

HUMOUR IN THE *ROMAN D'ENEAS*

Raymond Cormier

From a study of the extensive marginalia, gloss, and commentary tradition surrounding Virgil's *Aeneid* during the Middle Ages, it has been deduced that, in a number of cases, the twelfth-century author of the *Roman d'Eneas* incorporated on numerous occasions such scholia in his adaptation of the Latin epic into Old French. That is, he adapted not only Virgil's Latin epic but also parts of the surrounding mediaeval Latin commentary as well. This argument will be demonstrated more fully in a number of studies to appear, research which is the result of a fruitful Fulbright year in Western European libraries (Holland, Switzerland, and France; and more recently, in Great Britain and Italy). In these various European libraries, over one hundred *Aeneid* manuscripts have been consulted and their wealth of ninth- to twelfth-century annotations scrutinized.

The present study focuses on a small cluster of problematic and most often rather amusing passages in the Old French *Eneas* romance. They were chosen because they represent, in the first instance, a divergence from the classical model. Recognition of each of the anomalies, or incongruities, like loose threads in the text's fabric, allows a privileged glimpse of the inner workings of the Old French romancer's art, i.e., of his compositional habits. This methodology brings us into the craftsman's workshop. The author was clearly a *dévoué* of the classics, but not lacking a hearty sense of humour. Moreover, the anomalies cannot be explained or understood in light of the tradition of glosses to the *Aeneid*. That is, no glosses have been

found so far to explain the author's divergences from Virgil's Latin text. In my matrix of some thirty-odd anomalies, these particular episodes revealing humour, whether accidental or intentional, cannot be explained through the tradition of Virgilian scholia. They appear, therefore, to be inventions of the French romancer.

Preliminarily, twelve such anomalous and, of course, humorous, or at least quizzical, episodes have been organized into three arbitrary groups, each one exemplifying a type of humour. The three types are the humour of *complicity*, whereby the author's sly wink at the audience is suggested by a delightful or exquisite juxtaposition that provokes a guffaw or a chuckle. Second, the humour of *exaggeration* may imply, through hyperbole in fact, a knowledge of Virgil's text by the audience or, if not, then a devalorization of the classical model in favour of a droll laugh at the expense of the original. This type may also appear in its opposite form, revalorization, i.e., up or down the hyperbolic scale. Third is the humour of *irony*, whereby the author turns completely from his model and actually mocks or makes sport of the Virgilian scene or setting in question. Here the range runs from the gruesome to the commonsensical, from the graphic to the impious.

The first group, episodes revealing an inferential humour of complicity, should include first a pair of passages that is complementary and forms an Ovidian echo in the *Eneas*, namely the stories of the Judgment of Paris and the adultery of Mars and Venus.

In each case, the Old French author reaches a point in his narrative where he feels obliged to explain, for his audience, an obscurity in his source. Both episodes involve a woman or women who entice a male with sexual temptation in order to have their way. In the Judgment of Paris episode, the author writes that the Trojans were hated by Juno, the "goddess of the sky . . .," who "was very cruel to them" (*Juno, qui ert del ciel deesse, / estoit vers aus molt felenesse*, vv.93-94). To elucidate the reasons for her "great hatred," the romancer simply relates the celebrated action:<sup>1</sup>

formant avoit coilli an hé  
toz çaus de Troie la cité  
del jugemant que fist Paris:  
por lui haoit tot le país.  
L'acheison de cel jugemant  
voil reconter asez briemant.  
Juno et Pallas a un jor,  
Venus la deesse d'amor,

estoient a un parlemant.  
 Discorde i sorvint sodemant;  
 une poome d'or lor gita  
 antr'eles trois, puis s'an ala;  
 il i ot escrit an grezois  
 qu'a la plus bele d'eles trois  
 faisoit de la pome lo don.  
 Antr'eles en ot grant tençon,  
 chascune la voloit avoir,  
 mais par autre voltrent savoir  
 lo jugemant, cui ert la pome. (vv. 95-113)

Thus goes the tale of woe, how the three came to Paris, asked him for a judgment, and how he tricked them by asking them to return in three days, knowing each would come forward with special favours to his profit. Juno did so and promised wealth; Pallas came to offer courage and prowess; but Venus' gift was irresistible -- the most beautiful woman in the world. This pleased Paris the most; thus deprived, Juno and Pallas were so enraged they "held the people of Troy in hatred" (*Pallas et Juno s'an marrirent / et çals de Troie anhaïrent*).

