

CHAPTER FOUR

POETA ET HISTORIOGRAPHUS: THE EXAMPLE OF LUCAN

Among the Latin writers most read and studied in the Middle Ages was Lucan. From Carolingian times onwards he had a secure place in the canon of school authors; the large number of manuscripts of the *Pharsalia*, many of which contain marginal glosses, reflects how widely he was read. His work was much excerpted and quoted and was frequently exploited as a treasure-house of historical *exempla*; its influence even extended beyond the world of Latin letters to the vernacular epic.¹

The *Pharsalia*, or *Bellum civile* as Lucan's epic is more properly called, is a literary account of the civil war between Pompey and Caesar, a theme taken from Roman history, which Lucan has at many points reconstructed with painstaking accuracy, although in the final instance he sees his role as that of poet who need not be bound by historical fact; he calls that man 'Invidus . . . Qui vates ad vera vocat'.² Modern scholars have emphasized how Lucan's poetry transcends — but does not negate — the history of the civil war in order to produce a tragic vision of the loss of Republican liberty, a vision of history that has the status of 'fiction based on reality'.³ The hybrid quality of the *Pharsalia* was also recognized by some of its medieval readers. Conrad of Hirsau, in his *Dialogus super auctores*, an elementary guide to literature for schoolboys written during the first half of the twelfth century, presents Lucan as a 'poeta' who is nevertheless 'verax in historiae veritate'; later in the same century Arnulf of Orleans, a teacher of literature at the famous arts school in that city and author of a commentary on the *Pharsalia*, says of Lucan 'non est iste poeta purus, sed poeta et historiographus'.⁴

Lucan, who manages to be both poet and historian without the one role annulling the other, is a model for the historical writing of Otto of Freising in the twelfth century. In the preface to the *Gesta Frederici*, a chronicle of the deeds of Barbarossa, he justifies digression from the 'plana hystorica dictio' by appealing to the examples of Virgil and Lucan, who mixed 'res gestae' with 'res fabulosae';⁵ his *Chronica* is a universal history written, as he puts it, 'in modum

tragediae'.⁶ Recently, Fritz Peter Knapp has described the entry of oral tradition into the world of the *litterati* that takes place with the writing down of the *Nibelungenlied* in terms of an assimilation to this same model of poeticized, tragic history: the end of the Burgundians, like the destruction of the Roman republic, is lamented as a catastrophe of world-historical dimensions.⁷ Might the example of Lucan, the author of an epic based on, but not reducible to history, not also be relevant to the poetics of another contemporary *litteratus* writing in the vernacular: Gottfried, the author of a tragic, commemorative *senemaere* for which, I argued in the last chapter, history is the precondition?

If I mention Otto, the *Nibelungenlied* and Gottfried together, it is not to suggest that they are a homogeneous group of tragic historians in the mould of Lucan. They have their different starting-points and intentions. Otto's purpose is to place poetry at the service of historical cognition; according to him, Lucan's fictional digressions are intended to disclose 'intima quedam phylosophiae secreta', the deep meaning of history in other words.⁸ The vernacular works do not have the same philosophical pretensions, and one would not want to press any parallel between *Tristan* and the *Nibelungenlied* too far; both may narrate a tragic history, but in Gottfried it is the history of two lovers that is central, not the fate of an entire people. But what unites all these authors is that in one way or another they could be said to be experimenting with history, and that Lucan, who around 1200 is the canonical example for any *litteratus* who attempts this, may be adduced as the authoritative background against which such an experiment is conducted. The aim of this chapter will be to show how Lucan's poeticization of *res gestae*, as his medieval interpreters understood it, can shed light on Gottfried's non-historiographic use of history.

It is unlikely that Gottfried, that '*clericus par excellence*',⁹ would not have read the *Pharsalia* at school, and it is therefore probable that he was familiar with grammar teachers' discussions of Lucan's anomalous standing as *poeta et historiographus*. However, the framework in which I propose to discuss the relationship between Gottfried and Lucan is not that of model and imitation. Direct imitation of Lucan by Gottfried is in any case out of the question; the latter author's task is, after all, to tell the story of Tristan and Isolde, and that leaves him little scope for making material borrowings from a writer whose theme is the civil war in Rome.¹⁰ Nor would it be exactly right to say that the medieval tradition of commentary on Lucan provided Gottfried with a theory of 'fiction based on reality' that he applied in his own work. Theory and application are inappropriate terms, for two reasons. Firstly, sources such as *accessus* and *scholia*, where most of the discussion of the *Pharsalia* is to be found, are not concerned with making pure theoretical statements: these documents are not *artes poeticae*, full of precepts for the would-be writer, but pedagogical aids, offering preliminary guidance to the student of literature, and their poetics is accordingly rudimentary, geared to the pragmatic business of describing the

most striking peculiarities of each of the various curriculum authors.¹¹ Secondly, the sources that describe Lucan as poet and historian neither apply a general theory of a mixed epic genre in order to explain him, nor do they develop such a theory from his example. The designation *poeta et historiographus* lies more in the way of an ad hoc classification aimed at getting schoolboys to grasp the point that, compared to other curriculum authors, Lucan is a difficult case to accommodate within the system of genres; it seems, moreover, that there never was a theory of a mixed epic genre, combining fiction and history, independent of the canonical anomaly that is Lucan.¹² My dominant reason, however, for rejecting the pairs model and imitation, or theory and application, is that a discussion of Gottfried and Lucan needs to include a third term: the vernacular tradition. In Chapter Two we traced the emergence in vernacular literature of an experimental or fictional mode of narrative alongside the archival and historiographic tradition; independently of Latin and Lucan, the vernacular had created its own opportunities for conducting an experiment with history. The vernacular gives Gottfried his material and a set of poetic options; he, working in the vernacular, situates himself within its distinctive horizons. All the poets of the literary excursus — Gottfried's tradition — write and sing in German, not Latin. It is therefore necessary to give up the model of dependency and its associated line of questioning (does Gottfried try to be like Lucan?) in favour of an interactive model that situates Gottfried in dialogue with Latin and the vernacular and asks how certain Latin traditions available to an educated writer are appropriated in a vernacular context.

In defining Lucan as a canonical anomaly the grammarians are obliged to discuss the difference between fiction and history as well as the interrelation of the two terms in a single text. They therefore provide categories that could have helped Gottfried respond to the problems posed by narrating in a tradition where there is a choice between archival and experimental poetics. We must take a fairly close look at the medieval reception of the *Pharsalia* in order to form a clear idea of what these categories and their interrelation are.

PATTERNS IN THE MEDIEVAL RECEPTION OF THE *PHARSALIA*

The confrontation of the terms *poeta* and *historiographus* had been topical in Lucan criticism ever since the first publication of the *Pharsalia* in A.D. 62 or 63. Certain of Lucan's contemporaries evidently considered him unworthy of the title of *poeta* because according to them he had done no more than write a history of the civil war in verse.¹³ These critics found fault with Lucan because he had dispensed with the intervention of the gods in human affairs that characterizes epics such as the *Aeneid* and had failed to dress up the bare facts of history in mythological trappings; these criticisms, which depend on a very narrow conception of what epic entails, 'can be summed up by saying that Lucan's fault

was that he was not Virgil'.¹⁴ This condemnation of Lucan as a mere historian — for condemnation it was — endured down the following centuries with remarkable persistence, presumably kept alive by the teaching of classical authors in the schools; Servius in his commentary on the *Aeneid* declares that 'Lucanus . . . in numero poetarum esse non meruit, quia videtur historiam composuisse, non poema', and from there the verdict makes its way into the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, who reproduces it almost verbatim: 'Lucanus . . . in numero poetarum non ponitur, quia videtur historias composuisse, non poema'.¹⁵ Servius and Isidore enjoyed considerable influence in the Middle Ages, and were it not for that, it is likely that the controversy surrounding Lucan would have been long forgotten;¹⁶ as it is, the authoritative verdicts of these two commentators, whose impersonal tone ('Lucanus videtur, non ponitur') suggests that they are themselves reproducing an item of fossilized school knowledge, were able to provoke a live response among medieval *grammatici* who, when they resolved the old question *an Lucanus sit poeta?* in the manner of Arnulf or Conrad, showed themselves to be more sensitive to Lucan's qualities than either antiquity or the Renaissance.¹⁷

There are medieval sources that regurgitate the traditional verdict: Lucan is a historian, not a poet. The *Commenta Bernensia*, a tenth-century collection of glosses to the *Pharsalia*, state that 'Lucanus dicitur a plerisque non esse in numero poetarum, quia omnino historiam sequitur, quod poeticae arte non convenit';¹⁸ a hundred years or so later, Anselm of Laon, whose *Glosae super Lucanum* are preserved in a twelfth-century manuscript, repeats the judgment, invoking the etymology of the word *poesis* in support: 'Notandum etiam, quod iste non proprie dicitur poeta, cum poesis dicitur fictio'.¹⁹ Since poetry is by definition invention, Lucan, who narrates historical events, cannot be a poet. The tone of distance in 'Lucanus dicitur a pleris' or 'non proprie dicitur' suggests that the commentators were not in wholehearted agreement with these judgments but were simply rendering due respect to the traditional verdict made authoritative by Servius and Isidore; indeed both the *Commenta Bernensia* and Anselm are prepared to consider Lucan as a poet in his actual practice, explaining many aspects of his technique with reference to poetic, not historiographic, norms. Thus the *Commenta Bernensia* excuse as 'poetica licentia' Lucan's substitution of the South wind for the North wind in the line 'Propulit ut classem velis cedentibus Auster' (III, 1), or the idea expressed in 'Dat poenas maioris aquae' (IV, 143) that a river might be punished (Usener, pp. 90, 126), while Anselm immediately qualifies his dictum with an acknowledgment that Lucan does indeed invent on occasion ('in descriptionibus locorum fingit, inde vocatus est poeta'), and in the *Glosae* makes repeated use of phrases such as 'solent poetae' in order to explain diverse aspects of Lucan's practice: the structure of the prologue, the reference to past events as though they belong to the future, the technique of making one book run smoothly into the next, the occasional

inclusion of a fable for the sake of delight.²⁰ This position, according to which Lucan is a historian *de jure* and a poet *de facto*, may be termed 'Isidorean': although Isidore is one of the chief sponsors of the view that Lucan is a historian, his verdict is purely formal, for elsewhere in the *Etymologiae* when he wants to illustrate a point with a quotation from Lucan, he will often introduce it with the words 'de quo poeta' or 'poeta meminit'.²¹

