Michèle Gally

FECUNDITIES OF THE TRACE:
Medieval Scholars and Medievalists before the Medieval Text

> "Copyists perceive that writing has its own order, opaque to spoken language, that it follows its own purpose and enjoys a particular status" (Bernard Cerquiglini)

> "[We must interrogate the Middle Ages] as the place of resonance of a voice." (Paul Zumthor)

Taking up Paul Zumthor's reflections on medievalism and medieval studies in *Parler du Moyen Age*, this essay discusses the necessity to keep alive the distinction between medieval scholars and medievalists, because this distinction allows us to reflect on the two complementary sides of a necessary relation to the past.

The scribe's gesture, the minstrel's voice: two moments that have, to differing degrees, been lost, for while the first has left material traces, the second must have its presence distilled through signs that have been preserved by the first. But both gesture and voice must be reconstituted, for they are no longer immediate to us, they constitute both monuments and documents. Bernard Cerquiglini has described the moment, which according to him is essential, when spoken language becomes written language:

> Detaching oneself from a simple transcription of orality can have illegitimate reasons. In the first place, technical ones [...] Followed by grammatical ones. Copyists perceive

that writing is not simply a light gauze covering and exposing the living word; it is a form of language. (2000, 117-118)

Paul Zumthor, on the other hand, remained sensitive to the vocal quality of medieval poetic production:

Therefore no less than mastering the techniques of philology and of textual analysis, it is the task of the medieval scholar to convince himself of the incomparable values of the voice, to sensitivise his attention to it; even better, to live them because they can exist only when still warm, independently of the concepts in which we are obliged to imprison them in order to describe them. (1987, 18 [epigram], 20)

The "medieval", or at least that which we tentatively and often secretly negatively designate as such,[1] and that includes the productions of a long period ranging from the end of the Roman empire to the Renaissance, survives only through opaque *texts*, texts that long remained forgotten in the insides of manuscripts, i.e. that which Brunetière called "a hodgepodge" (*un fatras*). We must therefore, first of all, agree on the object of our designation, and then on the possibilities and ways to apprehend it, to read it, as well as its diffusion and reformulation. We must also reach agreement on the meaning of past acts of burying the medieval before ourselves transforming it through an act of recreation: why awaken these old texts, and to what purpose? Indeed, approaching such old texts raises numerous theoretical and epistemological issues.

That which some will designate, in turn, the fashion for medieval fictions, is sometimes showcased, and sometimes ignored. In this process, an important role is played by a primary distinction established between "medieval scholars" and "medievalists", if one decides to designate thus each of the two attitudes, the first one a professional and "academic" one, the second a creative and "poetic" one. Nonetheless, the questions the two approaches ask sometimes seem to share a common ground.

Vernacular medieval works are therefore texts that reach us through a number of veils – difficult languages, manuscript and editorial traditions, various strata of commentary and compilations – that which the school of Constance called "a historic series of concretisations" (Jauss 1978, 117-119). Isn't critical, scholarly experience dominated and limited here by the unsurmountable historicity of its object of study? In *Parler du Moyen Age*, Paul Zumthor pointed out the challenges that this situation poses: "It is not without violence that I perceive the echo of these few vanished words. They still resonate in the way the sea does in a shell, in the cavity of the text over which, as they tell me, I am poring" (102). Always, despite everything, the

inescapable presence of the *text*, which alone transmits these faded voices, barely audible. And, adds Zumthor, "the only thing that will justify our effort in reading is the pleasure it gives us [...] a pleasure confronted to historical knowledge in an apparent mutual denial but which one could not dissociate without entirely ruining the enterprise."

This is a new programme whose stakes are high: to reconstitute the link between the past text and the present reading, an essential link that gives a contemporary sense to the very effort made in establishing it, a link that should not belong to the domain of erudition alone. The mention of pleasure gives our exploration a new twist: who takes pleasure in reading medieval texts? Does the medieval scholar seek pleasure or knowledge, of what does her satisfaction consist in discovering forgotten texts? Should she make of a dead work a *poetically* living work, or an *academically* living one? If the study of medieval texts aims to restitute that which once was, then it will find itself caught between the historical or philological work of updating, and that of finding analytic tools that will constitute so many new rapprochements between the present of the critic and the past of the object of study. These rapprochements, which can be audacious, or even equivocal, sometimes open up a more or less consciously anachronistic reading that one could, in turn, call "medievalist" and that runs the risk of departing from the work of scholarship.