The non-Virgilian humour here plays on the imagery of both the three great goddesses in contention, rushing home to deceive each other, then stealing back to the young swain for the offer of bribes, and the humorous vanity yet pathetic jealousy of both Juno and Pallas, scorned by a mere mortal woodsman who, nevertheless, "knew the laws well" (*a lui, qui molt savoir des lois, / por jugier en erent venues*, vv. 120-21) -- at least that is what the goddesses believed.<sup>2</sup>

As if a counterpanel to the Judgment of Paris episode, the romancer has interpolated a similar narrative invention some four thousand lines later. Venus, noting her son's predicament, when the Latins are about to besiege the Trojan fortification, comes to her spouse to request arms on behalf of Aeneas. Thus would the Trojan hero be enabled to fight his enemy Turnus in single combat. For this, Venus offers Vulcan a night of joyful delight and pleasure -- a novelty -- because<sup>3</sup>

Set anz avoit toz acompliz  
 qu'il ne fu mes de li saisiz,  
 ne en un lit o li ne jut,  
 por grant ire qui antr'aus fut . . . . (vv. 4349-52)

The author says he wishes to explain now the reason for the estrangement. Mars and Venus loved each other illicitly, we are reminded; Vulcan craftily constructed a fine net of iron and placed it around the lovers' bed. Thus was the God of Fire able to catch them as they lay together enveloped in the net. He then invited the gods to come view this sight publicly. Some were displeased, writes the romancer; others wished "to be tied up likewise tightly with her" (*por quant s'en i ot il de teus / qui volsissent estre alsement / laciez o li estroitement*, vv. 4372-74). Venus became angry at Vulcan, although she made up with him to wheedle this favour and have her own way.

This episode is lifted directly, it would appear, from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (IV.171-89), where he tells of the sun revealing to Juno's offspring the "shameful behaviour" of Mars and Venus; how a stunned Vulcan fashioned invisible "slender bronze chains, nets and snares . . .," and set the trap, catching the pair in *flagrante delicto*. The "ivory doors" were flung open by Vulcan and the gods were highly amused by the "shameful sight," though "one . . . prayed that he too might be so shamed. They laughed aloud . . . ." The reader is thus invited to chortle at the sight of these two dignified divinities strung up like helpless hams in a net, whether of bronze or of iron, caught red-handed indeed.<sup>4</sup>

Next, still in the context of the humour of complicity, there is a kind of non-Virgilian challenge or disembarkation *topos* used in the *Eneas* that should be taken as risible. As the hero and his ships sail up the Tiber and reach Arcadia, the land of Evander, the latter's young warrior son leaps to his feet and, not recognizing the Trojans, rushes to attack, saying,<sup>5</sup>

'Seignor', fait il, qui estes vos,  
 qui ci vos anbatez sor nos?  
 Armé venez an nostre terre;  
 ne sai se volez pais ou guerre;  
 se vos venez ça por mal faire,  
 ne vos volons de rien atraire;  
 ançois que vos vegnoiz a port,  
 seroiz vos tuit navré o mort.' (vv. 4661-68)

This untrusting welcome, absent from the *Aeneid*, represents a kind of *dépit guerrier* (not unlike the *dépit amoureux* theme in poetry, romance, or theatre). One expects that the Arcadians should know who these visitors are -- just as, in another, quite distant setting, a rather desperate Danish

coast guard brandishes his spear and shouts down to the Geatish warriors arriving on the shore: "'What sort of people may you be who have come in arms from across the ocean in that great ship? . . . Listen to plain speaking, you foreign seamen. You had better tell me why you have come, and at once.'" Finally, after further discussion, Hygelac's men are permitted to advance up the strand to Hrothgar's hall, where Beowulf's bravura will soon be tested.<sup>6</sup> As is the case with *Beowulf*, the Old French author's audience knows who the visitors are, realizes that Pallas is being prickly and rather uncourtly, thus provoking, for the *Eneas* listener at least, a small non-Virgilian snicker.