An anonymous *Accessus Lucani* preserved in the twelfth-century Tegernsee collection of introductions to Latin school authors reverses the traditional judgment that Lucan is a historian and not a poet.²² In words that sound as though they are meant as a riposte to Anselm, this commentator declares 'notandum quoque, quod iste proprie dicitur poeta' and, under the rubric 'qualitas operis', attempts to apply Suetonius's definition of epic poetry as 'divinarum rerum et heroicarum humanarumque comprehensio' to Lucan:

metrum istud est heroycum, quia constat ex humanis divinisque personis continens vera cum fictis. . . Ex humanis constat personis, scilicet ex Iulio Cesare et Pompeio; aliquando etiam de divinis in hoc agitur, continet et vera quaedam ad phisicam et quaedam ad historiam cum falsis et fabulosis.²³

Servius, in the *accessus* to his *Aeneid* commentary, describes what he calls the 'qualitas carminis' of Virgil's epic like this:

metrum heroicum et actus mixtus, ubi et poeta loquitur et alios inducit loquentes. est autem heroicum quod constat ex divinis humanisque personis, continens vera cum fictis. (*In Vergilii carmina*, I, 4)

It is clear that the Tegernsee *accessus* has copied Servius, but not as clumsily as Franz Quadlbauer believes when he remarks: 'Man sieht, wie gläubig man die Alten ausschreibt! Die personae divinae sind brav für Lucan übernommen, obwohl er in den *Pharsalia* auf den Götterapparat verzichtet'.²⁴ Although Lucan did indeed do without the active involvement of the gods in human affairs and was therefore considered by some of his contemporaries not to be a poet, the *Pharsalia* still contains enough in the way of mythological allusion, magic, dreams and divination to satisfy medieval expectations of poetic figment.²⁵ Moreover, the author of the Tegernsee *accessus* has tried to adapt the Servian formula to the peculiarities of the *Pharsalia*, isolating Lucan's treatment of Roman history and 'phisica', natural history, as constitutive of the true, that is non-poetic, element in the work.²⁶ In its overall structure, the *Accessus Lucani* is not modelled on Servius, nor indeed are the other *accessus* in the Tegernsee collection, with one exception.²⁷ All this suggests not blind copying, but deliberate selection in pursuit of a polemical end, quoting Servius against Servius in order to reclassify Lucan as a poet by — however crudely — 'Virgilianizing' him.

This reversal of the traditional verdict remains within and indeed affirms the inherited logic of critical debate on Lucan ('if Lucan is not a poet, then he is a

historian' or the converse); when, however, the Tegernsee *accessus* points out that the *Pharsalia* contains a mixture of historical and natural historical truth on the one hand and poetic figment, 'falsa et fabulosa', on the other, it has in effect abandoned the traditional way of thinking about Lucan in terms of strict alternatives and made of him a *poeta et historiographus*, even though this is not expressed on the level of nomenclature. Likewise, Conrad of Hirsau calls Lucan a poet, yet singles out for praise not only eminently poetic attributes such as his sublime style and the beauty of his diction, but also his truthfulness as a historian.²⁸ For Conrad, the term *poeta* can accommodate all this; towards the beginning of the *Dialogus*, where he is explaining basic literary critical vocabulary to his pupil, he declares 'Porro poeta fitor vel formator dicitur, eo quod pro veris falsa dicat vel falsis interdum vera commisceat'; whether the name of poet is intended to have the same scope in the *Accessus Lucani* is a moot point.²⁹

More than any of the other commentators we have been looking at, Arnulf of Orleans recognizes and reflects on the fact that the *Pharsalia* is an anomaly when compared to the works of other school authors, and that its generic classification presents certain difficulties. In the *accessus* to his Lucan commentary, he sets up a distinction between pure poets on the one hand and the complex case of Lucan on the other:

Sicut Iuvenalis purus est satiricus, Terencius purus comediis, Horacius in odis purus lyricus, non est iste poeta purus, sed poeta et historiographus. Nam historiam suam prosequitur et nichil fingit, unde poeta non simpliciter dicitur, sed poeta et historiographus. Nam si aliquid fictitii inducit, non ex sua parte sed ex aliorum hoc inducit, apponit vel ut perhibent, vel ut dicunt, vel ut memorant. (*Glosule*, p. 4)

It is to Arnulf that we owe the name for Lucan's anomalous complexity or impurity: 'poeta et historiographus'. Each of these roles is correlated with fiction: where invention is absent ('nichil fingit'), we have Lucan the historian, and where it is present ('aliquid fictitii inducit' — we shall return shortly to discuss the meaning of this), the poet.

In the commentary proper Arnulf refers several times to Lucan's allusive technique, his avoidance of positive statement, as a specifically poetic trait, as when, for instance, he gives three possible explanations of the movement of the tides 'more philosophi, sed nullam solvit aut affirmat more poete', or when he touches on the myth of Phaethon's sisters, supposedly metamorphosed into the poplars growing along the banks of the River Po ('non affirmat verum esse ut historiographus sed tangit ut poeta'), or again when he describes how Taurus had to extend his hoof so that Ethiopia would be covered by a sign of the Zodiac, so remote is that country ('poetice dictum est, ne opponatur').³⁰ This principle of poetic agnosticism in matters usually demanding scientific rigour is given its explicit formulation by a commentator of Lucan in the eleventh century: 'proprium est poetarum, ut non unam sectam solummodo, sed diversorum opiniones suo carmini inserant'.³¹

FICTION AND THE SUPERNATURAL: THE 'POETA-VATES' COMPLEX

The complexity of Lucan's poetics has left its mark on all the medieval commentaries we have examined, including the ones that operate with simple, mutually exclusive definitions: even the most traditionalist group, represented by the *Commenta Bernensia* and Anselm of Laon, acknowledges Lucan's poetic qualities de facto. Governing all the permutations of the terms *poeta* and *historiographus* is the notion of *factio*: its absence is the sign of the historian, its presence indicates the poet. The historians themselves share this way of drawing distinctions; Theoderic of Fleury comments that 'Lucanus novimus ob hoc poetae nomen non promeruisse quod absque fictione, quae convenit poetis, veritatem prosecutus est Punicae historiae'; the anonymous author of a twelfth-century adaptation into Latin hexameters of Dares Phrygius's *Historia de excidio Troiae* complains that 'historiam Troye figmenta poetica turbant', but reassures his readers: 'Non ego sum, quoniam nil fingo, poeta vocandus'.³² The following sections are devoted to the concept of *factio*, on which the distinction between poet and historian turns.

The *Accessus Lucani* isolates pagan mythology and superstition as the specifically fictional component of the mixture of 'vera cum fictis' that makes up the *Pharsalia*. Arnulf appears to mean the same thing when in his *accessus* he says that Lucan is a poet to the extent that he introduces an element of fiction ('aliquid fictitii') into his otherwise historical narrative, an element that, moreover, he has not invented himself ('non ex sua parte') but has taken from others ('ex aliorum parte'). It is worth emphasizing this, because it means that the poet does not have to be personally responsible for his inventions in order for them to count as such: the quality of the writing, rather than the fact that it cannot be attributed to any source, defines it as fictional. According to Arnulf, Lucan indicates his indebtedness to others in such passages with the phrases 'ut perhibent', 'ut dicunt', 'ut memorant'. Such marked passages might be, for instance, Lucan's mention of an augur who is supposed to have foretold the significance of the battle at Pharsalia, 'Euganeo, si vera fides memorantibus, augur/Colle sedens' (vii, 192–93), or the episode of the arrival of Cato and his men at the temple of Jupiter Ammon, reputed by some to be an oracular seat, which Cato however, true to his stoic principles, declines to consult:

Ventum erat ad templum, Libycis quod gentibus unum
 Inculti Garamantes habent. Stat sortiger illic
 Iuppiter, ut memorant. (ix, 511–13)

Both of these examples have prophecy as their theme, and if it is these and similar passages that Arnulf has in mind when he refers to the element of invention in Lucan's work, then what he calls 'aliquid fictitii' is more or less the same thing as what the *Accessus Lucani* terms 'falsa et fabulosa'.³³

The identification of fiction with themes of pagan mythology and divination is consistent with the idea of the poet as divinely inspired visionary, an idea that goes back as far as Plato.³⁴ An important source for this doctrine in the Middle Ages is, once again, Isidore. According to him, poetry began as ceremonial speech in honour of the gods, and even after its scope had widened considerably, to embrace lyric, tragedy, comedy and satire, this origin in cult and ritual was not altogether obscured; along with all the other genres of poetry listed by Isidore, there remained one that was concerned with the gods and whose authors are called 'theologici'.³⁵ The intimacy between poet and divinity is also expressed by another name, that of *vates*: not only does the poet sing of the gods, he is a prophet inspired by them. Isidore explains the etymology of this appellation, common in Latin:

proinde poetae Latine vates olim, scripta eorum vaticinia dicebantur, quod vi quadam et quasi vesania in scribendo commoverentur . . . Etiam per furorem divini eodem erant nomine, quia et ipsi quoque pleraque versibus efferebant. (*Etymologiae*, viii.7.3)