Now the specialist or the scholar cannot afford to do without methodological and theoretical choices. And each of these choices refers to categories that he must interrogate, since they serve as more or less explicit heuristic tools: origins and authenticity, the same and the analogous, otherness, or traces. Each of these concepts thus explains a different, more or less thought-through position assumed by the critical approach. It is around this cluster of questions that I would like to engage my own reflection and debate, understanding "medieval" principally as "medieval text" and starting out from the textual heritage, both fictional and poetic, of the medieval centuries. To do this, I will briefly describe the most salient philological positions, before coming to the ambiguity of the anthropological choices made by Paul Zumthor and comparing the positions, equally fecund, of the author and the scholar in this enterprise of resurrecting the past.

A voyage through philology
Philology, in the sense given at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries to the scholarly study of texts, was the cradle of medieval studies and of the "medieval". In recent years numerous works have

appeared on the founding fathers of this academic discipline. One can detect among them a first movement, that of "going back" to a remote past. The return to the Middle Ages, then, was the exhumation of a past and of the relation of this past to a national consciousness. Going back to such a past was also related to origins, in the double sense of an infancy and a foundation. The Middle Ages were perceived to be related to the primitive, the naive, the spontaneous, the coarse, somewhere between the genius of the nation and the collective soul of its people. A confusion crept in between medieval poetry and folklore. The romantic view, that believed in the creative potential of medieval literature,[2] combined with philology and the positivism of textual science. Renan declared: "The modern spirit, that is to say rationalism, critique, liberalism, was founded on the same day as was philology. The founders of the modern spirit are the philologists" (841). Later he explained: "Philology is the exact science of the things of the spirit". According to him, neither Antiquity nor the Middle Ages had known it, while the nineteenth century made of it its first science. Because philology was, for Renan, the basis of all knowledge, the means of access to all writings, monuments and documents, to follow again the distinction between works of art and of fiction, and archival writings lacking any aesthetic motivation: "history, not curious but theoretical about the human spirit: this is the philosophy of the nineteenth century. Now this study is only possible through the immediate study of monuments, and these monuments cannot only be approached without recourse to the special researches of the philologist" (834). It was through this filter that the Middle Ages entered the history of the human spirit, of which it constituted one stage. It represented a past epoch that was indispensable to know in order to understand the present and this was so, according to Gaston Paris, "without any aesthetic pleasure" for medieval poetry had definitively been "surpassed". In his eyes the medieval scholar's task was the historical and philological exploration of the French Middle Ages without any other kind of sympathy. Of this scholarly severity was thus born the particular discipline of the medieval scholar.

But this was a scholarly illusion, for such a philology participates fully in the invention of the Middle Ages, in the double sense of a rediscovery and a recreation. This academic, meticulous, classifying way of looking at texts creates a corpus that both reveals and betrays that which is in the manuscripts, or to be more exact, it redeploys the texts, modifying them in different ways.

If, for example, we take a brief look at the successive editions of the poems of Thibaut de Champagne, from the liminary 1742 edition of La Ravallière until that of Wallensköld in 1925, which was the first scholarly

critical edition to be published, we see how the editors consistently claimed to be passing from "medieval confusion" to modern order. This act of ordering was to take place following the double principle of a hierarchy of poetic genres and a supposedly spiritual and biographical trajectory followed by the poet, from his love songs to his pious ones, and passing through his *pastourelles, jeux-partis* and crusade lyrics. Commentators oscillated between valuing the medieval poet and an attitude of condescension. Having become a poetry to be read rather than sung, Thibaut's oeuvre (saluted by Dante as one of the greatest *trouvères*) remained in some ways an immature poetry even in the eyes of its rediscoverers. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Wallensköld proposed a reasoned reconstitution of Thibaut's text which was meant to lead to the establishment of a single authoritative text. Despite taking into account several different manuscripts, he remained faithful to the principles of the eighteenth-century philologist Ravallière and, like him, he also discounted the role of music.

