

EMOTIONS, HISTORY AND PRESENCE IN BENOÎT DE SAINTE-MAURE'S *ROMAN DE TROIE*

LUKE SUNDERLAND

ABSTRACT

Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie* is notable for its long descriptions of buildings and objects and for its focus on the emotions of characters. Drawing on historiographical work by Eelco Runia and Frank Ankersmit, amongst others, this article argues that the *Roman de Troie* represents a mode of history privileging a material and affective relationship to the past via engagement of the senses. Rather than representing the past as having a particular meaning for the present, the *Troie* transcends the difference between literature and history, encouraging sensory openness to history whereby the audience might be moved by the past and drawn into shared emotional vulnerability with the protagonists. The *Troie* makes the past present, conjuring it into being to allow for a sublime, traumatic experience of the past.

Keywords: romans antiques; historiography; emotions; senses; presence; history; Troy; trauma; sublime; historical experience

THE *ROMAN DE TROIE* (generally dated to c.1165) is considered a generic hybrid, combining literature and history.¹ Indeed the text claims to present historical truth:² Benoît de Sainte-Maure explicitly rejects Homer's narrative about Troy, choosing as sources the 'eyewitness' accounts of Dares and Dictys.³ He claims that Dares' account was translated from Greek into Latin by Cornelius Nepos, the nephew of Sallust, and that he, in turn, faithfully translates the Latin into French. The text thus authorizes itself by reference to ancient history.⁴ But if the *Roman de Troie* gives itself the status of history, what type of history is it? What was good history for twelfth-century readers? How do we explain the presence of so-called literary features such as laments and descriptions? I will argue here that the *Troie* encourages historical experience: though Benoît flaunts his knowledge, invoking the seven liberal arts and presenting the history of Troy as edifying reading, he does not tame the past and allow comfortable intellectual mastery, but rather encourages emotional involvement. The past is not represented, but re-presented, performed, brought to life through

the stimulation of affective and bodily links, of moods and senses. The narrative flow is frequently interrupted for descriptions focusing on the materiality of objects (the sights and sounds of buildings, tombs, statues, clothing and precious items) and on characters (their physicality, their manners, and most importantly their emotional states). These moments, which modern readers might skip over, play no epistemological role. No new knowledge about the past is communicated. Rather, sensual and emotional interaction with the past is encouraged through focus on its materiality and physicality.

The myth of Trojan descent claimed by many European rulers, including the Normans, made Benoît's text something more than entertainment for his first public, which was probably the Plantagenet court of Henry II. Throughout the Middle Ages, the Troy matter was deployed for differing political or ideological uses, all depending on acceptance of the historical status of the Trojan War and the Trojan diaspora.⁵ On the model of *translatio imperii*, great rulers knew that their doom would come: the fall of Troy prefigured their own demise. More broadly, for medieval thinkers, the past was more than dead tradition, and 'there was no attempt to evaluate the past on its own terms and thereby preserve discontinuities'.⁶ Instead, fantastic genealogies, invented etymologies, forged documents and the abuse of authentic ones all resulted from a mode of thinking where 'the past was only significant with regards to its interpretation, its present intelligibility'.⁷ All medieval Troy stories therefore developed within a context where the past was alive, reused to justify power and to derive lessons for the present. Benoît's prologue connects to that broader phenomenon by stressing the continued need to acquire accurate knowledge about the Trojan past (1–144).⁸ Inspired by this, Matilda Bruckner reads the text in light of medieval memory treatises, suggesting that the *Roman de Troie*'s tendency to divide and recapitulate aids memory, making the past a mirror to reflect on the present.⁹ But the *Troie*, I propose, is irreducible to an epistemological, didactic or political use of the past. Rather, in telling the horrifying destruction of a great civilization, it draws on the power of the senses to encourage curiosity, wonder, emotional exposure and participation in the vulnerability of the Trojans. In its descriptions, the text recreates sensory perception to close the gap between the real and the imagined,¹⁰ to conjure the past into being, rather than representing it as meaning something. And throughout, the Trojans live their future as already past – the future perfect being a key temporal mode of the work – so that the audience might experience their past and future as a vivid present. Within a framework stressing the repeatability of history – all civilizations will fall, just like Troy did – the text works to encourage first sensual, then emotional contact with the past.