Finally, two quasi-lyrical moments should detain us briefly for this category of authorial complicity. Both episodes occur in the midst of the so-called love descriptions in the *Eneas* and neither interpolation appears supported by Virgil or Ovid. This refers first to the "arrow of Love," sent by an archer of Lavine, around the shaft of which she has tied a letter declaring her love for the Trojan. The arrow is shot so as to touch no one, falls at the moat's edge near the Trojan camp, thus breaking the truce sworn to earlier by Eneas and Turnus, in preparation for their single combat. The arrow would serve as a token of treachery, to be sent into the town as evidence of the broken truce.<sup>7</sup>

The second passage follows soon upon this one. The arrow of love that also (paradoxically) brings war causes Eneas to fall in love, for it starts a "war of love" in his heart. After much gazing and staring at Lavine in the tower, Eneas turns to leave, but<sup>8</sup>

la cité regardot sovant  
 et donc redisoit a sa gent  
 que molt par estoit la tors bele:  
 plus le disoit por la pucelle  
 que ne faisoit por la meisiere.        (vv. 8903-07)

Later, as Eneas sighs at the sight of the tower, his men observe:

'Tel gardant a en cele tor,  
 se ses consalz an ert creüz  
 tost nos avroient receüz:  
 se tuit li autre l'an creoient,  
 molt hastivement se randroient.  
 Sire', font il a lor seignor,  
 'veez, molt est bele la tor,

mais il a un piler laïsus  
 qui auques pent vers vos çaus.  
 Veez com la meisiere est plaine,  
 li pilerz droiz et l'ovre saine.  
 Molt est bele cele fenestre  
 lez le pilier, de ça sor destre,  
 mail il s'i esta uns archiers  
 qui molt traïroit ça volantiers.  
 Sire, car vos traïez an sus  
 que il ne traïe a vos çaus.' (vv. 9236-52)

Eneas, understanding this little joke, himself smiles at the metonymy.<sup>9</sup>

Thus, the non-Virgilian arrow of love causes war to break out literally and breaks the truce of *pudor* or respectability between lovers. The beauty of the tower, noted by Eneas' men, evokes a gentle giggle, even on the part of the hero.

In the second category belong elements of hyperbole, whether up or down the scale of exaggeration. For example, in describing the reasons for the original outbreak of hostilities between Latins and Trojans, the Old French author, expanding on Virgil's brief elements in the Seventh *Aeneid* that depicts Ascanius' killing of Silvia's tame deer, provides a pastoral portrait of Tirus, of his daughter's amusing and intimately treated pet deer -- which itself contrasts ironically with the subsequent realistic feudal clash, giving Turnus a rationale for the laying of a siege. While the deer does seem to draw upon an opposite number in the tame tigress of the *Thebes* romance, a charming detail is added by the *Eneas* romancer, namely that<sup>10</sup>

Tant ert li cers de bone orine  
 que la nuit servoit al mangier,  
 si ert en lou de chandelier  
 devant lo pere a la pucelle.  
 Mervoïles ert sa teste belle,  
 quant uns granz cierges li ardoit  
 sor chascun rain que il avoit.  
 Issi servoit chescune nuit . . . . (vv. 3552-59)

This fanciful non-Virgilian trait represents an exaggeration of the model, a kind of Ovidian interpolation, imagery that surely induces a bit of grinning bemusement.

