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LE ROMAN DE FLAMENCA:
HISTORY AND LITERARY CONVENTION

By PAUL A. OLSON

That Le Roman de Flamenca is ultimately concerned with the history of heterodox culture in Provence during the thirteenth century has been both affirmed and denied by competent Provençal scholars.¹ To complicate matters, the earliest work to suggest relationships between history and this romance, a study by Paul Grimm, attempted to show that the final tournament has to do with ambiguous events which took place between 1196 and 1200.² If the Provençal past has a bearing on Flamenca, it is important that we should understand just what aspects of that epoch the poem treats and from what point of view. This paper endeavors first to suggest possible meanings which the medieval reader might see in the conventions of the fable; then it applies these meanings to history, giving new evidence concerning the identities of some of the poem’s important characters. These are persons who were for the most part active in the Albigensian controversies. It is perhaps in the area where historical occurrences and literary conventions illuminate one another that the action of Le Roman de Flamenca is best understood.

The work presents itself most obviously as a poem about love; its Ovidian conventions must be placed in their medieval context before the rest of it may be understood.³ For example, when Guil-

¹ Georges Millardet, “Le Roman de Flamenca,” Revue des Cours et Conférences, XXXVI² (1935), 577-95; XXXVII¹ (1936), 673-90; XXXVII² (1936), 340-60, 629-47. See esp. XXXVII¹, 674-78. For a bibliography of earlier Flamenca scholarship, see XXXVI², 577-78; Diego Zorzi, Valori Religiosi Nella Letteratura Provenzale: La Spiritualità Trinitaria (Milan, 1954), p. 245, has stated the negative view.

² Charles Grimm, Étude sur le Roman de Flamenca (Paris, 1930).

³ This essay uses the exegetical approach to the romance tradition elaborated in recent essays by Mario Roques, Urban T. Holmes, D. W. Robertson, Jr., and Sister M. Amelia Klenke. Its approach to medieval Ovidian love conventions is based on that suggested by Professor Robertson to whom I am indebted both for method and for specific suggestions; cf. Robertson,
Laume de Nevers begins to conduct his courtship in the cloak of a clerk, Flamenca remarks to herself that he might do well to seek another love because certain disadvantages attend passion for her:

Li mi' amors non es amors,
Ans es angoissa e dolors,
Plena d'enui e de trebaill. (4159-61)

Now these are characteristic troubles of worldly or cupiditious love; the "autr' amor" (4158) which the lady is ironically made to distinguish and recommend may well refer to its conventional opposite, Charity. These two loves could, according to medieval theology, bring with them two corresponding fears, the one that fear of God which is the beginning of wisdom, the other the anxiety that one may lose the object of his desires. Flamenca's servant, Alis, knows both these fears; however, since she is less interested in wisdom than in seasoning the joys of her sex, she gives her lady some imprudent, warmhearted advice:

Mais una paor y a mala
Que joi d'amor destrui e tala,
Et autra paor y a bona
Per cui joy d'amor s'asazona:
L'un'es de ser, autra de fueill.
L'un'es de joi, autra de dueill. (5541-46)

While the poet recognizes the conventional theological distinctions concerning the nature of fear and love, he also makes use of devices which disclose indirectly his attitude toward the love and fear which Flamenca inspires. We are told that Archambaud is fired "d'un foc amoros" (160) at the first sight of her person; Guillaume understands that his desire for the noble wife is deeper than the abyss (1954). The conception of passio as a motion of the mind contrary to reason, as an amorous madness, is, in the Christian tradition, as old as St. Augustine, and St. Bernard makes