My inspirations here are several. First, I draw on Hans-Ulrich Gumbrecht's idea of the 'hidden' potential of literature, the way texts create presence, and change moods and feelings.¹¹ For Gumbrecht, criticism needs to go beyond focus on representation – seeking something more than yet another layer of meaning – and to account for the ability of texts to create emotional climates. Historians Eelco Runia and Frank Ankersmit have, in turn, continued this line of reflection to consider how history might integrate what would normally be considered 'literary' features; Runia tries to shift historical discourse, to move from meaning to presence, from representation to incarnation, from epistemology to ontology, and from identity to estrangement. He sees history as too disturbing to be represented; instead, we should be 'moved by the past', stimulated and troubled by writing that recreates cultural trauma and loss.¹² Ankersmit, who like Gumbrecht and Runia is dissatisfied with postmodern and poststructuralist paradigms for history, explores the stripping away of layers of contextualization to create a material and affective relationship to the past. Ankersmit argues that the past originates in a rupture, a separation from the present which drives a search for historical experience in terms of moods and feelings, rather than objective knowledge. When we experience the past – via historical writing which shares with painting, literature and music the ability to create presence and to affect emotions,¹³ or via historical artefacts – the past becomes less remote. Thus feelings of loss commingle with love and satisfaction, causing what Ankersmit calls 'sublime historical experience', his key example being the collective loss of identity felt after epochal shifts such as the French Revolution. Or, I would add, the fall of Troy, as Benoît too locates historical trauma in the discontinuity of empire. Benoît prefers an architectural metaphor in the *Roman de Troie*, but in his *Chronique des ducs de Normandie*, he likens his writing to a fresco (42,062–71)¹⁴ And Benoît, I will argue, represents the Trojan civilization in terms of the sensations, moods and feelings that its protagonists experienced, interpreting the task of history as the establishment of links to a shared past, stretching empathy across epochal gaps, such that his audience might be moved by Troy's history, and experience the emotional climate of their ancestor civilization.¹⁵

More broadly, in thinking about the *Troie*'s status as history, I have looked to Michel de Certeau's critique of modern historiography.¹⁶ De Certeau contends that history has been essentially rationalist, as historians, on his view, encourage distant meditation by suturing what is dead (past) from what is not, thus killing historical societies so that they, safe in their omniscience, can practise resurrection and ventriloquism, whilst denying the living body of tradition that lies in the gestures, habits and unspoken memories carried by modern societies. The past thus becomes the site of lack, of the repressed that will inevitably return (although

they say little about de Certeau, Runia and Ankersmit clearly take inspiration from him in reading history as trauma).¹⁷ De Certeau suggests that history might instead involve reabsorbing the past through memory, speech and presence, making the past a living treasure in the midst of society. De Certeau's work was furthered by my final inspiration, François Hartog, who argues for the existence of historically- and geographically-different 'regimes of historicity' – that is, different modes of constructing the relationship between past, present and future.¹⁸ Though he admits that every era's historiography is different, Hartog contends that, until the French Revolution, the past was held to inform the present on the model of *historia magistra vitae*, as a useful collection of wisdom. From the French Revolution until the fall of the Berlin Wall, history was dominated by a national, futurist model, where the past no longer informed the present. And since 1989, to follow Hartog's sweeping argument, we live in a presentist era, where the present consumes everything, as the past is brought to us in museums and commemorations. Hartog's model is partially persuasive in this context, but he ignores the mechanism by which the past is made present in texts like the *Roman de Troie*, which creates historical continuity via a specific act of writing, invoking the past in an emotionally and aesthetically engrossing way.¹⁹ The *Troie* shares much with the mode of commemoration (which Hartog sees as modern), combining the past's exemplarity with tributes to its unrepeatable uniqueness. I will argue here, then, that the *Troie*'s temporal contradictions can be attributed to the clash between regimes of historicity at its heart: it commemorates a lost past whilst simultaneously resurrecting it to allow for historical experience and to move beyond intellectualization into the realms of the emotions and the senses.

The Trojan past and the medieval present

For Ankersmit, every civilization drags along its mythologized pasts, 'pasts that it cannot historicize and that no less define its identity [...] than the successfully historicized past', the accepted narrative of past events which are understood as leading teleologically to the present.²⁰ Benoît's *Troie* presents a history that cannot be neatly and safely historicized. The Trojans are the predecessors of medieval Europeans, linked to them as original to copy because, for the medieval reader, Troy represents the ideal civilization, at a level of perfection that later societies will imitate, but never reach. Thus metonymic displacement is combined with metaphoric condensation; that is, successive periods of history are each reduced to one civilization (there were the Trojans, then the Greeks, then the Romans), but these different historical civilizations are also concentrated on one model, since each

subsequent civilization brings with it the best qualities of its predecessors via *translatio studii*. The relationship to the past is ambivalent, a sublime mixture of feelings of loss and recovery, of pain and pleasure, because the movements of *translatio* are not peaceful transfers but violent jolts.²¹ According to this scheme, connections to the Trojan past are scars, and the Trojans are a former identity of medieval Europeans, only possessed in the mode of loss.

Throughout the *Roman de Troie*, Benoît seeks what was exemplary about Trojan life, but also constantly stresses its uniqueness. His history thus creates both distance and the desire to touch, literally and metaphorically. Historical continuities always remain because of the broad schema at work, but in the detail, Benoît moves to overcome distance, by pushing the present into the past, and vice versa, levelling chronological difference. His anachronism is well known: Benoît's ancient warriors fight like twelfth-century knights, run their affairs like medieval lords, and love like Ovidian lovers. The use of repetitive time markers – 'El tens que chantent li oisel' (4,167) [In the season when the birds sing]; 'La nuiz passa, li jorz repere' (12,683) [The night passes, the day returns] – also underscores the cyclic rhythms of human history, inscribing parallels with love lyric, epic poetry and the organization of medieval life. For Benoît, the Trojan past is a living past. After narrating the building of Troy, he suggests genealogies to the present when he declares that the Trojans were great innovators:

Jués establirent e troverent
 Ou mainte feiz se deporterent.
 Onc ne fu riche maïstrie
 N'afaitement ne corteisie
 Dont l'on eüst delit ne joie,
 Que ne trovassent cil de Troie.
 Eschés e tables, jué de dé
 I furent, ce sachiez, trové,
 E mainte autre ovre deportable,
 Riche e vaillant e delitable. (3,177–86)

[They established and invented all the games that they frequently played with pleasure.

