of God; on Christian Doctrine.* Trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin, Marcus Dods, and J. F. Shaw. 2nd ed. Chicago: Encylcopaedia Britannica, 1990.

Banks, S. E., and J. W. Binns. "Introduction." *Otia Imperialia: Recreation for an Emporer*. Oxford: Claredon Press, 2002. xxv-xcv.

Baumgartner, Emmanuele. "Fiction and History: The Cypriot Episode in Jean d'Arras's Melusine." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France*. Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 185-200.

Biblia de San Luis (Facsimilie). Barcelona : M. Moleiro, 2000-2004. Vault Collection Qautro, L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Bible moralisée: Faksimile-Ausgabe im Originalformat des Codex Vindobonensis 2554 des Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Com. Reiner Haussherr. Graz : Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt ; Paris : Club du livre, 1973. Vault Collection Qautro, L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Boivin, Jeanne-Marie, and Proinsias MacCana. *Mélusines Continentales et Insulaires*. Paris, France: Champion, 1999.

Brownlee, Kevin. "Melusine's Hybrid Body and the Poetics of Metamorphosis." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France.* Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 76-99.

Brownlee, Marina S. "Interference in Melusine." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France.* Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 226-240.

Clier-Colombani, Françoise. *La Fée Mélusine Ou Moyen Age: Images, Mythes Et Symboles.* Paris: Le Léopold d'Or, 1991.

---. "Le Beau et le Laid dans *le Roman de Mélusine*." *Le Beau et le Laid au Moyen Age.* Aix-en-Provence, France: Université de Provence, 2000. 79-104.

Cohen, S. Marc. "The Four Causes." *Philosophy 320*. University of Washington. 2002. 8 Nov. 2006. <http://faculty.washington.edu/smcohen/320/4causes.htm>.

Colwell, Tania. "Mélusine: Ideal Mother or Inimitable Monster?" *Love, Marriage, and Family Ties in the Later Middle Ages.* Ed. Isabel Davis, Miriam Müller, and Sarah Rees Jones. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003. 181-203.

Curry, Anne. *The Hundred Years War*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

D'Arras, Jean. *Mélusine Ou La Noble Histoire De Lusignan: Roman Du XIve Siècle. Nouvelle Édition Critique d'Après Le Manuscrit De La Bibliothèque De l'Arsenal Avec Les Variantes De Tous Les Manuscits.* Librairie générale française, 2003.

David, Christian. "Mélusine, Dame des Pictes: Re-Nouvellement ou du Neuf Avec l'Ancien." *Mythologie Française: Bulletin de la Société de Mythologie Française* 179-180 (1995): 27-48.

de Looze, Laurence. "'La Fourme Du Pié Toute Escripte'; *Melusine* and the Entrance into History." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France.* Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 125-136.

de Troyes, Chrétien. *Le Chevalier De La Charrette(Lancelot):Roman Traduit De l'Ancien Français.* Trans. Jean Frappier. 2nd ed. Paris: H. Champion, 1974.

Di Scipio, Guiseppe Carlo. "Saint Paul and Popular Traditions." *Telling Tales: Medieval Narratives and the Folk Tradition.* Ed. Francesca Canadé Sautman, Diana Conchado, and Di Scipio, Giuseppe Carlo. New York: St. Matin's Press, 1998. 189-208.

Di Voragine, Jacabus. "The Golden Legend." *The Catholic Forum.* 2002. 1 Nov. 2006. <http://www.catholic-forum.com/saintS/golden160.htm>.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

Frontain, Raymond-Jean. *The David Myth in Western Literature.* West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1980.

Gould, S. Baring. *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages.* London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1894.

Guerin, M. Victoria. "The King's Sin: The Origins of the David-Arthur Parallel." *The Passing of Arthur: New Essays in Arthurian Tradition.* Ed. Christopher Baswell and William Sharpe. New York: Garland Publishing, 1988. 15-30.

Harf-Lancner, Laurence. "La Serpente et Le Sanglier: Les Manuscrits Enluminés des Deux Romans Français de Mélusine." *Le Moyen Age: Revue d'Histoire et de Philologie* 101.1 (1995): 65-87.

---. *Les Fées au Moyen Âge: Morgane et Melusine, La Naissance des Fées.* Genève: Editions Slatkine, 1984.

Hartland, E. Sidney. "The Romance of Melusine." *Folklore* 24.2 (1913): 187-200.

*The Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate: diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions in divers languages: the Old Testament first published by the English College at Douay, A.D. 1609, and the New Testament first published by the Enlgish College at Douay, A.D. 1582/ published with the approbation of James Cardinal Gibbons.*Baltimore, Maryland: John Murphy Company, 1914.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. “Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship.” *U of California Publications in History 33.* Berkley: U of California P, 1946.

Kelly, Douglas. "The Domestication of the Marvelous in the Melusine Romances." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France.* Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 32-47.

Krell, Jonathan F. "Between Demon and Divinity: Mélusine Revisited." *Mythosphere: A Journal for Image, Myth, and Symbol* 2.4 (2000): 375-96.

Le Cycle De Mystères Des Premiers Martyrs: Du Manuscrit 1131 De La Bibliothèque Saint-Geneviève. Ed. Graham A. Runnalls. Geneve: Droz, 1976.

Le Goff, Jacques, and Le Roy Laudrie, E. "Mélusine Maternelle Et Défricheuse." *Annales ESC.*3-4 (1971): 587-622.

Lecouteaux, Claude. *Mélusine Et Le Chevalier Au Cygne.* Paris: Imago, 1997.