similar comparisons between the heat of concupiscence and the flames of hell. Such overt references lead one to suspect that the treatment of "fin'amor" is in this poem jocular rather than romantic in implication. More sophisticated evidence for this interpretation appears in the garlands, mirror, and comb which Archambaud's bride carries. These articles had long been the conventional toilette of Venus Luxuria. Furthermore, Flamenca's amorous effects upon the knights at her marriage banquet or the later tournament resemble the emotions aroused in soldiers by another foolish Venus whom Gower describes. Five hundred guests at the banquet forget their meal while gazing at Flamenca. Her beauty becomes the more fair the longer they keep their eyes on it. The poet possibly wished us to view her differently, to perceive not only that the behavior of the guests is ludicrous, but also that Flamenca is sister to the goddess who was, symbolically regarded, the mother of adulterous loves and of sin in general. In this light, the exaggerated praise throughout the romance of the woman's attractiveness seems mildly incongruous. If one accepts the evidence of Albericus of London, Guillaume speaks no well-phrased compliment when he praises her as his siren and compares desire for her to the appetite of Tantalus for the golden apple (4030-45). Another, more subtle form of irony juxtaposes images for the Virgin, the well of grace, and imagery which describes Flamenca through traditional emblems for cupidity (4695 ff.). The apparent similitude between the mothers of the "twin loves"

St. Augustine, "De Civitate Dei," Opera Omnia (Paris, 1838), Liber VIII, xvii; Bernard of Clairvaux, PL, CLXXXIV, 1266.

For examples, see Jean Seznec, The Survival of the Pagan Gods (New York, 1953); for mirror, see p. 107 (cf. illustrations, pp. 107-8). For the garland tradition, see p. 205. The comb relates to the long tresses which normally appear on such figures. In Le Roman de la Rose, the mirror, garlands, and long tresses decorate the figure "Oiseuse" whom Seznec relates to Venus Luxuria, p. 107; for her connotations, see Robertson, Cigés, pp. 35-36, and Albericus of London, Mythographus 3, p. 239, in Scriptores Rerum Mythicarum Latini tres Romae nuper reperti, ed. G. H. Bode (Cellis, 1834).


Compare Albericus: "Sirenes igitur corporales illecebras evidentem designant," (M. 3, p. 233) and "Unde et Tantalus dicitur, quod interpretatur visionem volons" (M. 3, p. 186).
may also be figured in the illumination on the epistle which Guillaume sends to Flamenca but that passage will be reserved for later treatment in our discussion. Altogether, such allusions serve to dramatize the moral opposition between celestial love and self-love, an opposition which creates for Guillaume and for Archambaud the possibility of choice central to any Christian cosmogony.

While Flamenca acts little enough in the poem, she is yet the agent in her Venus role of most of its action; medieval writers recognized that her kind of passion possessed a ready force in man’s motivation. Hence, Guillaume, like Chrétien’s Cligès, discovers love to be the “tyrannical power which tortures lovers, burns them, causes paleness, trembling, lack of appetite, sleeplessness, mental derangement, and so on.” 10 Chrétien and the later, unknown author probably wished to play something of a joke on the young suitors, and both looked to Ovid’s “book of jokes” for source material. Guillaume’s sleeplessness is not calmed by his taste for the songs of the nightingale who sits in the ancient evil garden, and the case for a romantic attitude toward his affair loses some of its weight when the author notes that the baths in which his trysts were conducted gave off such smells that no one would go near them unless he had to. Nor does one discern the elegant artifice of “amour courtois” in the knight’s ecstasy at seeing his lady turn to spit in church (3117-29). The ironic bite of the praise applied to him is as effective as that given to Flamenca. He is first introduced as the superior of the heroes, Absalom, Solomon, Hector, Paris, and Ulysses; yet, these worthies were not always much admired during the middle ages. Most of them could be types, in the Ubi Sunt poems, of the vanity of the world or the vanity of fleshliness.11 The comparison to Absalom is more significant than the others since Guillaume is adorned with the beauty and golden hair conventionally assigned to the Absalom type. Paul Beichner has shown that this golden crop generally signified to biblical commentators “some kind of excess, which might be further particularized as excess of the flesh, concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life.”12 Absalom’s peer has enough