Given this primeval connexion between poetry and religion, it is understandable that medieval teachers of literature should single out the mythological references in Lucan as evidence of his poetic quality. The notion of the poet's divine inspiration is invoked by both Anselm and Arnulf in their glosses on the opening lines of the *Pharsalia* 'Bella per Emathios plus quam civilia campos, / Iusque datum sceleri canimus'. Anselm explains that Lucan uses the plural form of the verb 'quia poetae non dicuntur loqui suo spiritu sed divino' or, in the words of Arnulf, 'quia poete non ore proprio tantum loquuntur sed de spiritus revelacione'.³⁶

Mythology, magic, dreams, and divination, all these manifestations of superstition and the supernatural, which make up what I call the *poeta-vates* complex and go a long way in Lucan towards compensating for the active intervention of the gods missed by certain of his contemporaries, are by no means redundant ornament in the *Pharsalia*. On the contrary, they form the interpretative mantle of history, infusing meaning and structure into the fabric of events (Morford, pp. 59–60, 70). To give just one example, the words supposedly uttered by the augur before the battle at Pharsalia 'Venit summa dies, geritur res maxima' (vii, 195) impart hierarchy and therefore sense to the linear narration of successive occurrences, leaving no doubt that this battle is the decisive climax about which the destiny of Rome turns; on that day, Lucan laments, a whole world died, and liberty was overthrown along with Pompey (vii, 617, 638–46; see Marti, 'Tragic History', p. 202). Set against this portrayal of catastrophe, the question of whether there really was an augur present to speak these prophetic words becomes of secondary importance.

In *Tristan* too there is a comparable element of what might be described in the language of the *Accessus Lucani* as 'divinae personae', 'ficta', 'falsa et fabulosa', or

what Arnulf would consider to be the introduction of a fictional component into the account of historical events. In the literary excursus, Gottfried refers to the 'gotinne Minne' who dwells on 'Zytheron' (4808–10); Mount Cithaeron is one of the traditional seats of the Muses, who are also mentioned by Gottfried in this passage along with an entire host of mythological figures: Apollo on Mount Helicon (4865, 4871), the Sirens (4872), Orpheus (4790), Vulcan (4932), Cassandra (4950), and the fountain of Pegasus (4731), the last named being an allusion to the streams Aganippe and Hippocrene, which according to Greek mythology sprang forth from under Pegasus's hoof on Mount Helicon and conferred poetic inspiration on whoever drank their waters. The goddess Minne is mentioned again as the tutelary deity of the cave of lovers (16722–23; 17222–23), and the Sirens make another appearance when Gottfried likens the effect of Isolde's music-making to them (8087–89, 8108–11). In addition to these figures drawn from classical mythology, there are the representatives of an indigenous tradition: the fairies who endowed the poet Bliigger von Steinach with his genius (4700–04) and whose land is called Avalon (15808), also the home of the magical dog Petitcreiu, who was presented by a goddess to Duke Gilan (15806–10).

From a modern scholarly point of view, Gottfried's allusions to classical mythology are not strictly accurate; he confuses Mount Cithaeron with Cythera in Crete, in classical times one of the principal centres of the cult of Aphrodite, and equates Muses with Sirens ('Apolle und die Camenen,/der oren niun Sirenen'; 4871–72). It is also striking how fluid the boundary is between classical and indigenous, pagan and Christian elements. The Muses are not only conflated with the Sirens, but with the angelic choirs as well (Gottfried hopes that his prayer for inspiration will be heard in the 'himelkoeren' (4906) of Mount Helicon), and the distinction between goddess and fairy is blurred: it is not clear whether the 'gottinne' (15809) who gave Petitcreiu to Gilan is also one of the fairies from Avalon; Cassandra's skill and wisdom are said to be 'von den goten gefeinet' (4960). The goddess Minne, related to Venus or Aphrodite through the reference to Cithaeron-Cythera, is nevertheless not completely identified with the classical divinity; in the guise of 'viuraerinne' (930), 'gewaltaerinne' (961), 'lagaerin' (11711), 'verwaerinne' (11908) ('verwerraerinne' in MSS FWBNES), 'süenaerinne' (17535), she appears as the personified representation of aspects of passion, and in the episode of the lovers' cave she presides over a figurative landscape of amorous vices and virtues.³⁷

It is not easy to determine how much of this syncretistic pantheon is Gottfried's own addition to what he already found in Thomas, what other sources he might have drawn on, or to what extent he is personally responsible for the mixture of various mythological traditions.³⁸ But what interests us more is the fabulous, and therefore fictitious, quality of these phenomena, irrespective of whether Gottfried has introduced them 'ex sua parte', as Arnulf would say, or

'ex parte aliorum'. (Analogous to Lucan's signals of the type 'ut memorant' are Gottfried's source references in 'der geist ze himele, als ichz las, / von den goten gefeinet was' (4959–60) or 'ein hundelin . . . daz was gefeinet, horte ich sagen' (15805–06).) Besides these numinous creatures, the story also contains a considerable element of magic and divination, which Gottfried, who otherwise professes to have no time for the conjuring tricks employed by the 'vindaere wilder maere' (4665), is obliged by tradition to include; had he omitted this ingredient, the story would have been substantially different. In Gottfried's version the element of magic gravitates around the figure of the elder Isolde. She is portrayed as a sort of white witch whose powers of clairvoyance ('ir tougenliche liste') reveal to her in a dream that it was Tristan, and not the cowardly steward, that killed the dragon (9298–305), and whose knowledge of plants and their properties enables her to heal otherwise incurable wounds, such as the one inflicted by Morold's poisoned sword (6942–53), and, last not least, to prepare the love-potion (11432–44).³⁹

The potion is the medium connecting the historical 'humanae personae' Tristan and Isolde with the 'divina persona' Minne:

Nu daz diu maget unde der man,
Isot unde Tristan,
den tranc getrunken beide, sa
waz ouch der werlde unmuoze da,
Minne, aller herzen lagaerin (11707–11).

Both of these supernatural powers will shape the lovers' destiny, Minne as tutelary goddess of Tristan, his 'erbevogetin' (11765), who had already brought his parents Riwalin and Blanscheflur under her dominion, and the love-potion as

diu waernde swaere,
diu endelose herzenot,
von der si beide lagen tot. (11674–76)

With these prophetic words the entire narrative to follow is placed under the sign of tragedy. In the preceding chapter we saw how, in the prologue, Gottfried implies that the passion of the lovers is historical fact (see above, pp. 54–57). Whether he also regarded the love-potion in the same way or not, by making it into an augury of the lovers' death he takes it into the realm of *res fictae* or *fabulosae*, opening up perspectives of meaning that the *res factae* do not possess in themselves, just as Lucan's flights of invention mould the multifarious acts of war into a tragic history. Of Gottfried it might equally well be said as it has been remarked of Lucan that 'the events which in real life happen at random and move without arrangement were shaped by him, and he stamped upon them the order and the patterns of poetry' (Marti, 'Tragic History', p. 203).

The potion is a hybrid: on the one hand a 'tranc von minnen', a real drug with specific pharmaceutical indications (11435–42), on the other, as 'waernde

swaere' and 'endelose herzenot/von der si beide lagen tot', an abstract prefiguration of consuming, fatal passion. This double aspect of the potion, material and intellectual, combines two stages in the development of the motif in the Tristan legend: a primitive stage, such as we find in Beroul and Eilhart, where the material agency of the potion as magical, love-inducing drug is to the fore; then, beginning with Thomas's modernization of the old story, a superstratum of figurative meanings, which absorb the motif into an increasingly cerebral, casuistic treatment of the theme of love.⁴⁰ Gottfried's intellectualization of the potion does not, however, negate its efficacy as the material cause of passion (Tristan and Isolde still fall in love because they drink it), nor is the philtre reduced to a symbol, as was maintained by Emil Nickel: 'Mehr und mehr wird aus dem Trank, der Liebe im Wortsinn wirkte, ein Trank, der nurmehr symbolisch Liebe bedeutet'.⁴¹ The potion, in Gottfried's figurative interpretation of it, is less a symbol of love than a portent of suffering and death; the glosses 'waernde swaere' and 'endelose herzenot' do not so much reveal an intrinsic meaning as foretell what the consequences of drinking the philtre will be. They transform a fixed and material fact — the 'tranc von minnen' causes love — into a meaning that is open and experimental. The prediction of 'waernde swaere' and 'endelose herzenot' is not a pharmaceutical indication, but an interpretation of the potion's effect which can only be borne out by the narrative, which therefore has to be experienced, gone through, by the reader, before the prophetic potential of these words is fulfilled. The glossing of the potion is not a disclosure of timeless symbolic essence, but an experiment with the signifying possibilities of a magical object whose meaning is a function of aesthetic experience and the unfolding of the narrative in time.