Léglu, Catherine. "Nourishing Lineage in the Earliest French Versions of the *Roman de Mélusine*." *Medium Ævum* 74.1 (2005): 71-85.

Lundt, Bea. *Melusine Und Merlin Im Mittelalter.* Munchen: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1991.

Maddox, Donald. "Configuring the Epilougue: Ending and the Ends of Fiction in the Roman De Melusine." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France.* Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 267-288.

Markale, Jean. *Mélusine Ou l'Androgyne*. Paris: Editions Retz, 1983.

Maser, Simone. "L'Image De David Dans La Littérature Médiéval Française." *Moyen-Age* 99.3-4 (1993): 423-48.

Mayer, Paola. "Melusine: The Romantic Appropriation of a Medieval Tale." *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 52.2 (2002): 289-302.

Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fictionin Late Medieval France. Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1996.

"A Melusine Story from the Gold Coast." *Journal of Royal African Society* 5.17 (1905): 104-7.

Monmouth, Geoffrey of. *Historia Regum Britanniae.*. Trans. Sevastion Evans. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1934.

Morris, Matthew W. "The Romance of Mélusine and the Sacralization of Secular Power." *Postscript: Publication of the Philological Association of the Carolinas* 14 (1997): 57-68.

Nichols, Stephen G. "Melusine between Myth and History: Profile of a Female Demon." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France*. Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 137-164.

Painter, Sidney. "The Lords of Lusignan in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 32.1 (1957): 27-47.

Pairet, Ana. "Melusine's Double Binds: Foundation, Transgression, and the Genealogical Romance." *Reassessing the Heroine in Medieval French Literature*. Ed. Kathy M. Krause. Gainesville, FL: UP of Florida, 2001. 71-86.

Pickens, Rupert T. "The Poetics of Paradox in the *Roman De Mélusine*." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France.* Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: Universit of Georgia Press, 1996. 48-75.

Pisan, Christine de. *The "Livre De La Paix."*. Trans. Charity Cannon Willard. The Hauge: Mouton & Co., 1958.

Réau, Louis. *Iconographie De l'Art Chrétien*. Vol. II. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1955.

Richardson, John. "Niuwer David, Niuwar Orpheus: Transformation and Metamorphosis in Gottfried Von Strassburg's *Tristan*." *Tristania* 17 (1996): 85-109.

Roblin, Sylvie. "Le Sanglier et La Serpente: Geoffrey La Grant' Dent Dans l'Histoire De Lusignan." *Métamorphose Et Bestiaire Fantastique Au Moyen Age*. Ed. Laurence Harf-Lancner. Paris: Ecole normale supérieure de jeunes filles, 1985. 247-285.

Sergent, Bernard. "'Cinq Études Sur Mélusine' (2éme Partie, 4-5)." *Mythologie Française: Bulletin de la Société de Mythologie Française* 179-180 (1995): 10-26.

---. "Cinq Etudes Sur Mélusine: Premiere Partie: 1-3." *Mythologie Française: Bulletin de la Société de Mythologie Française* 177 (1995): 27-38.

Seward, Desmond. *A Brief History of the Hundred Years War: The English in France, 1337-1453.* London: Robinson, 2003.

Speigel, Gabrielle M. "Maternity and Monstosity: Reproductive Biology in the *Roman De Méluisne*." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France.* Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 100-124.

Stark, Judith Chelius. "The Pauline Influence on Augustine's Notion of the Will." *Vigiliae Christianae* 43.4 (1989): 345-60.

Stouff, Louis. *Essai Sur Mélusine: Roman Du XIV^e siècle Par Jean d'Arras*. Dijon: Université de Dijon, 1930.

Strum-Maddox, Sara. "Crossed Destinies: Narrative Programs in the *Roman De Mélusine*." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France.* Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 12-31.

Taylor, James H. M. "Melusine's Progeny: Patterns and Perplexities." *Melusine of Lusignan: Founding Fiction in Late Medieval France.* Ed. Donald Maddox and Sara Strum-Maddox. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. 165-184.

Tilbury, Gervase of. *Otia Imperialia: Recreation for an Emperor*. Trans. J. W. Binns and S. E. Banks. Ed. J. W. Binns and S. E. Banks. Oxford: Claredon, 2002.

Tristan et Iseut: Les Poèmes Français, La Saga Norroise. Trans. Daniel La Croix and Phillip Walter. Ed. Daniel La Croix and Phillip Walter. Librairie générale française, 1989.

Vernier, Richard. *The Flower of Chivalry: Bertrand Du Guesclin and the Hundred Years War.* Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003.

Victorin, Patricia. "Le Nombril de Mélusine ou la Laideur en Partage dans la Mélusine de Jean d'Arras." *Le Beau et Le Laid au Moyen Age.* Aix en Provence: Université de Provence, 2000. 531-546.

Vincensini, Jean-Jacques. "De la Fondation de Carthage à celle de Lusignan: 'Engin' de Femmes Vs. Prouesse des Hommes." *Magie et Illusion Au Moyen Age.* Aix-en-Provence, France: Université de Provence, 1999. 579-600.

---. "Introduction." *Mélusine ou la Noble Histoire de Lusignan.* Paris: Le Livre de Poche, 2003. 7-98.

---. *Pensée Mythique et Narrations Médiévales.* Paris: Honoré Champion Editeur, 1996.

Wilson, Stephen. *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Wright, Nicholas. *Knights and Peasants: The Hundred Years War in the French Countryside.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998.