It is as a reaction to these assumptions regarding reconstitution, assumptions that were in fact ways of bending medieval lyric to the forms of classicist or modern poetry, that several "new" philologists, such as Bernard Cerquiglini, have chosen to adopt an extreme position. The quest for a sure or true text does not, according to them, mean anything when viewed against medieval traditions of textuality, for this notion is a derivative of the state of development of the printing press during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when philology too was shaped. Not only do such attempts reclassify medieval texts, dissociate them or reassociate them, but they also provide a version of them according to classicist and modern norms regarding literary texts. These editors make a number of decisions in order to turn the medieval document into a book such as we know it today (Cerquiglini 1989, 42 sq.). Bernard Cerquiglini's proposal to conserve "the essential variance" (58) of the medieval text, the idea that the work is constantly being rewritten, that its meaning is difracted everywhere and that its origin cannot be found anywhere, suggest the lineaments of a new philology that, aided by electronic media, might become the image of this textual instability, of this consubstantial reformulation. These proposals, however, lead to other quandaries.

For what kind of legible text would one then be able to obtain? That which modern readers were initially seeking in the Middle Ages viewed as a monument, as a point of "origin", then becomes its contrary. Being a medieval scholar is to measure oneself to something that is neither a stable text, nor the presence of an author. It is accepting that the works conserved within the

extant manuscripts remain to us, in fact, impossible to grasp. Any approach to medieval textuality would then always be, in some sense, a betrayal, a transformation, or even a way of making it come to us by shedding its native culture.

Leaving the text behind

The relation to a possible medieval text thus appears to be a lure.

In a complete reversal, albeit a progressive one, Paul Zumthor decided for his part to turn away from the letter. Seizing the medieval, according to him, could not be done through the text, nor through philology. Paul Zumthor proposed a revolution in the proper sense of the term. He decided to read only anthologies and to ignore the question of the establishment of the exact text. It was the quality of medieval poetry, one could say, that really interested him. The texts in the extant manuscripts were merely imperfect, incomplete traces of this poetry, and represented only partial witnesses to what it once had been.

At first, however, Zumthor took as his starting-point the tools of structural linguistics, minutely analyzing the elements in poems that, together, constituted a vast whole in which the singularity of each *trouvère* was banished, since it was the product of a projection of our own categories onto a lyrical production completely different from that of nineteenth-century poets: no quest for the author, then, and even less so was the search for biographical motives now considered relevant.

This reading presented itself as a break with the past, one that had been initiated by Robert Guiette, who had been the first to propose a "formalist", non-romantic reading of the medieval lyric tradition. In the eyes of this Belgian medieval scholar, the medieval *chanson* was an art of combining rhymes and words, and demanded a sort of "formal" intelligence of which our ancestors had been in possession. In a certain sense, the poem did not say anything, its function was to be and to "sing". Its repetitions were not weaknesses but the signs of a complex poetics, the meaning and aesthetic value of which proceeded from these very constraints.[3]

So it was a new category that emerged, that of *alterity*, replacing the categories of recognition, or even of the "true".

From a different perspective than Zumthor's, Hans-Robert Jauss at several moments developed this notion of alterity and considered it, in his turn, as a break within medieval studies:

> The alterity of medieval literature is the reflexive experience of the distance and the historical quality of this epoch that is, in such a singular and exemplary way, isolated, both from a political and socio-cultural viewpoint [...] If one delivers the literature of

the Middle Ages from the illusions of continuity, then particular characteristics emerge that pose a set of problems to hermeneutic thought, and are beyond the theoretical horizon of the followers of the old historical-philological methods, as well as that of the new structuralist methods. (323)

Jauss finally makes of medieval literature, thus perceived, a paradigm for the understanding of literature in general, as a phenomenon fundamentally marked by its alterity: "Can't this epoch be much more exemplary for our understanding of literature because of its 'alterity'"?.

To what extent, however, is it enough to remain at this initial stage, merely stating the alterity of the medieval, designating a break, the consciousness of a distance between the medieval and the modern? It is not clear, once more, that accepting this difference makes medieval poetry any more legible. Zumthor moved beyond this obstacle by proposing a new displacement, a new theoretical detour. He proposed, in a manner of speaking, to return to the concept of sameness through a new analogy: medieval lyric is related to other experiences of oral poetry in the world, and more precisely still, to the human experience of the voice. The point is to move towards a newly found orality on the basis of ethnological research and to establish a link between ancient poetry, with its figures of minstrels, and the oral productions of other cultural zones than the European one. There is no historical filiation in this case, but it is the present-day search for a referent bridging both ancient works and modern experience.