10 Robertson, Cligès, p. 38.
11 See Paul Beichner, “Absolon’s Hair,” Mediaeval Studies, XII (1950), 228-31, where a number of such catalogues are assembled.
12 Beichner, p. 233.
of those faults. Later he accepts a tonsure of his fine hair only in order to approach Flamenca; Madame Bellepilile then saves his locks, blonder than the gold leaf of Montpellier, from the fire by wrapping them in the piece of white sendal which she forwards to the lady of the castle. The incongruity of the scene is pointed up by Hugo of St. Victor's explanation that the tonsure began with the Nazarenes who shaved the head as a sign of their continence, placing the hair on the fire of sacrifice. Ovidian ironies implicit in other sections in which Guillaume appears might be similarly explained; these scattered examples have been educed merely to clarify the serious ethical basis of the poem's levity about his illicit game.

Archambaud's admiration for Flamenca develops a second disoriented kind of love. The conventional jealousy which grows from his passion degrades him to a derelict state; he leaves his hair and beard unngroomed so that he resembles "una garba/De civada quan es mal facha" (1326-27). After locking up his wife, he beats her, and generally terrorizes the household. Finally, his people cease to respect him. Now the jealous husband could often in the period be a figure for more general possessiveness. Alanus de Insulis includes jealousy among the effects of avarice; both Jean de Meun and Gower confirm this association. Gower states, "Men mai wel make a liklihiede/ Betwen him which is averous/ Of gold and him that is jelous/ Of love, for in on degre/ Thei stonde bothe.

That is, women could serve quite as well as riches to bring home the ephemeral nature of the temporal. Indeed, the description of the covetous man and his eccentricities in the De Planctu might easily depict Archambaud, were gold substituted for "Flamenca" as the emblem for temporalia.

Though the satire directed against the ruler of Bourbon is more boisterous than that used against his rival, occasionally devices of indirection similar to those applied to Guillaume appear. When Archambaud becomes jealous, he appears as a type of Satan. He is

---

11 Hugo of St. Victor, "De Sacramentis," PL, CLXXVI, 422.
called the "fers aversiers" (2440) and "diabol" (3899), and he comes to resemble the demons which painters make. Furthermore, the beast imagery which reflects his changed nature may take its origin from bestiaries which allegorized the same animals, the leopard, ape, dog, and bear, as types of the devil.\(^{16}\) These references to Satan are appropriate only if Archambaud's jealousy dramatizes a larger avarice; among the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil, the last was thought to lure men into covetousness.\(^{17}\) The devilish, laughable sire of Bourbon with his possessive regard for the nodus of evil gets no more cover for his vices than the adulterous Guillaume. Thus, the poet's handling of literary conventions in this work does not support romantic views of its three main characters; rather the Ovidian and jealous husband conventions would seem to be used for purposes of humorous undercutting. One may now turn to the history of the period to see in what manner this attitude on the part of the author applies to it.

We may begin with Guillaume in our endeavor to show that Ovid's type of jocular treatment of love could be extended to interpret Albigensian history. The conception of heresy as a false infatuation was not new in the thirteenth century. Specifically, the Pseudo-Augustinian commentary on the *Apocalypse* appeared early in a tradition which identified the fornications (*Apoc. XVII: 4*) of the woman of Babylon with heterodoxy.\(^{18}\) In this context, the love of Flamenca becomes a symbol for heretical inclinations. We are told that Guillaume had her in mind when he joined his strange sect:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cant autr'amador} & \text{ s'accomptisson} \\
\text{Es genson e s'afffollisson} & \\
\text{E pesson de bels garnimens,} & \\
\text{De cavals e de vestimens,} & \\
\text{Fraire Guillems s'apataris,} & \\
\text{E per si dons a Dieu servis.} & \quad (3813-18)
\end{align*}
\]

One suspects that the author was not innocent in cloaking the

\(^{16}\) The leopard, in Rabanus Maurus, "De Universo," *PL*, CXI, 220; for the ape, see "De Bestiis et Allis Rebus," *PL*, CLXXVIII, 62-63. For the dog and the bear, see Maurus, *PL*, CXI, 223.

\(^{17}\) Rabanus Maurus, *PL*, CXII, 1364-65.