FICTION AND DICTION: THE POET AS COLOURIST

Anselm of Laon, who considers that Lucan is not a poet in the proper sense of the word, because he does not invent, nevertheless acknowledges the existence of a fictional element in the *Pharsalia*, which would entitle its author to the name of poet after all. Anselm focuses on a different aspect of invention from Arnulf and the Tegernsee *accessus*: 'iste non proprie dicitur poeta, cum poesis dicitur fictio, sed tamen in topographiis, i. in descriptionibus locorum fingit, inde vocatus est poeta; nam in describendo mutat ipsos portus' (Weber, p. 3). *Topographia* or *descriptio loci* is a recognized rhetorical *figura sententiae*, one that is especially useful as a technique of amplification. Strictly speaking, this figure pertains only to the description of real places, and should be distinguished from *topothesia*, the description of fictitious places, but the term *topographia* is often used loosely to cover both definitions, as when Matthew of Vendôme illustrates the device with a description of an invented *locus amoenus*, and indeed *topothesia* can stand for any inaccuracy or licence in matters of geography, as it does when Servius points out

that Virgil's description of Carthage in Africa actually corresponds to the real place of the same name in Spain.⁴² An example of Lucan's licence in these matters is his confusion of Argos and Mycenae, the real home of Thyestes, in 'Astra Thyestae/Intulit et subitis damnavit noctibus Argos' (vii, 451–52), which error moves one eleventh-century scholiast to remark 'Mycenas dicere debuit; sed sciendum est mutavisse illum nomen ex vicino sicut frequentissime apud poetas invenimus'.⁴³

Gottfried can also take liberties with geography; in the preceding section we noted his confusion, purposeful or otherwise, of Cithaeron and Cythera, but he also locates Arundel on the continent (18688), while the hero's fatherland, which must have been called something like 'Ermenie' in Thomas, appears in his version as 'Parmenie' (see above, pp. 51–52). The most extended topographical passage in the work is the description of the lovers' cave and the ideal landscape round about it.⁴⁴ Here, the distinction between *topographia* and *topothesia* becomes blurred, for the cave, it turns out, is both real and imaginary.

The description of the cave opens with the reference to Corineus (see above, p. 48), which establishes the site's antiquity and makes it clear that we are dealing with a real place located in Cornwall; appropriately the *topographia* continues with an enumeration of the cave's physical properties: it is round, wide, high, straight and smooth, its floor is of green marble, in its middle stands a crystal bed, dedicated to the goddess Minne, there are windows, and a door of bronze (16703–29). Next, Gottfried describes the ideal landscape that surrounds the site and narrates the arrival of the lovers and the perfect life they lead there; having done this, he returns to the cave, but this time to disclose its meaning:

Nun sol iuch niht verdriezen,
irn lat iu daz entsliezen,
durch welher slahte meine
diu fossiure in dem steine
betihtet waere, als si was. (16923–27)

There follows a figurative exegesis, in which each of the physical characteristics of the cave previously listed in Gottfried's *topographia* is said by him to signify some quality or virtue that pertains to love: thus the roundness of the cave stands for love's simplicity, its breadth for love's power, its whiteness and smoothness for the purity of love, and so on (16928–17099). This unlocking of the abstract and universal significance contained in a real, historically and geographically specific place has the status of allegory, in the definition given by Bernard Silvestris ('oratio sub historica narratione verum et ab exteriori diversum involvens intellectum').⁴⁵ Gottfried ends his exposition of the cave's figurative meaning with the words 'diz weiz ich wol, wan ich was da' (17100). This assertion is followed by an autobiographical account of Gottfried's own journey to the cave, in which he recounts how he found and penetrated love's sanctum, contemplated its various features, danced on its marble floor (which stands for

steadfastness) and even made his way right up to the bed, on which, however, he never lay (17101–35). Thanks to the preceding allegory, Gottfried is able to translate personal information into figurative code, and the reader can decode this cipher again, to obtain a declaration of inexperience on the part of the author who, although he professes to know about love and its component qualities, has never tasted it in its absolute purity and honesty, the virtues represented by the crystal bed (16983–84). What is startling about this operation of figurative encoding and decoding is that it reverses the normal direction of allegory from the particular to the universal, for in this instance it cannot really be said that the circumstances of a single individual are elevated to a level of transcendent significance through their projection onto the timeless canvas of allegory; rather allegory is being used as a device for making a confession about personal fortunes in love, so that the reader who follows the figurative process through to the end is led away from love as a constellation of abstract ideas to statements concerning the knowledge and experience of an individual lover.

Equally startling is the manner in which Gottfried concludes his autobiographical digression:

ich han diu fossiure erkant
 seit minen einlif jaren ie
 und enkam ze Curnewale nie. (17136–38)

With this statement, an oscillation is introduced between real and imaginary geography, for if Gottfried can claim to have visited the cave without ever setting foot in Cornwall, this must mean that the cave, which up till now had been assumed to exist in reality, is also a place of the poet's imagination. *Topographia* becomes *topothesia*. Moreover, this oscillation renders ambivalent Gottfried's allegory, since an exegesis based on what now turns out to be a fictitious *descriptio loci* must be, following the definition of Bernard Silvestris, an integument (see above, p. 35). But more important in my view than the question of whether Gottfried's figurative interpretation of the cave is allegory or integument is the fact that the entire passage should end by focusing not on the significance unlocked from the stones and minerals out of which the cave is constructed, but on the way in which one particular subject experiences that place and its meaning. The final emphasis is not on the object of 'erkennen', but on the duration of the process ('seit minen einlif jaren ie') and its imaginary nature ('und enkam zu Curnewale nie').

The isolation by Anselm of the one figure of *topographia* as proof of Lucan's inventiveness is a symptom of an underlying feeling that all figurative language is a form of fiction and therefore appropriate to poetry. The same glossator who noted Lucan's poetic substitution of 'Argos' for 'Mycenae' says of his use of the figure *prosopopoeia* in 'Aequora senserunt motus' (VIII, 197) that 'per poeticam phantasiam dat sensum inanimatae rei'.⁴⁶ Conrad of Hirsau, for whom Lucan is

scrupulously truthful in matters of history, nevertheless celebrates him as a poet, whose hallmarks are above all else his high style and polished diction, his 'grandiloquus modus in stilo' and his 'pulcra verborum et sententiarum ordinatio'.⁴⁷ Quadlbauer points out that this last phrase echoes the grammarians' concept of correct sentence structure, as in Priscian's definition 'Oratio est ordinatio dictionum congrua sententiam perfectam demonstrans', but Conrad's emphasis on 'pulcra ordinatio' (rather than 'congrua ordinatio') in addition suggests that what he admires in Lucan's language is its rhetorical accomplishment, its display of ornament and colour.⁴⁸ Indeed the *Commenta Bernensia*, and the commentaries of Anselm and Arnulf all devote considerable effort to explaining Lucan's use of figures and tropes.⁴⁹

The name given by rhetoricians to the embellishments of style, in oratory as in poetry, is *color*. In the *artes poeticae* of the Middle Ages, the term is used extensively to denote both ornament in general and tropes and figures of thought and diction in particular.⁵⁰ Among medieval historians, there is a corresponding tendency to eschew the *colores rhetorici*, the cultivation of which, it is feared, might get in the way of the immeasurably more important task of telling the truth and even lead the author to become entangled in falsehood; it is not uncommon for the prolegomena to historiographic writings to contain an apology for the author's unpolished language, the *rusticitas* of his diction.⁵¹ Lupus of Ferrières (c. 805–62), for instance, asks his readers to be so kind as to overlook any roughness of language that may result from his omission to latinize vernacular names of places and persons:

Id autem a periti benevolentia lectoris optinuerim ut, sicubi Latini sermonis lenitas hominum locorumve nominibus Germanicae linguae vernaculis asperatur modice ferat ac meminerit non carmen me scribere ubi poetica licentia nonnumquam mutilantur atque ad sonoritatem Romani diriguntur eloquii vel penitus immutantur, sed historiam que se obscurari colorum obliquitatibus rennuit.⁵²

The concept of 'colorum obliquitates', which in Lupus's view are all very well in poetry but not in history, where they would obscure the truth, is derived ultimately from the *Divinae Institutiones* of Lactantius, a work dated to the early years of the fourth century. Lactantius maintains that it is wrong to consider the pagan myths as outright falsehood, because such a view is insensitive to the specific mode of operation of poetry. According to him, the poets do not invent, but encode real events in figurative language instead, cloaking them in a disguise which the trained reader nevertheless knows how to penetrate. The gods of myth and legend were really men, whom the poets wished to adorn, and the apparently fantastic events connected with them are in fact real occurrences, translated into the language of trope and figure. By way of illustration, Lactantius explains that the eagle that supposedly raped Ganymede is 'poeticus color', 'aquila' standing metonymically for a legion of soldiers, whose ensign is

an eagle, or perhaps for a ship with an eagle as figurehead.⁵³ He sums up the nature of myth:

Non ergo ipsas res finxerunt poetae; quod si facerent, essent vanissimi: sed rebus gestis addiderunt quemdam colorem. Non enim obtrectantes illa dicebant, sed ornare cupientes. Hinc homines decipiuntur: maxime quod, dum haec omnia ficta esse arbitrantur a poetis, colunt quod ignorant. Nesciunt enim, qui sit poeticae licentiae modus; quousque progredi fingendo liceat: cum officium poetae sit in eo, ut ea, quae gesta sunt vere, in alias species obliquis figurationibus cum decore aliquo conversa traducat . . . Nihil igitur a poetis in totum fictum est: aliquid fortasse traductum, et obliqua figuratione obscuratum, quo veritas involuta tegetur. (cols 171–72)

For Lactantius, the pagan myths both are and are not fiction: with regard to their origins in real events, they are not invented; but they are fictitious insofar as the poets employ figurative diction in order to add colour to these events, embellishing and thereby obscuring them beyond recognition, so that it becomes the task of the discerning reader to straighten out the oblique relationship between language and reality and to restore the truth in its pristine transparency. This exclusive identification of fiction with ornamental language is clear from the very beginning of Lactantius's discussion of myths and their truth-value:

At enim poetae ista finxerunt. Errat quisquis hoc putat. Illi enim de hominibus loquebantur; sed ut eos ornarent, quorum memoriam laudibus celebrabant, deos esse dixerunt. Itaque illa potius ficta sunt, quae tamquam de diis, non illa quae tamquam de hominibus locuti sunt. (cols 169–70)

The equation of fiction with diction, of the poet's office with the complete transformation of reality into figurative cipher, is taken on board by Isidore, who quotes the Lactantian definition of poetic invention as the reason why Lucan is not to be numbered among the poets:

Officium autem poetae in eo est ut ea, quae vere gesta sunt, in alias species obliquis figurationibus cum decore aliquo conversa transducant. Unde et Lucanus . . . (*Etymologiae*, viii.7.10)

Servius too, who is Isidore's authority for the verdict on Lucan, follows this line of reasoning. The occasion for his famous pronouncement concerning that poet is a gloss to the words of Aeneas about how Venus has been his guide: 'bis denis Phrygium conscendi navibus aequor, / matre dea monstrante viam, data fata secutus' (I, 381–82). Servius demonstrates that what Virgil really meant was that his hero was shown the way by the morning star, the 'stella Veneris', but that he could not state this directly because the law of poetry demands that he should not touch on matters of historical fact except 'per transitum', by way of a change; a series of further relevant examples from the *Aeneid* is then given, leaving the reader in no doubt that he must decode 'mater dea' as a reference to the morning star. At the end of his brief exposition of how Virgil converts reality into figurative codes, Servius adds that Lucan cannot be a poet because he

does not treat the raw material provided by history in this transformative manner.⁵⁴

Just as Lucan's handling of supernatural machinery had led to his being denied the title of poet in his own day, but accorded it in the Middle Ages, so too his use of the colours of rhetoric was regarded by some as proof that he was a historian, while for others it was an indicator of his poetical quality. That the same criterion can be invoked in support of both positions is attributable to a change, or differences, in the perceived function of poetic language. In the Lactantian view, which is the one adopted by Servius and by Isidore, the poet is expected to bring about a complete transformation of reality by means of 'obliquae figurationes' and 'decor'; it follows that Lucan, whose historical references are largely intact and transparent, can never be considered a poet, even if he does intersperse rhetorical colour among the facts of history, as Isidore himself acknowledges.⁵⁵ The example of Lupus of Ferrières, however, reveals that there was another way of thinking about poetic language and its function, which was perhaps the result of a reinterpretation of Lactantius. Explaining why he is not going to alter the vernacular form of proper names in order to accommodate them to the sounds of Latin, he asks his readers to bear in mind that it would not befit him, a historian, to employ any of the 'colorum obliquitates' in which the poets delight. In this context, the notion of 'colorum obliquitates' can hardly have the meaning it would have possessed in Lactantius or Isidore, since the phonetic modification of words to suit a foreign language hardly amounts to a linguistic conversion of reality so complete that it would utterly obscure the truth. For Lupus the scope of poetic diction lies not in the wholesale transformation of reality, but in its decoration; it involves, in the words of Peter von Moos 'nicht ein imaginäres Abweichen von der Geschichtswirklichkeit . . . sondern ein "écart" von der gewöhnlichen Sprache' (pp. 117–18). The slightest alteration of a placename, even if it did not make for obscurity, would presumably be for Lupus an instance of *topothesia*. According to this view, in which figurative language functions simply as an adornment, without necessarily disguising the facts beyond recognition, the mere presence of figures and tropes in an otherwise historical narrative such as the *Pharsalia* would be enough to qualify its author as a poet.

Gottfried's diction is so richly embellished with *colores rhetorici* that Stanislaw Sawicki remarks: 'Es wäre wohl kaum der Mühe wert, alle die "colores verborum et sententiarum" (schemata lexeos et dianoeas), welche den sog. leichten Schmuck bilden, zu besprechen, um zu beweisen, daß Gottfried fast alle gekannt und sich ihrer bedient hat'.⁵⁶ Gottfried's rhetorical expertise is by no means confined to the *ornatus facilis* and its characteristic figures, as the impressive array of examples presented by Sawicki shows; he knows how to use *figurae sententiarum*, such as *descriptio*, *expolitio*, or *similitudo*, for the purpose of amplification, and his resources of eloquence include even the tropes, the hallmark of

so-called difficult ornament.⁵⁷ What is more, his knowledge in these matters extends to the use of the appropriate technical vocabulary, and in a way suggesting that, for him, figurative language is a definitive feature of poetic invention. In praise of Hartmann von Aue he says:

ahi, wie der diu maere
 beid uzen und innen
 mit worten und mit sinnen
 durchverwet und durchzieret!
 wie er mit rede figieret
 der aventiure meine! (4622–27)

The parallel construction of these two exclamatory sentences implies that *durchverwen* and *durchzieren*, to which correspond Latin *colorare* and *ornare*, are the same thing as *figieren*, which verb is actually derived from *figere*, confused with *figere*.⁵⁸ Gottfried thus connects diction and fiction. The meaning of the reference to the outward and inward colouring of speech is more controversial. The form of words bears a marked resemblance to the introductory advice given by Geoffrey of Vinsauf, whose *Poetria nova* was probably written around 1200, on the proper way to use the ornaments of style: ‘Sit brevis aut longa, se semper sermo coloret/ Intus et exterius’.⁵⁹ According to Sawicki (p. 57), both Geoffrey and Gottfried mean the technical and highly specific distinction between *figurae sententiarum* (inward ornament) and *figurae verborum* (external colour). This interpretation of these lines from the *Poetria nova* has been disputed by Christoph Huber, who argues that in what are intended as words of preliminary guidance, Geoffrey is not as yet concerned with making distinctions on the level of detail, and that his recommendation is to be taken in a more general way, as meaning that a poet should attend not only to the outward form of language, the *verba*, but also to its inward content, the *res* or *sententiae*, for only when the two are in harmony does effective communication become possible. This is therefore, according to Huber, the underlying sense of Gottfried’s notion of ‘uzen unde innen durchverwen’.⁶⁰ Convincing as this is as a reading of Geoffrey, it seems to me that Gottfried, who differs from Geoffrey in that he speaks of colouring and adorning ‘mit worten und mit sinnen’, does give the formula a more narrowly technical interpretation as well and does also intend the distinction between the two types of rhetorical figure or *color*. Since the *figurae verborum* and the *figurae sententiarum* respectively influence the form and the content of language, the technical distinction between the two is always implicit in any statement concerning the form and content of poetic diction in general; in this way the narrow interpretation of the formula ‘intus et exterius colorare’ proceeds from the broad one without contradicting it.⁶¹

Hartmann von Aue, Bligger von Steinach, Heinrich von Veldeke, the three narrative poets to whom Gottfried refers by name in the literary excursus, are together known as ‘verwaere’ (4691), dyers or colourists, in marked contrast to

the minnesingers or 'nahtegalen' (4751), whom Gottfried praises for their musical qualities and not for the rhetorical or poetic excellence of their diction. In the case of Bliigger and Heinrich, Gottfried puts their talent for poetry down to supernatural inspiration: Bliigger owes his genius to the fairies, while Heinrich has drunk from the spring of Pegasus (4699–704; 4730–32). The two aspects of fiction we have been examining, the supernatural and the use of poetic diction, come together in these divinely inspired writers, who are both *vates* and *coloratores*. The supernatural manifests itself as poetic diction even more directly in the case of the 'gotinne Minne'. This 'divina persona', described by Gottfried as a 'verwaerinne' (11908), sets about her work in the same way as Hartmann, colouring both without and within. As soon as Tristan and Isolde drink the love potion, Minne takes possession of their hearts (11707–15), but she does not stop at that:

Minne die verwaerinne
 dien duhtes niht da mite genuoc,
 daz mans in edelen herzen truoc
 verholne unde tougen,
 sin wolte under ougen
 ouch offenbaeren ir gewalt. (11908–13)

For the dyer Minne, the bodies of the lovers are as language for the poet, to be coloured inside and outside, and in such a way as to bring the two sides into accord. Thus the changing complexion of Tristan and Isolde accurately reflects the turmoil going on inside them:

so wart ir lich geliche var
 dem herzen unde dem sinne . . .
 ir varwe schein unlange in ein:
 si wechselten genote
 bleich wider rote;
 si wurden rot unde bleich,
 als ez diu Minne in understreich. (11906–20)

Tristan and Isolde, the supposedly historical personages who lived and died hundreds of years ago (222, 12323–24), are here subjected to the transformations of fiction.

The interpenetration of rhetoric and the supernatural occurs again in Gottfried's account of Tristan's baptism, where figurative language is allied to prophecy. Immediately before the rite is to be performed, Rual and Floraete consult each other in private about what they are to call their foster-child. Casting his mind back over the recent past, Rual chooses the name Tristan because, he explains to his wife, it is appropriate to the sorrowful circumstances that have attended the orphan's life ever since its parents were first united in love (1974–99). Then Gottfried takes over. He gives the derivation of 'Tristan' from 'triste' and emphasizes again how fitting a name it is, adding to Rual's motivation for it a new, prophetic dimension: not only is the name Tristan an

expressive summation of its bearer's career up to the time of his baptism, it also betokens his entire future, which is going to be overshadowed by heartfelt grief and will end tragically in the most bitter of deaths (1999–2022). The explanation of the name by Gottfried summarizes the story so far, foretells future events, and interprets everything in terms of dominant themes in the work, love and sorrow, life and death. For both Rual and Gottfried the name is suited to the person denominated, but whereas Rual is guided in his choice of an appropriate name for the child by a retrospective examination of Tristan's 'dinc', the circumstances of his life up till the moment of his baptism (1986, 1988, 1990), Gottfried directs his gaze to the future, and proceeds from the name to the course of Tristan's life to come. Rual uses signs historically, Gottfried prophetically and poetically.