Despite the testimonies of medieval poetic theoreticians such as Dante and Deschamps on the primarily sonorous quality of medieval poems (Gally 2010, 160-161, 224-231) this procedure cannot however really serve as a basis for a scholarly approach, for the living voice can only be perceived through the indications that can be found in the text that transmitted it. Zumthor, as if fascinated by the relived reality of the voice, placed it at the centre of all understanding of the medieval. One proceeds then from the text to the body. To song he substituted the voice. This position avoids textual genetics and the question of origins. In *La poésie et la voix*, he stated: "The voice has neither an origin, nor a destiny, it neither evolves nor declines, it claims no filiation: it is presence, formalized by the physical movements of a body as much and even more than by the words that are pronounced" (Zumthor 1984, 38). Thus Zumthor proposed to delimit more closely the specificity of the medieval, by founding it on a universal. He resolved the dilemma between a socio-historical approach, a linguistic-formalistic approach (that of his own *Essai de poétique médiévale*) and that of the singular subject. No text, no author. For him that which we call "literature" was able to exist "only by separating itself from the

original vocalities." Zumthor however "crossed" one further threshold and revived the desire to designate an origin.

> Perhaps we must cross a further threshold and ask ourselves if the origin of all was not the most closed of forms, the most opaque, the one that most manifestly masks poetic language: song. People assure me that one of the techniques used to rehabilitate aphasia patients consists in singing sentences to them, gradually flattening the melody until they become spoken language. One could deduce from this situation an apologue applicable to the history of European languages! Our languages proceed from song and the medieval centuries learned only gradually what poetry is outside of song. (Zumthor 1984, 64)

Song at the origin of every language act: one cannot be further removed from poetry as a discourse. But just as if the process of going back were being fully completed, there was also another step before this one, a kind of first physiological burst: "In the beginning was the cry: midwives have known this for a long time, but it was useful to remind poets of this" (Zumthor 1990, 142). But is a cry really poetry? More exactly, doesn't poetry itself take part in a willed and crafted negation of the cry, in its very denial? And this would appear to hold for the medievals as much as for the moderns.

This apprehension of the medieval through a detour mediated by other cultural experiences, then by a sort of self-exploration, is in accordance in some ways with a romantic positioning, and is in accordance with an almost intimate experience of Zumthor's own. For sure, his procedure awakens us magnificently, but not without ambiguity: the medieval, at least medieval lyric, is no longer a textual event, and even less a manuscript one. One can perhaps reach its echo only in the staggered reproduction of a performance and within the context of the generalist aims of a kind of anthropological thinking. Zumthor does not shy away from this consequence and invites us to "leave the literary event" and to consider medieval poetry as an anthropological object, as "the privileged dramatic site where the tensions can be grasped that call into question our idea of humankind" (Zumthor 1987, 9). Doctors, psychoanalysts, ethnologists, musicians and poets are thus invited to come together around the universal and essential phenomenon of the voice. That which remains of medieval production is, paradoxically, only the medium that would allow us to rethink this vital source. We have reached the ends of the philologist's text, and we are getting closer to a process of appropriation that opens the door to medievalism, or that which might be the scholarly counterpart of it, if one designates by that shifting term a relation to the medieval in which the observer or analyst implies himself in a mirror game of identities.[4]

Could speaking of the Middle Ages, then, be the same as speaking of humankind, an ambition that Renan had already ascribed to philology. Is it an attempt to regain a past epoch, or is it to speak of oneself, the main concern of our own time?

Poetic recreations, academic recreations: On poets and critics
In "La littérature médiévale comme vivier de formes" (Medieval literature as a breeding ground of forms), the contemporary poet and novelist Pierre Lartigue writes:

> At the end of the sixties, in order to revive a rhythmic game on a new basis, we became interested in the troubadours, in the great rhetoricians (*grands rhétoriqueurs*), in poetic writing before Malherbe . . . The point was not to revive a form from the past as a kind of refuge, but to understand the properties of a singular strophic combination and to rely on it to revive the musical game and to give ourselves over to more unpredictable pleasures than those provided by traditional metrics. The problem is always to invent a new language within the language that is ours. (32-33)

This renewed presence of medieval lyric at the heart of contemporary poetic processes takes place in a wilful break with a classicist aesthetics and romantic lyricism. More straightforwardly, Jacques Roubaud connects the Oulipo experimental literary movement to the troubadours: "The idea of poetry as an art, as a craft and as a passion, as a game, as irony, as research, as a form of knowledge [...] as a form of life, this idea that was espoused by many poets in the poetic tradition and more recently still by Raymond Queneau, I have made my own and I see the first example of it in the troubadours [...] That is why this book is a homage and, even indirectly, it speaks of the poetry of our own day" (17).