Patarin priest with a costume suggestive of the woman of Babylon's when he goes to his Venus for the second time.19

In any case, Guillaume de Nevers was an actual historical figure and a well-known heretic. Pierre des Vaux de Cernay has the longest account of him and the one which comes closest to paralleling parts of Flamenca:

Exeuntes autem a Monte Pessulano Oxomensis episcopus et prefati monachi, venerunt ad castrum quoddam, nomine Cervianum, ubi invenerunt quendam heresiarcham, Balduinum nomine, et Theodoricum quendam, filium perditionis et stipulam eterni incendii; iste de Gallia erat oriundus, nobilis quidem genere, et canonicus fuerat Nivernensis; postea vero, cum quidam miles, qui erat avunculus ipsius et hereticus pessimus, in Parisiensi concilio coram Octoviano, cardinali et apostolice sedis legato, fuisset de heresi condempnatus, videns iste quod latere diutius non valeret, ad partes se transtulit Narbonenses; ubi ab hereticis in maximo amore et veneratione est habitus, tum quia ceteris aliquantulum acutior videretur, tum quia gloriabantur se habuisse de Francia (ubi esse dinscitur fons scientiae et religionis christiane) sue credulitatis socium, sue nequitiae defensorem; preterea quod "Theodoricum" se faciebat vocari, cum "Willelmus" antea vocaretur.-Habita cum his duobus disputacione per octo dies, Balduino videlicet et Theodorico, predicatores nostri universum populum dicti castri salutaribus monitis ad sepedictorum hereticorum odium converterunt; ipsos siquidem hereticos a se libentissime expulissent, sed dominus castri, veneno perfidie infectus, eos sibi familiares fecerat et amicos. Verba autem illius disputations longum tempus esset per omnia enarrare; set hoc solummodo adnectere dignum duxi, quod, cum venerabilis episcopus dictum Theodoricum ad ima conclusionis disputando deduxisset, "Scio" inquit Theodoricus "scio cujus spiritus sis. Sicqidiem in spiritu Helye venisti "; ad hec sanctus: "Et si ego in spiritu Helye veni, tu venisti in spiritu Antichristi."20

There are attractions which the student can little resist in piecing together some chronicle of Guillaume's life from the bits of evidence that we have. It would appear that he came south from his education in Paris to become archdeacon of Nevers sometime before 1190. His name appears on ecclesiastical documents in 1190 and 1199 with other members of the Nivernais clergy, notably dean Bernard, the abbé Rainaud de Saint Martin, and Evrard de Chateauneuf.21 These three became in 1199-1200 the subject of eccle-

19 Compare ll. 6375-81 with Apoc. 17: 4.
21 René de Lespinasse, Cartulaire de Saint-Cyr de Nevers (Paris, 1916),
siastical investigations because they were suspected of heresy and accused of overly friendly relations with the mushrooming Nivernais movement toward heterodoxy. Whether Guillaume was also suspect is left unrecorded, but it seems likely that he and other members of the lower clergy were involved in a general scandal. It is probable that, as a result of the investigations, he may have openly gone over to the southern side, since he does not appear in Nivernais records after 1201, and shortly thereafter he engaged in the debates in the south which Pierre des Vaux de Cernay records.

In passing south from Nevers to Narbonne, the traveller would, in all likelihood, pass through Bourbon; yet, this gives one no warrant for turning Guillaume's love for the wife of the princely cuckold into an historical tryst at the local baths. However, certain parallels between the account of Guillaume in the romance and that in Pierre des Vaux de Cernay do emerge: his education at Paris, his reputation in certain quarters for acuteness, his association with a friendly uncle. Moreover, other events in Guillaume's roman appear as extensions of the general Ovidian ironic mode when measured in terms of his heresy. His most obvious error is the use of his priestly office as an instrument of a worshipful lechery. The "donzels" remark when he takes orders that he would resemble a new monk of Citeaux or Chartreuse if he were but wearing the correct clothes (3692-97) becomes more amusing when one remembers that Citeaux was the residence of the order endowed by Innocent III with the principal authority in the conversion of the Albigensians. Again, the knight, shortly after his arrival in Bourbon, offers an unorthodox petition which consists of the seventy-two names of God in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. On Whitsun Monday, the day after the feast of the founding of the church,
Guillaume promises that he will build churches and bridges with all his rent if God will but grant him Flamenca. He will even surrender his share in Paradise.25