Behind the naming of Tristan lies the etymological postulate of a motivated connexion between signifier and signified; the name will reflect the nature of its bearer. For Rual and Gottfried alike it is important that the name should be adequate to the person; Rual ponders carefully 'waz namen ime gebaere / nach sinen dingen waere' (1984–86), and Gottfried insists that 'der name was ime gevallesam / und alle wis gebaere' (2004–05).⁶² However, whereas for Rual the consonance of signifier and signified is established by historical reference and is already obvious at the time of naming, for Gottfried the agreement between the name and what it denominates is experimental and open, and can only be proved once the narrative has run its complete course. Rual works from history to arrive at an adequate name which, as the encapsulated essence of Tristan's story up to the present, is bounded in its reference: the name stands for its bearer's past, which is the proof of its appositeness. Gottfried works in the opposite direction, from the name to Tristan's story, past and future. Gottfried is here employing a technical device of rhetoric, the so-called *argumentum a nomine*, one of the *loci* proper to the figure of thought *descriptio personae* and by means of which, in the definition given by Matthew of Vendôme, 'per interpretationem nominis de persona aliquid boni vel mali persuadetur'.⁶³ What is special about Gottfried's use of the *argumentum a nomine* is that he frees the signifier from its bounded reference and makes its adequacy dependent on aesthetic experience. In his hands, the name 'Tristan' becomes an interpretation and a prophecy, not denoting the hero's career, past or future, but generating meanings about it. The name is not a symbol and Gottfried is not uncovering some fixed essence for which it stands; rather he is experimenting with the name's signifying potential, the 'vis nominis',⁶⁴ in order to produce interpretations and predictions that are provisional and conditional upon aesthetic experience, for their appositeness will not emerge unless and until the reader will have read the narrative for himself:

der name was ime gevallesam
und alle wis gebaere;

daz kiesen an dem maere . . .
 diz maere, der daz ie gelas,
 der erkennet sich wol, daz der nam
 dem lebene was gehellesam:
 er was reht alse er hiez ein man
 und hiez reht alse er was: Tristan. (2004–22)

Aesthetic experience is the indispensable counterpart to Gottfried's experiment with the name; only by duplicating that experiment in the act of going through the text can the reader appreciate the consonance of name and character. Gottfried's motivation of the historical signifier 'Tristan' does not operate by appealing to some law of symbolism in order to disclose to the reader what the name encloses; it engages the reader in an experimental and experiential probing of the name's signifying potential. Moreover, this engendering of meaning is not a once-and-for-all revelation, but is a function of the time it takes to go through the text: whoever has read the story (the prefix *ge-* in 'gelas' indicates perfective aspect) will come to understand.

In the first book of the *Pharsalia*, Caesar is on the point of crossing the Rubicon when he has a vision of Rome personified, who bids him go no further if he would respect the law; standing on the river's bank, Caesar utters an invocation to the gods, justifying his warlike course of action (I, 183–203). So far as we are able to tell, there is no historical authority for these words of Caesar's; Lucan has invented them, using the figure of thought known in the technical language of rhetoric as *sermocinatio* (Lausberg, paras 820–25). What is most striking about this fictitious prayer is that the tutelary divinities of Rome invoked by Caesar, Jupiter Tonans, the penates of the house of Iulus and the fires of Vesta, are, as Pierre Grimal has pointed out, all institutions of the imperial state religion inaugurated by the Julio-Claudian dynasty *after* the demise of the republic; this anachronism on Lucan's part, argues Grimal, is a deliberate anticipation of the new order of state that will be the consequence of Caesar's act of war, beginning with the crossing of the Rubicon; 'on voit comment l'invention poétique, loin de fausser l'histoire, la rend intelligible, y dessine correspondances et figures'.⁶⁵ History, mythology and figurative language, the three elements prominent in medieval anatomies of the *Pharsalia*, are brought to bear upon one another by Lucan in such a way as to bring out what, in all the contingent acts of war, is ultimately at stake in history.

Lucan's poeticized narrative of the civil war is connected by Grimal with Aristotle's definition of *poiēsis*; the discovery of a structure and a meaning in the *res gestae* lends them verisimilitude, universality, exemplarity.⁶⁶ Lucan's inventions enable him to be, in the words of Michael von Albrecht, 'wahrer als die Geschichte'.⁶⁷ This *poiēsis*, revealing the shape of history and its lessons, is intended to enhance historical cognition. In *Tristan* too, I believe, history,

mythology and figurative diction come together in significant interaction, but with a different purpose. Gottfried's poeticization of the historical substance of the story is not aimed at pointing up any higher, more philosophical truth than the narrated events might contain, their hidden architectonics, as it were. The meanings Gottfried engenders with the help of fictional devices do not lead towards historical cognition, but away from it, to a truth that exists only in aesthetic experience and is therefore imaginary. This is quite unlike the meanings produced by allegory or integument, for such truths pre-exist the interpretative operations through which they are disclosed and, once they have been laid bare, exist independently of these discovery procedures. For Gottfried, the significance of the story is an effect of the act of going through the text. It is the experimental significance of romance.

At the end of the preceding chapter I characterized Gottfried's poetics provisionally as a non-historiographic use of history. Now I should like to make that working definition more precise: Gottfried poeticizes history in order to make it signify in the experimental manner of a romance. In the next chapter, I shall be examining the part played in this experimental transformation of history by a concept of verisimilitude that — unlike the one critics have discerned in Lucan — is not Aristotelean.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. For the medieval reception of Lucan see Walter Fischli, *Studien zum Fortleben der Pharsalia* (Lucerne, 1951); Werner Fechter, *Lateinische Dichtkunst und deutsches Mittelalter*, pp. 12–21. On Lucan as curriculum author see the entry under his name in the index to Günther Glauche, *Schullektüre im Mittelalter*, p. 144; for the manuscript tradition see the article 'Lucan' by R. J. Tarrant in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, edited by L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983), pp. 215–18. Some impression of the many and largely ignored medieval manuscripts later than the tenth century may be formed from Renato Badali, 'I codici romani di Lucano', *BPEC*, 21 (1973), 3–47, 22 (1974), 3–48 and 23 (1975), 15–89; of the 74 MSS of Lucan now in Rome, some 24 date from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries. See also Eva Matthews Sanford, 'The Manuscripts of Lucan: *accessus* and *marginalia*', *Speculum*, 9 (1934), 278–95 and her 'Quotations from Lucan in Mediaeval Latin Authors', *AJP*, 55 (1934), 1–19; Margaret Jennings, 'Lucan's Mediaeval Popularity: The Exemplum Tradition', *RCCM*, 16 (1974), 215–33. Jessie Crosland, 'Lucan in the Middle Ages, with Special Reference to the Old French Epic', *MLR*, 25 (1930), 32–51, is a discussion of Lucan's influence on the *chanson de geste*.
2. *Belli civilis libri decem*, edited by A. E. Housman (Oxford, 1926), ix, 359–60. Further references to this edition are given in the text.
3. Berthe M. Marti, 'Tragic History and Lucan's *Pharsalia*', in *Classical Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, edited by Charles Henderson, Jr, 2 vols (Rome, 1964), I, 165–204 (p. 203). See also Pierre Grimal, 'Le poète et l'histoire', in *Lucain*, edited by M. Durray, *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, 15 (Geneva, 1970), pp. 51–118.
4. Conrad of Orleans, in *Accessus ad auctores*, edited by R. C. B. Huygens (1970 edition), p. 110; Arnulf of Orleans, *Glosule super Lucanum*, edited by Berthe M. Marti, *Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome*, 18 (Rome, 1958), p. 4. On medieval discussions of Lucan as poet and historian see Marti, 'Literary Criticism in the Mediaeval Commentaries on Lucan', *TAPA*, 72 (1941), 245–54, and Peter von Moos, 'Poeta und historicus im Mittelalter: Zum Mimesis-Problem am Beispiel einiger Urteile über Lucan', *Beiträge* (Tübingen series), 98 (1976), 93–130.
5. Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I imperatoris*, p. 12: 'Nec si a plana hystorica dictione ad evagandum oportunitate nacta ad altiora velut philosophica acumina attolatur oratio, preter

rem ejusmodi estimabuntur, dum et id ipsum Romani imperii prerogativae non sit extraneum rebus simplicioribus altiora interponere. Nam et Lucanus, Virgilius caeteripue Urbis scriptores non solum res gestas, sed etiam fabulosas, sive more pastorum vel colonorum summissius vel principum dominorumque orbis altius narrando, stilum tamen frequenter ad intima quedam philosophiae secreta sustulerunt.'