The Middle Ages thus become a model that allows poets to find a new creative breath, to experiment with forms that are both new and already tested. This meeting is also a reappropriation, and the parallels between the medieval and modernity can be more or less hastily drawn. What matters is the impetus that it generates. A solidarity, a recognition, take shape and are proclaimed. This procedure has also allowed us to lift medieval texts out of the shadows of their manuscript existence. This is how the history of the discovery of medieval nonsense poetry, the *fatrasies*, can be read as part of the surrealist movement, from Bataille to Breton and Albert-Marie Schmidt. One could retort that that it was an error of interpretation (the belief that traces of automatic writing could be found in the thirteenth century) that subsequently gave rise to a more philological labour of analysis and establishment. But it is the enthusiasm, however inadequate, of Albert-Marie Schmidt,[5] linked to what

Michael Randall calls "a modern manipulation," (35) that brought the medieval poems out of the shadows, made them visible and legible, made them exist anew, and even attracted to them the attention of scholars.

This example seems to strengthen the idea that an anachronistic approach to ancient texts might be the most fertile one, and that we advance in our knowledge only thanks to audacious and false connections. This is the position taken by the art historian Georges Didi-Huberman. In *Devant le temps*, he speaks of the paradoxical fecundity of anachronism, of what he calls "the past perfect tense of the act of reminiscence", and of the "displaced resemblance" that allow for the emergence of a new object to be seen (20). The aim this time is not to make a modern work emerge from the encounter with a work from the past but to construct, on the basis of this almost spontaneous process, a better perception of the original work. This position would indeed allow us to rethink the "proper distance" between the historian and his object, neither too close, at the risk of becoming the medium of a fantastical subjectivity, nor too far away in its past, at the risk of becoming a positivistic residue in an objectivity that, according to Didi-Huberman, is just as fantastical. This double impasse is in fact that which we have discussed in these pages. In the impasse between the objectivity claimed by the scholar and the subjectivity of the poet before the old texts, which should we choose?

For Didi-Huberman, primacy should be given to the gaze of the spectator, that is to say a singular subject, uniting culture and sensibility: "If I am trying today to rememorate that which once stopped me in my tracks in the corridor of San Marco, I do not think I am wrong in saying that it was a kind of displaced resemblance between that which I was discovering there in a Renaissance convent and the drippings of the American artist [Jackson Pollock]" (20).

The gaze in question here is that of modern humankind, assumed entirely as such. Didi-Huberman proposes a kind of wager on the possibilities that this human being has to understand an old work, or some of its elements, under cover of a reception situation and an exacerbated consciousness of it. The gaze is no longer that of the scholar who puts aside (or claims to put aside as much as possible) his own position, but that of a scholar who remains present (within his own time) in the process of apprehending an object from the past. He must accept the fact that he possesses a hybrid, impure gaze, in which different times and experiences are mixed. But what difference is there any more, at this point, between the scholar and the artist? Is an essay by a literary or an art historian of another nature, does it aim for another meaning, than that of a poet drawing inspiration from a past work to write something for his

own time? In other words, to come back to our main issue, are we all medievalists?

This question engages the possibility of constructing an understanding that exceeds mere subjective reception, that establishes criteria that take into account interpretative errors or exactitude, and that establishes distinctions, however prudently, between truth and falsehood.

The scholar's work is part of her effort, that must constantly be renewed, to establish a distance to the object of her study. This effort does not lead to a complete success but constitutes a dynamic principle. To be sure, the work is also for her a site of projections. The philologist is moved by a certain idea of the truth of the text that she is studying. We saw this earlier. Now reading a text in the folios of a manuscript cannot be assimilated to viewing a painting or an image. It is not an immediate experience, not even the illusion of it. The medieval text demands a certain expertise, for without this its language will remain opaque, strange and foreign. In addition, these texts are also vestiges, not only the object of dreams or of reconstitutions. In this sense the medieval cannot be absorbed by medievalism. Zumthor's anthropological proposals give us instruments to contextualise, but do not help us to read, for example, a *trouvère* lyric, contrary to the aims of his first, formalist or linguistic approach.