This type of satire appears throughout the poem; however, two more complex manifestations of the ironic treatment of Guillaume's deviations should be examined at some length. Often manuscript illuminations portrayed side by side with the tree of the vices, rooted in cupiditas, a good tree rooted in humility or mercy and crowned with the virtues and Charity. A particularly fine tree of this kind may be found in a thirteenth-century compendium of Provençal poetic lore, Ermengaud's Breviari d'Amor.26 Ermengaud's tree is complicated, since it attempts to show in one diagram the relationship between God and Nature and between four kinds of love, the love of God, of offspring, of temporal goods, and of man and woman. In the middle of his tree is a woman, perhaps the Virgin, who is crowned with the love of God and neighbor; upon her breast she wears maternal love, and the love of temporal goods and the creaturely loves of male and female are placed beneath her feet to show that one ought to master them. Now Guillaume also constructs a "good" tree rooted in pietas and crowned with charity (4625-43), but his definitions of the parts of the tree are unconventional. For him "pietas" is a feeling for the sorrows of another, specifically for those of Flamenca. Mercy blossoms for Guillaume when he becomes Flamenca's warrior, in other words, a knight for a figure who suggests the false Venus or the woman of Babylon. And Charity, which Guillaume, like the orthodox Ermengaud, recognizes to be the crown of all goods, would appear to be realized for the Albigensian hero in the complete fruition of his amorous desires. The inversion of the orthodox scale of values is complete. For the woman of Ermengaud's tree who has put "Amor de mascul e de fembra" under her feet, Guillaume has substituted Flamenca. He has replaced Charity with masked cupidity. For the pietas which should bind him to his past and its religious traditions, he has substituted a sentimental submission to woman. Incidentally, Guillaume should know better

25 Guillaume by his actions or words consistently inverts the meaning of the ecclesiastical feasts mentioned in the poem; however, space limitations do not permit a thorough treatment of this.
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than to define *pietas* as he does, for, but a few lines earlier, he remembers Virgil (4609-10), whose Aeneas understood better the meaning of the word.

Similar ironies may appear in the epistle which Guillaume sends to Flamenca (7100-12). Its illuminations picture an angel kneeling before a woman who is called "la bella de Belmont." From this angel's mouth issue two flowers wreathed together, one of which touches the edge of the verses, and the other leads to the lady. The angel is counseling the lady to listen to the words of the flower, to hear the verses written on the manuscript. Now this would appear to be an ordinary annunciation scene. The Virgin was often addressed as the reigning beauty of Mount Zion, as the "montem myrrhae" of the *Canticum*, a kind of "bella de Belmont." However, Flamenca recognizes that the angel is only Guillaume, that the portrait of the "bella de Belmont" is only a picture of herself. The suggestion is tentative that this is a mock annunciation, but if it is, its irony is appropriate to the Patarin heresy. One of the central issues in the Catharist-orthodox controversy was the doctrine of the Trinity. While Trinitarian fervor rose in Southern Europe among the orthodox, the Catharists attempted to subordinate the second and third persons of the Trinity to the first and to negate the Incarnation. To the orthodox mind, the scene at the annunciation, where Christ was conceived, the Father was present as Creator, and the Holy Spirit descended in the form of a dove, could dramatize perfectly the doctrines of the Trinity. However, at Guillaume's "annunciation," there is no Incarnation and no Trinity, only a decorative picture of lust.