6. *Chronica, sive historia de duabus civitatibus*, edited by A. Hofmeister, MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum (Hanover and Leipzig, 1912), p. 3.
7. 'Tragoedia und Planctus: Der Eintritt des *Nibelungenliedes* in die Welt der litterati', in *Nibelungenlied und Klage: Sage und Geschichte, Struktur und Gattung: Passauer Nibelungengespräche 1985*, edited by F. P. Knapp (Heidelberg, 1987), pp. 152–70. The borrowing by the author of the *Nibelungenlied* of motifs and *topoi* from the *Pharsalia* is discussed by Fechter, pp. 131–33.
8. *Gesta Friderici*, p. 12; the relevant passage is quoted in note 5 above.
9. Joachim Bumke, *Höfische Kultur: Literatur und Gesellschaft im hohen Mittelalter*, p. 684.
10. I cannot find any trace of borrowing by Gottfried from Lucan in passages where imitation might have been possible, such as the description of storms or battle scenes, or in the depiction of Rual's steadfastness of character, for which Lucan's portrayal of the younger Cato as a model of Stoic virtue could readily have provided a model. Franz Josef Worstbrock, 'Ein Lucanzitat bei Abaelard und Gotfrid', *Beiträge* (Tübingen Series), 98 (1976), 351–56, demonstrates that Gottfried's harsh words about the 'vindaere wilder maere . . . die bernt uns mit dem stocke schate' (4665–73) are ultimately derived from Lucan's characterization of Pompey 'trunco, non frondibus efficit umbram' (I, 140), but doubts whether he has drawn on Lucan directly for this metaphor; Abelaard, Matthew of Vendôme and Eberhard the German all use it as well, and in the same context as Gottfried, namely the denigration of their intellectual and literary rivals, so that it is conceivable that the expression had already become a commonplace of literary critical vocabulary by the time of Gottfried.
11. Edwin A. Quain, 'The Medieval *accessus ad auctores*', pp. 216–28; Berthe M. Marti, 'Literary Criticism', p. 245.
12. In England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when there was a vogue for epic poems that recounted the civil wars between either the houses of York and Lancaster or King and Parliament, the 'Historicall Poets', as the authors of such epics styled themselves, had no theoretical justification for their practice other than the example of Lucan, whose name they continually invoke; see Helmut Papajewski, '*An Lucanus sit poeta?*', *DVLG*, 40 (1966), 485–508.
13. The most famous Neronian sources for the controversy are Petronius, *Satyricon*, 118 and Martial's epigram xiv, 194.
14. M. P. O. Morford, *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic* (Oxford, 1967), p. 85. See also Eva Matthews Sanford, 'Lucan and His Roman Critics', *Classical Philology*, 26 (1931), 233–57, and Michael von Albrecht, 'Der Dichter Lucan und die epische Tradition', in *Lucain*, edited by M. Durry, *Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, 15 (Geneva, 1970), pp. 265–308.
15. Servius, *In Vergilii carmina commentarii*, edited by Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen, vols I and II, *Aeneidos librorum commentarii* (Leipzig, 1923), I, 129; Isidore, *Etymologiae*, viii.7.10; Sanford, 'Lucan and His Roman Critics', pp. 236–37; von Moos, pp. 102–03.
16. Sanford, 'Lucan and His Roman Critics', p. 240; von Moos, p. 102.
17. For the critical fortunes of Lucan in the Renaissance see Papajewski, and also Klaus Heitmann, 'Das Verhältnis von Dichtung und Geschichtsschreibung in älterer Theorie', *AJK*, 52 (1970), 244–79, especially pp. 261–62.
18. *Scholia in Lucani Bellum civile*, edited by Hermann Usener, vol. I, *Commenta Bernensia* (Leipzig, 1869), pp. 8–9.
19. *Marci Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*, edited by Karl Friedrich Weber, vol. III, *Scholastae* (Leipzig, 1831), p. 3. This is a partial edition of Anselm's commentary as preserved in Berolinensis 1016 lat. fol. 34; see the description of the manuscript by Valentin Rose, *Verzeichniss der lateinischen Handschriften*, II, 3, Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, 13 (Berlin, 1905), pp. 1304–08, who also gives a transcription of those passages from Anselm's *accessus* that Weber omitted.
20. Weber, p. 3: 'Solent poetae tria ponere; solent enim proponere et invocare et narrare. Quod iste facit'; p. 11: 'Ita loquitur de praeteritis quasi futura essent; item solent loqui poetae', with reference to I, 38; pp. 108, 250: 'Ut solent facere poetae, continuat istum librum ad superiorem'; 'Consuetudo poetarum est, ut finem praecedentis libri initio sequentis iungant quibusdam particulis', referring to II, 1 and IV, 1; p. 150: 'Et sicut poetae solent delectare quandoque, addit laudes ipsius Eridani. Tangit illam fabulam . . .', on II, 410.
21. II.66.3, XII.4.16, 30–32, XVI.26.14, XX.10.1. On the Isidorean formalism of the *Commenta Bernensia* and Anselm see Marti, 'Literary Criticism', pp. 246–49, and von Moos, pp. 102–03.
22. Munich, clm. 19475, edited by Huygens in his edition of the *Accessus ad auctores*, Collection Latomus, 15 (Brussels, 1954), pp. 34–38, from which I quote. There is another redaction of this

- Accessus Lucani* in a twelfth-century manuscript from Benediktbeuern, clm. 4593, where it precedes a glossed text of the *Pharsalia*; this version, which is briefer in its discussion of the points that are of interest to me, forms the basis of Huygen's 1970 re-edition of the *Accessus ad auctores*, pp. 39–44.
23. Huygens (1954 edition), pp. 37–38; Suetonius, *De Poetis*, in *Praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae*, edited by August Reifferscheid (Leipzig, 1860), p. 17.
 24. Quadlbauer, *Die antike Theorie der genera dicendi im lateinischen Mittelalter*, SB der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, 241, 2 (Vienna, 1962), p. 28, fn. 37.
 25. Von Moos, pp. 106–07; see also the chapters on 'Divination and Magic' and 'Lucan's Dreams' in Morford, pp. 59–84. For Hartmann von Aue, Lucan is the source of information about witches and prophetesses; Morgan le Fay is compared to the Sibyl and 'Ericôtô . . . von der uns Lûcânus zalt' (*Erec*, edited by Albert Leitzmann, lines 5216–17).
 26. Isidore, for instance, relies heavily on Lucan for information in his chapter 'De Serpentibus', *Etymologiae*, XII.4. His chapter on astronomy also makes occasional use of the *Pharsalia* (III.41, 66.3, 71.29).
 27. Servius's *accessus* is organized under the following heads or *circumstantiae*: 'poetae vita, titulus operis, qualitas carminis, scribentis intentio, numerus librorum, ordo librorum' (p. 1). The *Accessus Lucani* inquires into 'materia', 'intentio', 'qualitas operis', 'utilitas', and 'pars philosophiae', as well as giving details of the poet's life (pp. 34–38). The only *accessus* in the Tegernsee collection that adopts the Servian schema is the one to Sedulius (p. 23 in Huygens's 1954 edition, pp. 28–29 in his revised edition of 1970); the others are based, with occasional variations, on the four constants of *materia, utilitas, intentio* and *pars philosophiae*. On the different schemas in use in medieval *accessus ad auctores* see Paul Klopsch, *Einführung in die Dichtungslehren des lateinischen Mittelalters*, pp. 48–55.
 28. Huygens (1970 edition), p. 110: 'Lucanus poeta, gemina illustris virtute, primo quidem in milicia, deinde in otio studiorum disciplina, ex antea probitate curialem et grandiloquum modum in stilo tenuit, verax in historiae veritate, validissimi ingenii, poematis ratione, strennitate animi et militiae iam depositae, pulcra verborum et sententiarum ordinatione'. By stylistic 'probitas' Conrad must mean the correlation of the three styles, high, middle and low, with the three social estates of courtier, burgher and peasant; see Quadlbauer, p. 116.
 29. Huygens (1970 edition), p. 75. Von Moos goes so far as to maintain that the inclusion of both truth and fiction under the single term *poeta* or *factor* was general in the Middle Ages, forming a complementary theory to the straightforward equation of fiction with falsehood (pp. 118–20).
 30. pp. 55, 128, 178, referring in turn to *Pharsalia* I, 412; II, 410; III, 253.
 31. Weber, p. 481 (gloss to VI, 608). The MS, Berolinensis 1012, lat. fol. 35, is of German provenance and contains scholia to Lucan (description in Rose, pp. 1300–03). Marti dates it to the thirteenth century ('Literary Criticism', p. 245).
 32. Theoderic of Fleury, *Historia illationis Sancti Benedicti*, quoted by von Moos, p. 104, fn. 21; *Historia Troyana Daretis Frigii*, quoted *ibid.*, p. 110. See also Marie Schulz, *Die Lehre von der historischen Methode bei den Geschichtsschreibern des Mittelalters*, pp. 139–43.
 33. On the attention paid by Arnulf to aspects of mythology in Lucan, see Marti in the introduction to her edition, p. xlix. Von Moos interprets the sense of 'aliquid fictitii' in an entirely different way: 'Der Fictio-Begriff wird schon hier eingeengt auf die Verwendung einer poetischen Sprache' (p. 117, fn. 23).
 34. Ernst Robert Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, pp. 469–70.
 35. Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VIII.7.1–2, 4–9; Isidore's authority for the religious origin of all poetry is Suetonius, *De Poetis*.
 36. Weber, p. 5, *Glosule*, p. 7; Marti, 'Literary Criticism', p. 250, von Moos, p. 111.
 37. In this paragraph I am indebted to the excellent account of Gottfried's mythological apparatus by Gerhard Schindele, *Tristan: Metamorphose und Tradition*, Studien zur Poetik und Geschichte der Literatur, 12 (Stuttgart, 1971), pp. 64–70, who emphasizes that the Middle Ages did not treat the classical heritage with the scholarly rigour of Renaissance humanism, and that what appear by our standards to be mistakes are in fact evidence of a live reception of pagan mythology, adapting it to suit new purposes; thus the confusion of Cithaeron and Cythera, the seat of the Muses and the sanctuary of Aphrodite, is intended to symbolize the unity of love and music (p. 65), and Gottfried's error in calling Helen of Troy the daughter of Aurora (8266), rather than of Leda, is consistent with his development of the metaphor of dawn and sunrise, which expresses the relationship between the elder and the younger Isolde (p. 47).
 38. Wilhelm Hoffa, 'Antike Elemente bei Gottfried von Straßburg', distinguishes between classical allusions that must already have been in the French source and those, such as the ones in the literary excursus, that are presumably Gottfried's additions from his personal learning and