To awaken ancient texts by framing them within a contemporary discourse or risky analogies, divesting oneself of the phantom notion of restitution, is of the essence. But this act is complete only if the attempt to establish this or that version of the text is accompanied by a meticulous commentary, that itself participates in this awakening and revelation. Scholarly discourse can assume this aspect of the survival of past texts precisely because it is itself the site of a history of this attempt, the site of different periods of understanding, of the establishment of multiple relationships, of the correction of "errors", all moments through which its object elaborates itself. It constitutes the positive site of an endless patchwork.

Poetic language, on its side, has other, complementary, stakes.

I have myself (in 1996 and then in 2000) suggested the French-language neologisms *médiévité* (medievalness), and *médiévalisme* (medievalism) (Gally 2000, 20), both of them to be applied to that which in modern works, both literary and not, remains of medieval motifs, figures and scenarios, that which remains still as a trace or an afterglow. I proposed to understand the meaning and function of these borrowings that were being made, not to produce an archaic effect, but because they were living sources of creativity and expression: this is where the fruitful alliance of the ancient and the modern is played out, capable of refining our definition of the modern more than of the

medieval. The metaphor of afterglow, itself borrowed from scientific discourse, refers for its part to a dialectic of presence and absence, to which is joined the notion of a delayed effect. This metaphor seemed to me appropriate to describe this particular, creative resurgence of medieval elements that are not always either clearly referenced nor even identifiable.

But the study of medieval texts proper remains independent of this process. It is located more on the side of the trace, which archaeologists seek and study and on the basis of which they reconstitute an object, living circumstances, a history. Despite the margin of error, their motivation is that of the quest for that which once was. Manuscript texts constitute the traces on the basis of which medieval scholars can offer all readers the possibility of reading narratives, poems, and treatises that reveal a moment of the history of fiction and of human thought. These texts reformulate, and no doubt also betray, the living word, but, by founding something other than it, by detaching themselves from its immediacy, they have been able to come down to us.

The study of the Middle Ages cannot be reduced to the influence of the Middle Ages on the arts, nor of all the forms of imitation that claim an ancestry in them. The Middle Ages cannot become a pipe dream, as they have for certain authors of anti-academic, anti-intellectualist fantasy who have mastered the art of covering their traces (Besson). Poetic recreations exist fully alongside the archaeology of the past that philologists (in the broad sense, as for Renan) have taken on, despite its difficulty. This archaeology constitutes our duty towards memory, and its scientific objectivity remains the horizon of the specialist, the attempt that he renews at each stage to efface himself as a subject.

The poet adopts a contrary position. He uses the medieval material, he dreams it, he recreates it. He wants to represent *his* world, not that of our ancestors. That is why he makes the medieval blow up into bits, and cleverly falsifies it. His restitution chooses to assume the form of the fragment, as in Apollinaire, Ezra Pound, Yves Bonnefoy, Pierre Michon, or Christian Bobin – or else that of metaphor. The Middle Ages then become an image of our own modernity. They often allow for the expression of a pessimist and disabused vision of the world, that was not that of the medievals themselves, who lived in a world of meaning and not in the modern one of the loss of meaning. The re-use of Arthurian legend and of the character of Merlin by Tankred Dorst, for example, testifies to this inflexion and this a-historical reinterpretation (Gally 2010).

It seems to me essential, for my part, to keep the distinction alive between medieval scholars and medievalists, because this distinction allows us to reflect on the two complementary sides of a necessary relation to the past. The triumph of medievalism over medieval studies would be an ambiguous triumph to the extent that, by in reality considering only its own time, medievalism would confine itself in a stance of presentism that, as the historian François Hartog (157) reminds us, constitutes a mortal risk in our time.

Notes

1. See the study of designations of the Middle Ages by Burde.
2. Thus Paulin Paris, one of the first medieval scholars, belonged to this intellectual movement. See on the differences in interpretation between Paulin Paris and Gaston Paris, Bähler 2004a and 2004b, especially 548-550 : "this position (preferring 'the common people', carriers of national identity, to the clergy) cannot be equated in any sense to any romantically-inspired glorification of popular literature as such" (549).
3. There is not among the *trouvères* any Oulipo-style work according to Guiette, who does not oppose formal virtuosity to the meaning of the poem. See Gally 2011. However, poet-critics such as Jacques Roubaud have tended to consider this lyrical poetry from the viewpoint of its formal games: see below.
4. For a discussion of the definitions of this term, see Ferré.
5. "C'est à une libération totale que tendent les fatrassiers, à une libération que nulle entreprise politique ne saurait leur procurer, à une abolition définitive de tous les interdits, de tous les tabous, de tous les dogmes, de tous les décrets, de toutes les lois, de toutes les formules, de tous les arts de vivre, d'aimer, de penser ou d'écrire qui gênent chaque homme et qui l'entravent dès l'instant où, tout nu, par la trappe d'un ventre, il tombe du Paradis [...] Puissent les amateurs qui feuilletteront notre modeste florilège, avoir le sentiment d'écouter du fond des âges monter un chant préparatoire aux plus téméraires de nos fugues poétiques. Le trésor des fatras, poèmes surréalistes du treizième, du quatorzième et du quinzième siècle, recueillis, commentés, transcrits" (Schmidt, 200).