When we turn to the conventional avarice of the jealous husband, we discover it to be as relevant to a historical Archambaud as are the Ovidian conventions to Guillaume. This ruler, Archambaud VII, was convicted of heresy, but his separation from the church was due more to his love of possession than to any doctrinal disputes. The story of his attack on the ecclesiastical arm in 1228 is told by Chazaud in his *Étude sur la Chronologie des Sires de Bourbon*:

Au mois de juin, les doyen et chanoines de Bourges, au nom de tous les

---

"D. Rupertus, PL, CLXX, 208.

chapitres et de toutes les abbayes du Berri, adressèrent au pape Grégoire IX les plaintes les plus vives contre le sire de Bourbon qui, confiant en sa puissance et glorieux de ses immenses richesses, non-seulement refusait d'entrer dans la commune de l'archevêque, et d'observer la trêve imposée par lui à tout son diocèse, et jurée par tous les hommes nobles et non nobles du Bourbonnais, mais en outre, opprimait les églises, les personnes ecclésiasitiques et les croisés, avec une si effroyable tyrannie, malgré les solennels avertissements qui lui avaient été faits et par députés et de vive voix, que l'archevêque avait été contraint, dans l'intérêt de son diocèse, après avoir pris conseil des hommes les plus éclairés, de promulguer contre lui une sentence d'excommunication.29

Archambaud’s struggle with Phillipe, the Archbishop of Bourges, continued for eleven years. During all this time, he was under sentence of excommunication, and he alone among the nobles of the area refused to swear the “commune” with the archbishop.30 Finally, on September 1, 1239, Archambaud submitted to the ecclesiastic with a humiliating oath.31 No evidence shows the sire of Bourbon to have been in sympathy with Albigensians. However, his persecution of the church and of crusaders which it had sent against the southern nobility would be sufficient basis for his inclusion in the romance. The historian’s compulsive, stubborn ruler does not deviate far from the poet’s. His greed comes through in the poem’s characterization of his jealousy. The poet may also suggest that Archambaud’s concern for temporalia had perverted the church in his territory and prepared the way for the coming of “Guillaume de Nevers” and his schismatic cult.

Though the romance contains no such overt reference to Archambaud’s heresy as the lines specifically identifying Guillaume as a Patarin, at the beginning of the tale there is a hint of what is to come when Gui de Nemours considers whether he ought to marry Flamencat to Archambaud or to the King of the Slavs or the King of Hungary (33-36). Catharists were often known as Bougars, and the Slavic areas of Europe were generally thought to be the breeding ground of the cult.32 Thus Gui does not place the sire of Bourbon in very good company when he compares him with these eastern kings.

31 Fazy, I, 508-9.
32 Zorzi, p. 235; Borst, pp. 66-71.
Structurally, the poem may be divided into three sections. The first two parts use literary conventions to interpret and satirize the careers of individual historical figures. The first treats of Archambaud’s marriage and the growth of his jealousy; the second deals with Guillaume’s arrival in Bourbon, his devices to effect a liaison with Flamenca, and its consummation. If one speaks of structure in terms of ideas, these sections may be said to develop the relationship between the failure of the ruler and the failure of the priest, between the false state and the unorthodox religion. The last section, commencing with Archambaud’s recovery from his illness and Guillaume’s departure from Bourbon, is a more complicated historical allegory which seems to survey in a cursory fashion the broader panorama of the wars of heresy. Guillaume, upon leaving Bourbon, participates, as Flamenca’s knight, in a series of tournaments in Flanders, Brabant, and then in Bourbon. He goes first into Flanders where he hears that there is a war. Now from 1144 Flanders had been a center of heresy. In 1162, Henri, the archbishop of Reims, made a tour of the territory, and, shocked by the prevalence of the Manichean belief, secured the services of his brother, King Louis VII, to write to Pope Alexander III concerning the trouble. The problem reappeared in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and sporadic efforts to uproot the group continued well into the thirteenth century. These struggles may well be the Flemish tournament in which the Patarin hero participates.