- reading, of Ovid in particular. Schindele, pp. 65–67, quotes parallels from other medieval authors for many examples of Gottfried's apparently faulty mythological knowledge.
39. In the so-called primitive version of the Tristan legend, that of Beroul and Eilhart, a single Isolde retained many of the traits of the fairy of Celtic myth, who combined the roles of miraculous healer and supernatural lover; the 'courtly' version, represented by Thomas and Gottfried, has separated these two functions and distributed them between *two* Isoldes, mother and daughter. This change, which assists the drive towards a more rational motivation for events and an increasingly more conceptual treatment of the theme of love, destroys the original thematic coherence of magic, love and the physician's art. See Schindele, pp. 30–32, 40–46, 56.
 40. Beroul, *The Romance of Tristan*, edited by A. Ewert, 2 vols (Oxford, 1967–70), lines 2133–46; Eilhart von Oberg, *Tristrant*, edited by Franz Lichtenstein, Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, 19 (Strassburg, 1877), lines 2279–2300; Thomas, *Les Fragments du Roman de Tristan*, edited by Bartina H. Wind, Douce Fragment, lines 1223–26 (p. 134). See Schindele, pp. 56–64.
 41. Nickel, *Studien zum Liebesproblem bei Gottfried von Straßburg*, Königsberger Deutsche Forschungen, 1 (Königsberg, 1927), p. 4; compare Friedrich Ranke, *Tristan und Isold*, Bücher des Mittelalters, 3 (Munich, 1925), p. 204: 'Das Motiv vom Liebestrank selber . . . entwickelt Gottfried vom mechanischen Erklärungsprinzip, vom Trank, der Liebe wirkt, einen Schritt weiter zum Symbol hin, zum Trank, der Liebe bedeutet'. Against the view put forward by Nickel and Ranke that Tristan and Isolde fall in love without the potion causing it, see Hans Furstner, 'Der Beginn der Liebe bei Tristan und Isolde in Gottfrieds Epos' *Neophilologus*, 41 (1957), 25–38; the most recent discussion of this celebrated issue is Christoph Huber, *Gottfried von Straßburg, 'Tristan und Isolde': Eine Einführung*, pp. 66–77.
 42. Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, para. 819; Matthew of Vendôme, *Ars versificatoria*, edited by Edmond Faral, in *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle*, pp. 147–49; Servius, *In Vergilii carmina*, I, 65–66: 'topothesia est, id est fictus secundum poeticam licentiam locus. ne autem videatur penitus a veritate discedere, Hispaniensis Carthaginis portum descripsit', about *Aeneid*, I, 159.
 43. Berolinensis 1012, in Weber, p. 554. Marti attributes this gloss to the *Commenta Bernensia* ('Literary Criticism', p. 251), so does von Moos (p. 118, fn. 55). Lucan does not make the mistake otherwise: 'qualem fugiente per ortus / Sole Thyesteae noctem ducere Mycenae' (I, 543–44). Another instance of topographical inaccuracy in the *Pharsalia* is the confusion of Phocis in Greece with Phocaea in Asia, the origin of the colonists who first settled at Marseilles (III, 340; v, 53).
 44. See in particular the two essays by Rainer Gruenter, 'Bauformen der Waldleben-Episode in Gottfrieds Tristan und Isold', in *Gestaltprobleme der Dichtung: Günther Müller zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, edited by R. Alewyn, H.-E. Hass, C. Heselhaus (Bonn, 1957), pp. 21–48, and 'Das *wunnecliche tal*', *Euphorion*, 55 (1961), 341–404; also Frederic C. Tubach, 'The "locus amoenus" in the Tristan of Gottfried von Straszburg', *Neophilologus*, 43 (1959), 37–42, and Ingrid Hahn, *Raum und Landschaft in Gottfrieds Tristan: Ein Beitrag zur Werkdeutung*, Medium Aevum Philologische Studien, 3 (Munich, 1963), pp. 31–34, 119–42.
 45. See above, p. 35. The seminal study of the allegory of the cave is Friedrich Ranke, 'Die Allegorie der Minnegrotte in Gottfrieds Tristan', *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse*, 2 (Berlin, 1925).
 46. Berolinensis 1012; Weber, p. 612. *Prosopopoeia*, which usually refers to the creation of fictitious persons, such as Lucan's personification of Rome (I, 186–92), can also include the attribution of human speech or sensations to inanimate beings; see Lausberg, paras 826–29.
 47. See note 28 above for the full citation of Conrad.
 48. Quadlbauer, pp. 47–49, 60–62. *Pulcher* is an epithet used frequently of the high rhetorical style.
 49. Marti, 'Literary Criticism', pp. 248–49, and in the introduction to her edition of Arnulf, pp. xxxix–xli.
 50. For instance, Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria nova*, edited by Faral, *Les Arts poétiques*, pp. 220–45.
 51. Schulz, pp. 84–98; Gertrud Simon, 'Untersuchungen zur Topik der Widmungsbriefe mittelalterlicher Geschichtsschreiber bis zum Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts', part II, pp. 73–82. Both of these scholars emphasize that there were also historians who were keen to cultivate a refined diction, which they considered would ennoble their material.
 52. Quoted by Schulz, pp. 87–88, 141. See also von Moos, p. 118, fn. 55.
 53. Lactantius, *Opera omnia*, edited by J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia latina*, 6 (Paris, 1844), col. 170: 'Rapiusse dicitur in aquila Catamitum: poeticus color est. Sed aut per legionem rapuit, cuius insigne aquila est; aut navis, in qua est impositus, tutelam habuit in aquila figuratam'.
 54. Servius, *In Vergilii carmina*, I, 129: 'hoc loco per transitum tangit historiam, quam per legem artis poeticae aperte non potest ponere. nam Varro in secundo divinarum dicit ex quo de Troia

- est egressus Aeneas, Veneris eum per diem cotidie stellam vidisse, donec ad agrum Laurentem veniret, in quo eam non vidit ulterius: qua re terras cognovit esse fatales: unde Vergilius hoc loco "matre dea monstrante viam" et eripe, nate, fugam, item nusquam abero et descendo ac ducente deo et iamque iugis summae surgebat lucifer Idae. quam stellam Veneris esse ipse Vergilius ostendit qualis ubi Oceani perfuscus Lucifer unda, quem Venus ante alios astrorum diligit ignes. quod autem diximus eum poetica arte prohiberi, ne aperte ponat historiam, certum est. Lucanus namque ideo in numero poetarum esse non meruit, quia videtur historiam composuisse, non poema'. Servius refers to *Aeneid* II, 619–20 ('eripe, nate, fugam finemque impone labori. / nusquam abero'), II, 632 ('descendo ac ducente deo'), II, 801–02 ('iamque iugis summae'), VIII, 589–90 ('qualis ubi Oceani').
55. He illustrates the tropes *parabola* and *similitudo* with examples from Lucan (*Etymologiae*, I.37.33, 35).
 56. Sawicki, *Gottfried von Straßburg und die Poetik des Mittelalters*, p. 131.
 57. pp. 71–114 (amplification), 116–31 (tropes), 131–49 (figures of thought and diction).
 58. See the note by Peter Ganz to line 4624 in his edition of *Tristan*, I, 169. He refers to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, vol. VI, col. 770, on the confusion of *figere* and *figere* in Latin, and gives another instance of MHG *figieren*, meaning 'to form, shape, create': 'swaz man damit formieret. / gezirkelt ald figieret' (*Reinfrid von Braunschweig*, lines 20791–92). Compare Conrad of Hirsau's formula 'factor vel formator' (Huygens, 1970 edition, p. 75). Okken, *Kommentar zum Tristan-Roman Gottfrieds von Strassburg*, I, 232, thinks however that the MHG is probably derived from OF *figurer*, 'to represent'. The usual form of this verb in MHG is however *figurieren*; see the *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, III, 309.
 59. Faral, *Les Arts poétiques*, p. 220.
 60. Huber, 'Wort-Ding-Entsprechungen', pp. 284–90; Geoffrey continues his advice on inward and outward coloration: 'Verbi prius inspice mentem / Et demum faciem, cujus ne crede color: / Se nisi conformet color intus exteriori, / Sordet ibi ratio . . . in his quae dixeris esto / Argus et argutis oculis circumspice verba / In re proposita' (Faral, p. 220).
 61. This point is conceded by Huber, 'Wort-Ding-Entsprechungen', pp. 287 fn. 56, 290.
 62. See Huber, 'Wort-Ding-Entsprechungen', pp. 269–76, who also shows that the words used by Gottfried in order to express the consonance of signifier and signified are in fact technical terms of etymology: to 'gehellesam' and 'gevallesam' correspond Latin *consonans* and *conueniens*.
 63. Faral, *Les Arts poétiques*, p. 136.
 64. Isidore, *Etymologiae*, I.29.1: 'Etymologia est origo vocabulorum, cum vis verbi vel nominis per interpretationem colligitur'.
 65. Grimal, 'Le Poète et l'histoire', pp. 56–59 (p. 59).
 66. Grimal, pp. 54–55. On Aristotle, see above, pp. 34–35. See also von Moos, pp. 118–25, who argues that medieval readers such as Otto von Freising and John of Salisbury valued the same qualities in Lucan, even though Aristotle's theory of *poiésis* was unknown to them.
 67. Remark made in the discussion following Grimal (see 'Le Poète et l'histoire', p. 115), referring to the invented episode of Caesar's destruction of the holy grove at Marseilles (III, 399–452).