In the Vulcan episode that follows the adultery tale of Mars and Venus discussed above, there are three elements of hyperbolic humour. Here is found the famed Virgilian purple passage that describes Aeneas' armour, but in the hands of the Old French author, it becomes a fascinating transposition incorporating a Norman preoccupation with ocean-going matters as a basis for amplification. Aeneas' shield, for instance, is constructed from

De la coste d'un grant poisson,  
qui est an mer, 'cetus' a non,  
de cele ot fait Vulcan l'escu . . . . (vv. 4445-47)

Similarly, Aeneas' huge broadsword has a "very good scabbard made of the tooth of a fish . . . ." (*A l'espee ot fuerre molt bon, / qui fu de la dent d'un peisson*, vv. 4507-08).<sup>11</sup>

These diverting, enigmatic tidbits of sea lore occur in association with a fine example of non-Virgilian exaggeration, namely, Vulcan's anvil. The God of Fire works on Aeneas' sword and<sup>12</sup>

Quant Vulcan l'ot aparoillee,  
an s'enclume l'a essaiee,  
ou il feisoit sa forgeure,  
qui molt ert grant et molt ert dure;  
sis piez ert liee, espesse nuef,  
ne la treisissent trente buef.  
Il i feri, si la trancha,  
jus qu'en terre li branz cola . . . . (vv. 4491-98)

Neo-Freudians might see this as an example of self-mutilation; attention is drawn rather to the anomaly, i.e., the inconsistency between Virgil's text and the Old French adaptation, as well as to the burlesque exaggeration itself, a fine instance of the *Eneas* author's sometimes whimsical or cavalier attitude toward his most serious model.<sup>13</sup>

The last example of exaggeration draws on another episode that represents an inexplicable divergence from Virgil. Framed by the Pallanteum and Evander story is the tale of Cacus, a man-eating monster that vomits dark fire and plagues the land, but vengeful Hercules comes and seizes the creature, knots him up and entwines him closely, then strangles the fiend until his eyes burst out, draining the blood from his throat. The *Eneas* author merely abbreviates this time, saying only laconically that Hercules "killed him there with great bravery and hung his head on a tree" (*par grant vertu iluec l'ocist, / a un arbre pendi la teste*, vv. 4642-43).<sup>14</sup>

We can appreciate the epic devalorization that obtains here, the down scaling of exaggeration, as it were, if we consider an analogous passage, from another time and place, of dark and evil encounter:

He stood upright and gripped Grendel so tightly that the talons cracked to bursting. The monster fought to escape . . . , his talons were in an enemy clutch . . . . The fiend suffered excruciating pain. An enormous wound became visible in his shoulder; his sinews snapped, and tendons burst.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, a grand mythical event, the *heilbringer's* defeat of a monstrous "son of Cain" becomes, analogously, in the hands of the twelfth-century romancer, no more than an amusing instance of *abbreviatio*.

The third type of humour involves irony, whether it be that of circumstance, i.e., a lack of congruence between what happens in the text and the reader's expectations, or dramatic irony, i.e., a lack of congruence between what a particular character believes as the truth or hopes will occur and what the audience perspective knows as truth or will happen.<sup>16</sup>

One of the first to die as the hostilities break out over Silvia's stag is Sir Galesus. Driven by Ascanius' harangue, the Trojans push forward, slicing off hands and arms from the poor untrained Latin peasants. A certain man (for Virgil just a wealthy peacemaker),<sup>17</sup>

Danz Galesus, uns riches hom,  
 n'i ert venuz se por bien non  
 et por desfaire la mellee;  
 cil i recoilli tel colee  
 qu'il che<sup>r</sup> morz sempres a terre;  
 onques ne li lut mire querre  
 por sa plaie mediciner,  
 ne li estut loier doner,  
 ne metre entrait ne oignement;  
 ne langui mie longuement. (vv. 3675-84)

From such gruesome, even grotesque humour, the romancer can move on easily to another ironic episode where correspondence between event and expectation is lacking. Such is the case two thousand lines later when Eneas returns from Arcadia with reinforcements for Ascanius and the Trojan camp. Virgil describes how Aeneas raised high his shield that blazed in the sun and how the Dardanians shouted to the heavens from the walls.<sup>18</sup> For the *Eneas*



author, the scene offers an opportunity for a wry comment on military strategy. Within the camp the Trojans<sup>19</sup>