He then goes to fight in the tourney of the “dux de Braiman” at Louvain. The nature of the Brabant heresy is not entirely clear. However, schismatics were so lively there in 1232 that Henry I of Brabant sent a recommendation to his abbots and inquisitors that they should exterminate completely the perverse in his land. Walter Map, in his De Nugis Curialium, mentions the devious practices of the Brabançon. Pope Celestin III wrote to the archbishop of Arles instructing him to destroy the “Barbançons.” Or again, in 1179, the Archbishop of Narbonne addressed a letter to his clergy ordering them to excommunicate the heretics, their followers


--Moreau, III, 595.
and defenders, "les Brabançons, Aragonois, Costereaux." No one has ever shown that any Duke of Brabant supported the opposition to Rome, but the "dux de Braiman" possibly implied only the leader of the Brabançons to an audience familiar with such allusions.

Finally, there is the tournament held fifteen days after Easter in Bourbon. This tourney may be divided into two main actions. The first action consists of the conquests of Guillaume over the Count of La Marche, the Count of Toulouse, Geoffroi of Blaye, Arnaut of Boville, and Uc of Rosinelle. Guillaume is rather generous in that, when he conquers, he keeps none of the overthrown as prisoners. He requires only that they surrender themselves to Flamenc. Their obeisance to the woman would seem to be emblematic of the surrender which southern aristocrats made to the dictates of the heterodox. The Count of La Marche surrenders first. This count, Hugues of Lusignan, had married his son to the daughter of Raymond VII of Toulouse, and in 1226, Raymond hoped to be able to depend upon him for support against Louis VIII, but the pressure of the king and of apostolic legates apparently kept him in the French camp. However, the siege of Avignon that year went poorly because several of the crusaders including the ruler of La Marche were said to have secretly favored Raymond of Toulouse. Hugues at that time formed a league with Thibaud of Champagne and Pierre Maucclere with the intention of pushing a reaction against his king. Finally, in 1241, a Count of La Marche joined with Raymond VII in an ill-fated rebellion which was ruined in the defeat of Henry III of England and his retreat to Bordeaux.

Guillaume then captures Alphonse of Toulouse, Geoffroi of Blaye, Arnaut of Boville, Uc of Rosinelle, and the sixteen Castilians. They bow to Flamenc and return with a greeting for Guillaume from her. "Alphonse" is apparently a nickname for the members of the house of Toulouse since there was no Count Alphonse between 1194

---


**Belperron, p. 372.

and 1249. The name had been a favorite with the Toulousan house, and the use of this title is apparently only a veiled reference to Count Raymond VI or Count Raymond VII, both ruling spirits in the southern rebellion. I have been unable to locate Geoffroi of Blaye or Arnaut of Boville. The Úc of Rosinelle who goes with the group which bows to Flamenca may be a pseudonym for Raimon de Roussillon who was the ally of Count Raymond. And the business of the Castilian knights could relate to Count Raymond's Spanish negotiations. Thus, what evidence there is would seem to indicate that the first part of the tournament is a miniature picture of the spread of heretical inclinations among the southern lords who kneel before Flamenca when they are conquered by her knight.

The second part of the tournament takes the form of a series of jousts in which Guillaume plays no part. None of the warriors in this action is presented to Flamenca; it seems to represent the crusades to the south of France, picturing them, in miniature, as battles between one Christian and one heterodox lord. In some cases, the Christian lords mentioned took up the cross against the Saracens rather than in opposition to their southern brothers. The first joust opposes Archambaud and the Lord of Anduze. Anduze had long been a dependency of Toulouse, and, during this period, Pierre Bermond, its ruler, was a son-in-law of Count Raymond. Consequently, the Count of Anduze entered into an agreement with the Count of Toulouse to be in league with him, but it was to be in effect only so long as he did nothing against the papacy or the church. The Lord of Anduze was probably not the most pious of rulers, but he shifted his sides well enough so that Anduze was one of the two houses, in the area subject to the counts of Toulouse, which were not stamped out; with a promise of fidelity they were allowed to retain their dominions. Against the Lord of Anduze is pitted Archambaud of Bourbon whose heretical activities we have discussed.