Works cited

Bähler, Ursula, "Gaston Paris et la philologie romane: quelques réflexions synthétiques" in *Le Moyen Age de Gaston Paris. La poésie à l'épreuve de la philologie,* ed. Michel Zink, Paris, Odile Jacob, 2004. [2004a]
———, *Gaston Paris et la philologie romane*, Geneva, Droz, 2004. [2004b]
Besson, Anne, "Usurper la médiévité: stratégies archaïsantes des réécritures arthuriennes contemporaines", in Burle and Naudet.

Burde, Mark, "Entre médiéval et moyenâgeux, de la marge de manœuvre?", in Burle, Elodie and Naudet.

Burle, Elodie and Valérie Naudet (ed.), *Fantasmagories du Moyen Age* (*Senefiance*, 56), Aix-en-Provence, Presses de l'Université de Provence, 2010.

Cerquiglini, Bernard, *Eloge de la variante. Histoire critique de la philologie,* Paris, Seuil, 1989.

———, Jean-Claude Corbeil, Jan-Marie Klinkenberg and Benoît Peeters (ed.), *Le français dans tous ses états*, Paris, Flammarion, 2000.

Didi-Huberman, Georges, *Devant le temps*, Paris, Minuit, 2000.

Ferré, Vincent, "Introduction (I). Médiévalisme et théorie, pourquoi maintenant?", in Vincent Ferré (ed.), *Médiévalisme. Modernité du Moyen Age*, Paris, l'Harmattan, 2010.

Gally, Michèle, éd., *La trace médiévale et les écrivains d'aujourd'hui*, Paris, PUF, 2000.

———, "L'aura du Moyen Age sur la scène contemporaine", in *Médiévalisme. Modernité du Moyen Age*, éd. Ferré, Vincent, Paris, l'Harmattan, 2010. [2010a]

——— (ed.), *Oc, oïl, si. Les langues de la poésie entre grammaire et musique*, Paris, Fayard, 2010. [2010b]

———, "La poétique de la forme ou la modernité réfléchie d'un médiéviste: Robert Guiette", *Revue des Langues romanes*, 2011.

Hartog, François, *Régimes d'historicité*, Paris, Seuil, 2003.

Jauss, Hans Robert, "Littérature médiévale et expérience esthétique", *Poétique*, 31, 1977.

———, *Pour une esthétique de la réception*, Paris, Gallimard, 1978.

La Ravallière, Alexandre Lévesque de (ed.), *Les poésies du roy de Navarre. Avec des notes et un glossaire françois, précédées de l'histoire des révolutions de la langue française*, Paris, Hippolyte-Louis Guérin et Jacques Guérin, 1742, 2 vols.

Lartigue, Pierre, "Poésie-roman: la littérature médiévale comme vivier de formes", in Gally 2000.

Randall, Michael, "Des fatrasies surréalistes?", *Littérature*, 108 (1997).

Renan, Ernest, *L'avenir de la science*, in *Œuvres complètes*, III, Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1949.

Roubaud, Jacques, *La Fleur inverse*, Paris, Ramsay, 1986.

Schmidt, Albert-Marie, "Présentation [du *Trésor des Fatras*]", in *Cahiers de la Pléiade*, 11, Paris, Gallimard, 1950.

Wallensköld, Axel (ed.), *Les chansons de Thibaut de Champagne, roi de Navarre*, Paris, SATF, 1925.

Zumthor, Paul, *Parler du Moyen Âge*, Paris, Minuit, 1980.

———, *La poésie et la voix dans la civilisation médiévale*, Paris, Seuil, 1984.

———, *La lettre et la voix. De la « littérature » médiévale*, Paris, Seuil, 1987.

———, "Entretiens avec Henri Baudet", in *Ecriture et nomadisme*, Montréal, Hexagone, 1990.