Molt furent lié, si s'escriërent,  
 molt firent mal, trop se hasterent,  
 car s'il peüssent ariver  
 an pes, issir et aus armer  
 et peüssent celeement,  
 qu'il lor fussent destriers as dos,  
 ses eüssent antr'aus anclos,  
 se fussent cil an fin veincu;  
 mais ce lor a formant neü  
 que cil del chastel s'escriërent  
 et cil de l'ost se regarderent.  
 Voient les nes pres del rivaige,  
 qui a terre vienent o naïge:  
 se il n'i sunt a l'ariver,  
 il i porront ja meschever. (vv. 5607-22)

The irony here is circumstantial: the reader of Virgil expects no such authorial intervention. The Old French romancer's knowledge of military matters seems more pointed than that of Rome's great epic poet.

In yet another battle scene, ironic contrast deprecates a Rutulian champion, Turnus' second, so to speak. The first encounter is meant, when the amazing Amazonian Camilla is viciously taunted by Tarcon, a Trojan Thersites whose biting tongue on the battlefield has no match in Virgil's text (although the character does reproach the Etruscans at XI.732-40). Using an Ovidian commonplace, Tarcon asserts that a woman should not do battle with a man except at night in bed. His invective continues:<sup>20</sup>

'Laissiez ester desmesurance,  
 metez jus l'escu et la lance  
 et le hauberc, qui trop vos blece,  
 et ne mostrez vostre proëce.  
 Ce ne est pas vostre mestier,  
 mes filer, coldre et taillier;  
 en bele chambre soz cortine  
 fet bon esbatre o tel meschine.  
 Venistes ça por vos montrer?  
 Ge ne vos voil pas acheter;

portant blanche vos voi et bloie;  
 quatre deniers ai ci de Troie,  
 qui sont molt bon de fin or tuit;  
 çaus vos donrai por mon deduit  
 une piece mener o vos;  
 ge n'en serai ja trop jalos,  
 bailleraï vos as escuiers.  
 Bien vos voil vendre mes deniers;  
 se tant i pert, pas ne m'en plaing;  
 vos en avroiz doble guaaing:  
 l'un ert que men or avroiz,  
 l'autre que vostre bon feroiz;  
 mes ne vos sofira noiant  
 ce, que s'il an i avoit cent;  
 vos porriez estre lassee,  
 pas n'en seriez saolee.' (vv. 7081-106)

Camilla slays this character with one blow and screams back:<sup>21</sup>

'mialz sai abatre un chevalier  
 que acoler ne dosnoier;  
 ne me sai pas combatre anverse.' (vv. 7123-25)

While the irony is still circumstantial, and rather Ovidian in its smirking tone, the fact is that nowhere does such sniggering occur in the *Aeneid*. The Old French author is clearly inventing at this point.

The final example presents an interesting facet of the romancer's art and of his attitude toward the complex machinery of Latin mythology. In Virgil's last book (XII.229-37), another truce is broken, this one through supernatural causes. In the *Eneas*, a lone knight of the Latin forces decides that single combat may lead to evil and that they should not wager their lives on the basis of one man's actions, even if it be the champion Turnus. Whereupon the knight strikes a Trojan warrior dead and the fierce battle breaks out anew. Latinus the king had carried out all his gods and placed the idols on a silken cloth for the oath of single combat. When the king saw the battle start afresh,<sup>22</sup>

la fin qu'il avoit porparlee  
 li estut tot an fin guerpir,  
 si s'an comança a foïr.

Antre ses braz portot ses deus;  
 il nes tenoit noiant a teus  
 qu'il li peüssent rien valoir,  
 ne nul garant par aus avoir:  
 an tost foïr mialz se fiot  
 que en ses deus que il portot. (vv. 9440-48)

Rationalist that he is, the Old French romancer cannot resist this "civilized sneer," as Yunck calls it (p. 243), toward the pagan deities and poor Latinus' pathetic and hopeless situation. One is tempted to see in this episode a kind of dramatic irony, not unlike that found in the futile and just plain stupid events surrounding the actions of a certain blind king of Thebes, the one who mistakenly killed his father and married his mother.