38 Belperron, pp. 456 ff.
40 Belperron, p. 252 ff., p. 422; the Castilians may refer to Spanish mercenaries who fought in the wars.
The next joust is between the Count of St. Pol, who was one of the leaders of the Christian forces, and Aimeri of Narbonne, who defected from the Christian armies in the siege of Puisserguier. Later, in 1214, Simon de Montfort attacked Aimeri and made him submit to a humiliating treaty which included a promise not to attack any of the crusaders.

Following this, Guillaume of Montpellier and Garin of Reortier joust. I have been unable to locate Garin of Reortier; Guillaume of Montpellier, on the other hand, was active enough in the work against the Albigensians, for he was the patron of Alanus de Insulis and Alanus' tractate against the heretics was dedicated to him.

Of the next battlers, Gauthier of Brienne was a vigorous crusader in the Holy Land where he died in 1251. Oddly, his opponent, the Viscount of Turenne, seems also consistently to have been among the Christian forces. Here the satirist's purpose is a little obscure, and his arrangement of opponents may have a topical import which is more local.

The Counts of Rodez and Champagne follow on the tourney field. The Counts of Rodez seem generally to have been opposed to the Crusaders; in 1214 Simon of Montfort forced the Count of Rodez to submit to him and to recognize the king of France as his lord. Thereafter, Henry I appears to have been a faithful ally of the crusaders; he gave up his lands in 1219 with the purpose of going to the Holy Land. In 1242, the counts of Rodez got themselves into trouble again when Hugues of Rodez was excommunicated as the accomplice of Raymond of Toulouse. Since rulers of Rodez were vassals of the counts of Toulouse, their association with the heretical cause is not unusual, though they were of little importance to the unorthodox leaders, and their allegiance wavered. Pitted against this count is the Count of Champagne, Thibaud IV, who was a somewhat unwilling participant in the siege of Avignon which broke the back of the southern resistance. In 1219, Thibaud
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43 Belperron, pp. 197, 288-89.
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had asked Phillip Augustus if he might take charge of the southern expedition and was frustrated; yet, generally his allegiance to the orthodox cause was unflagging. Concerning the Viscount of Melun, I have failed to find any information, but the tiny Lord of Cardaillac who opposes him may be Bertran de Cardaillac who fought for the northern side.

Finally, the Count of Flanders and Geoffrey of Lusignan fight. Robert Lee Wolff has indicated the confusions which surrounded the leadership of Flanders during this time when an imposter successfully claimed the throne. Considering these confusions, it would be presumptuous to attempt to identify the poet's intention in naming the Count of Flanders. The author may refer to the numerous Flemish crusaders who went south or he could be thinking of the Count Baldwin's eastern trip. However, the opponent, Geoffrey of Lusignan, is probably the Geoffroy à la Grand'Dent of Lusignan who was in Italy in 1233 in order that the decree of excommunication against him might be raised. One suspects that the poem, in the missing portion at the end, might have gone on to show the eventual triumph of little men like Cardaillac, for the final results of the historical battle which seems to be shadowed in the tourney at Bourbon were none too auspicious for such as Guillaume de Nevers.

The poem presents some obvious problems which remain to be solved. What is the possible significance of the rite of washing Archambaud's hair? What did the poet mean by dividing the knights previous to the final tournament into two sides, on one side the Flemings, Burgundians, Auvergnats, and the jousters from Champagne, on the other side, the men of Poitou, Saintonge, Angouleme, Perigord and Quercy? The two sides approximate the opponents in the wars of heresy, but the division is by no means exact. However, the locus of the poem's concern is evident as well as something of its satiric intent. Little specifically Albigensian literature remains; Zorzi has demonstrated that there is no evidence of heterodoxy in the love poetry of Languedoc, a tradition which
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reached its final flower in *Le Roman de Flamenca*. If the romance was intended to make its audience laugh at false love and its vices, at heresy and its attendant social turmoil, perhaps other similar romances with suggestive historical references ought to be read in the same fashion. At present, we may praise this work for the seriousness of its shaping of history and the humanism of its Ovidian laughter. Its satiric conventions have content insofar as they depersonalize and give point to a Christian criticism of the time.
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