Not every humorous scene or situation in the *Eneas* has been covered. The episode of Rannes, for example, should not be passed over in silence. When Nisus and Euryalus stealthily attack the Rutulian camp, slaying dozens in the dark, the companions<sup>23</sup>

. . . il vindrent al paveillon  
 ou Rannes jut, qui molt ert sages:  
 d'oisiaus savoit bien deviner  
 et giter sorz et enchanter;  
 soz ciel n'avoit meillor divin.  
 Mais la nuit ot tant beü vin,  
 que tot son sens en ot troblé  
 et son savoir ot oblïé;  
 cil qui des autres devinot  
 de soi meïsmes rien ne sot  
 que sa mort li fust si prochaine,  
 mais bien avoit dit la semaine  
 que ce savoit il bien sanz faille  
 qu'il ne morroit pas an bataille.  
 Et ne fist il, il a voir dit,  
 car il n'i fu, n'il ne la vit;  
 ne sai coment il i morust,  
 car ainz que la bataille fust,  
 li fist Nisus lo chief voler:  
 ce ne sot il pro deviner. (vv. 5054-74)

This elaborate incident is amplified from Virgil's few words (IX.325-28 -- *sed non augurio potuit depellere pestem*). The irony arises not so much from the Latin text as from the Old French author's style. Once again, he scorns the pagans and their strange beliefs.

The grid of grinning interfaces has revealed some evidence for halcyon days in the late 1150's in France. By tugging at the frayed boundaries, the anomalies, or contradictions between the adaptation and the Virgilian model, we have glimpsed a cheerful Old French romancer whose jaunty drolleries fall easily into three categories -- the mirthful joke of *complicity*, the cheerful humour of *hyperbole*, and the smirk of *irony*. But these insights arose only through careful scrutiny of the textual seams, of the Virgilian model *cum* commentary and scholia in juxtaposition to the corresponding Old French passages. As suggested, no glosses have been found to explain the contradictions, and thus authorial intervention has been assumed -- for the sake of diversion, so typical of the romance form.

Using less than half as many muscles to smile as he does to frown, man, for many reasons, is a smiling animal. In general, through laughter and smiling, we release feelings of superiority or embarrassment. While the principles of humour are painfully difficult to enumerate, some possible explanatory indicators do exist. In a culture replete with outdated forms, risible elements of freshness and surprise, of inappropriateness (like the colliding juxtaposition of ludicrous disparates), of shocking breaches into conventional, orderly, and habitual modes of thinking may combine to cause laughter. Sometimes we just bare out teeth and grin to look ferocious and avoid a fight -- or, alternatively, to snigger in triumph or derision! But precisely why and when the naked ape expresses glee or amusement still remains largely a mystery.

We also know, thanks to Ph. Ménard's exhaustive study, that it is the pleasant and quiet smiles or winks of complicity that dominate the romance genre -- as opposed to the loud exuberant bursts of epic laughter. Romance is the dappled and half-hidden mode, where the bittersweet, the "precious," the *chiaroscuro* thrive. Out of such nuanced half-tones surely the *Eneas* poet could be permitted to turn a few tee-hee's.<sup>24</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Eneas: Roman du XIIe siècle*, ed. J.-J. Salverda de Grave. CFMA (Paris 1925-29) vv. 99-182; English trans. J. Yunck (New York 1973) 57-59.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Cf. B. Silvestris, *Commentum super sex libros Eneidos Virgillii*, ed. W. Reidel (Greifswald 1924) 46; trans. Earl G. Schreiber and Thomas E. Maresca (Lincoln, Nebr. 1979) 46-47, for an interpretation of the Judgment of Paris. Yunck translates "One day, Juno, and Pallas and Venus, the goddess of love, were in conversation. Suddenly, Discord came upon them; she threw a golden apple among the three of them, then she departed. It was inscribed in Greek that she was making a gift of the apple to the most beautiful of the three. There was great strife among them over it: each of them wished to have it, but they wanted someone else to decide to whom the apple belonged."

<sup>3</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 4302-93 Yunck, p. 142: "seven full years had passed by, during which he had not possessed her, or lain in one bed with her, because of the great anger between them."

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Odyssey* VIII.301-67 (episode sung by Demodokos), where Ares and Aphrodite are apprehended; Plato (*Republic* III.390) alludes to the story as well, noting that Haephestus chained up the lovers because they were caught lying together. Cf. H.D.F. Kitto, *The Greeks* (Baltimore and Harmondsworth 1967) 40-41, who stresses smithcraft and its divine exponent, Vulcan, whose elaborate and skillful forging of a gossamer net of iron was nearly invisible to the gods in this story. See further Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore 1979); Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. M. Innes (Baltimore and Harmondsworth 1983) 98-99.

<sup>5</sup> Yunck, p. 148: "'My lords, . . . who are you who have come upon us here? You came armed to our land, and I do not know whether you want peace or war. If you came here to do ill, we do not wish to have you at all: before you could come ashore you would all be wounded or dead.'"

<sup>6</sup> *Beowulf: A Prose Translation*, tr. David Wright (Baltimore and Harmondsworth 1957) 32.

<sup>7</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 8813-60; Yunck, pp. 231-32.

<sup>8</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 8900-01; Yunck, p. 233: Eneas kept "looking back often at the city. Then he would repeat to his men that the tower was extremely beautiful: he said it more because of the maiden than because of the masonry."

<sup>9</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 9230-53; Yunck, pp. 239-40: "'There are such glances in that tower that -- if their messages might be believed -- the Latins will soon receive us in the city: if all the others think as she [i.e., Lavine] thinks, they will surrender themselves very quickly. Sire', they said to their lord, 'look; the tower is most beautiful, but it has a pillar up there which leans a little down toward you. See how level the wall is, how straight the pillar, how well built the work. That window by the pillar is very beautiful, over there on the right, but there is an archer standing there who would be very happy to shoot here. Sire, draw back so that he does not shoot down at you.'" My correspondent and friend, Professor A. Petit, called this scene to my attention.

<sup>10</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 3525-64; quotation from vv. 3552-58; Yunck, p. 126: ". . . the deer was so well behaved that at night it served at dinner, and acted as a candelabrum before the father and the daughter. Its head was marvelously beautiful when a large candle burned on each of the points of its antlers. Thus it served each night." At *Met.*, XII.240, there is a collocation of candlesticks and stag's antlers; cf. T.P. Cross, *Motif-Index of Early Irish Literature* (Bloomington, Ind. 1952): mythical animals (B0); stag with golden antlers (B106.1.1); cow with silver horns (B109); magic deer (B188); stags that allow saints to use their horns for a bookrest (B292.4); helpful stag (B445); cf. (B611); fanciful traits (B700).

<sup>11</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 4445-46; Yunck, p. 144: "the side of a great fish, named cetus." On the scabbard, see Yunck, p. 145.

<sup>12</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 4491-98; Yunck, p. 145: "he tested it on the anvil where he made his forgings, which was very large and very hard. Its base was broad, its bulk large [lit., it was six feet wide, nine feet long]: thirty oxen could not drag it. He struck the anvil and cut it, the blade sliding through the ground."

<sup>13</sup> E. Faral, *Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et des romans courtois* (Paris 1913) 99 and note, speculates on, but offers no solid arguments for, the source of this motif.

<sup>14</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 4640-46; Yunck, p. 147.

<sup>15</sup> *Beowulf*, ed. cit., pp. 44-46; cf. M. Swanton, ed., tr. (Manchester 1978) 70-73, esp. on Grendel's shriek of pain.

<sup>16</sup> This distinction has been developed by my colleague at Wilson, Virginia A. Stojanovič, in re: Homer's *Iliad* (in conversation, and in

the Humanities Core Course -- Ancient and Medieval Cultures, February 1985).

<sup>17</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 3670-85; Yunck, p. 128-29. Galesus "had come there only for his good name and to stop the conflict; but he received there such a blow that he fell immediately to the ground, with never a chance to ask for a doctor to heal his wound. There was no need to bandage him, or apply a salve or ointment. He did not languish at all."

<sup>18</sup> *Aeneid*, X.261-63.

<sup>19</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 5602-23; the Strymonidae simile is deleted by the rationalistic Old French author, who may be drawing in this comment on his experiences at the warfront? Yunck translates, p. 166: "[The Trojans] were most joyful, and cried out. In this they acted very wrongly and were too hasty, for if Eneas and his men could have arrived in peace, to disembark and arm themselves, and could have come secretly upon the army under cover, so that they had their horses at the enemy's back, the enemy would have been trapped between them and totally defeated. But this harmed them greatly, for when the men in the castle cried out, those in the army looked, and saw the ships near the shore, coming to land under oars. If the enemy are not there at the landing, Eneas' men can hurt them indeed."

<sup>20</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 7081-106; Yunck, pp. 194-95: "'Let this arrogance be. Put down the shield and lance and the hauberk, which cuts you too much, and stop exhibiting your prowess. That is not your calling, but rather to spin, to sew, and to clip. It is good to do battle with a maiden like you in a beautiful chamber, beneath a bed-curtain. Have you come here to show yourself off? I do not want to buy you. But nevertheless, I see that you are fair and blond. I have here four Trojans deniers, all of very good fine gold; I will give these to have my pleasure with you a little while. I will not be jealous of it, but will share you with the squires. Indeed, I wish to offer you my deniers; if I lose a little by it I will not complain. You will have a double profit from it: the one in that you will have of my gold, the other in that you will be doing your pleasure; but that will not suffice you at all, unless there are a hundred of us; you may become tired, but you will not be satisfied.'"

<sup>21</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 7123-25; Yunck, p. 195: "'I know better how to strike down a knight than to embrace him or make love to him; I do not know how to do battle on my back.'"

<sup>22</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 9440-48; Yunck, p. 243: "he had to abandon completely the agreement he had discussed, and he began to flee. In his arms he carried his gods: he did not consider them at all so great that they could be of any help to him, or that he could have any protection through them. His faith was more in swift flight than in the gods he carried." Cf. parallels at vv. 6353-70; Yunck, p. 180 (Pallas' mother laments the failure of the gods to protect or save her son).

<sup>23</sup> *Eneas*, vv. 5055-74; Yunck, p. 155: "[They] came to a tent where Rannes lay, a man who was very wise. He knew all the languages of the birds, and knew very well how to divine and cast lots and utter spells; there was no better diviner under the heavens. But that night he had drunk wine until he had muddled all his senses and forgotten his wisdom: he who divined of others knew nothing of himself, that his death was so close to him. But indeed he had said that week, he knew without fail that he would not die in battle. And he did not -- he had spoken the truth -- for he was not there, and did not see it. I do not know whether he might have died there, for before the battle took place Nisus made his head fly: this he could not foresee at all." Cf. Cross (at n. 10): knowledge of animal languages (B216).

<sup>24</sup> See Ph. Ménard, *Le Rire et le sourire dans le roman courtois en France au Moyen Age* (1150-1250) (Geneva 1969) 292. See now also, Joachim Suchomski, "Delectatio" und "Utilitas": Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis mittelalterlicher komischer Literatur (Bern/Munich 1975), rev. by M. Curschmann, *Speculum* 53 (1978) 195-97; Boyce Rensberger, "An uncommon inquiry into the nature of a common phenomenon," *New York Times Magazine*, Aug. 10, 1975, p. 63 (on tickling). This study was the subject of a brief presentation at the 20th International Congress of Medieval Studies, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, May 1985 -- International Courtly Literature Society Session on Lesser-Known Romances, organized by Professors M. Blakeslee and E. Paige Wisotzka, to which scholars I am beholden. On the recent therapeutic / cathartic uses for laughter in psychotherapy, see Dr Donald W. Black, *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, December 7, 1984 (editorial, with a response by Art Buchwald). See also the important study by Victor Raskin, *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor* (Amsterdam 1984).