There is in fact no skilful invention, no entertainment or courtly pursuit that brings pleasure and joy that was not invented by the Trojans. Chess, backgammon and dice games were all invented there, as were many other great, agreeable and noble entertainments.]

Thus the lost, matchless city left a legacy.²² Troy lies all around us, latent in everyday things. The *Roman de Troie*, which aims to make this presence manifest, is quite different, then, to modern academic history, which de Certeau criticises for killing the past. And when Benoît pauses his narrative to offer an encyclopaedic description of the world, he underscores timeless geographical realities: ‘Oceanum’ (23,129) surrounds the world, which is divided into four parts according to the points of the compass. Julius Caesar, Benoît says, had everything mapped – there are 30 seas, 56 rivers and 62 islands – which Benoît now names.²³ This rehearsal of names creates presence, allowing spatial proximity to overcome temporal distance. The geography described is not specifically ancient or Trojan; rather, the truths of medieval *mappae mundi* have been integrated. This highlights the universal applicability of the text’s narrative, drawing the audience into shared humanity with the protagonists.

The Trojan past is also our present and future, since, on the model of *translatio imperii*, every great civilization will fall to be succeeded by another: the battle between Greece and Troy thus opposes two stages of history. The past fights the future, holding off the end. Here Hector worries about Greek power:

Vez Eürope qui il ont,
 Qui tient la tierce part del mont,
 Ou sunt li mellor chevalier
 E li mieuz duit de guerreier. (3,811–14)

[Look, they have Europe, which is a third of the world, where all the best knights, the most practised in war, are found.]

The people of Asia also obey the Greeks, whose empire looms large, always threatening to overshadow Troy. A number of Trojans can see the writing on the wall: Helenus, Panthus and Cassandra successively warn the Trojans against capturing Helen, but ‘Fortune ne voleit mie | Qui trop lur esteit anemie’ (4,165–66) [Fortune did not want [them to heed the warning] because she was their great enemy]. Cassandra repeatedly complains about her people’s suicidal choices, but she is imprisoned each time: she speaks at length when Paris and Helen marry (4,883–928) and again when the Trojans and Greeks bury the dead after the second battle (10,417–46). But not until Paris dies is her truth realized: ‘Des or veit hom les devinailles | Que Cassandra aveit pramis!’ (22,850–51) [Now we are seeing the prophecies which Cassandra had predicted!]. The term ‘devinailles’ – meaning ‘divine prophecy’, but

also ‘riddle’ – encapsulates Cassandra’s incomprehensible knowledge: the riddle suggests something that can be decoded, but here the challenge of doing so is not taken up.

Andromache too foresees her husband Hector’s death (15,284–87), but he ignores her warnings. As in many medieval texts, prophecy and foreknowledge provide powerful models for telling history, but here they remain powerless on the actantial level. Instead, emotions are foregrounded – on the part of those frustrated characters, unable to sway their colleagues from destructive choices, and on the part of the audience, who witness a series of missed opportunities to avoid doom. Some Trojans, then, are in the position of the reader: they know the future, but cannot alter the course of history. A number of characters resort to abandoning the declining civilization for the rising one: thus Calchas, Aeneas and Antenor switch sides. The movement of *raptus* works analogously: Jason abducts Medea, Hecuba is taken captive in the first destruction of Troy and enslaved, Helen moves the other way but is later returned, Achilles attempts to take Polyxena (via a peace deal), and finally, Andromache is given away to Pyrrhus, son of Achilles, who killed her husband. Defectors and survivors, who include foundational figures such as Aeneas, make the Trojan past a stowaway in the Greek present. Other characters, however, remain blind to what is happening. Thus some Trojans rejoice when they steal Helen:

Grant joi en orent, tiels i ot,
Cui mout pesa puis e desplot;
Tiel en furent joios e lié,
Qui puis en furent tuit irié. (4,633–36)

[They were very joyful about this, including some whom it would later weigh upon and displease; some were joyful and happy who would later be very upset about it.]

The omniscient narrator highlights their ignorance of the consequences. Such characters live in a pure present: Hartog considers this as pre-Christian temporality, citing the example of Achilles in the *Iliad*, who lives each day as the first day, before finally escaping to be celebrated forever as the greatest warrior.²⁴ In the *Roman de Troie*, even at the end, some Trojans, asleep when the Greeks arrive, remain blissfully ignorant. Everything is destroyed and all are killed, foreclosing any remaining genealogies to the future.²⁵ ‘Ha! las! cum fiere destinee! | Cum pesant nuit a cels dedenz!’ (26,060–61) [Alas! How fierce destiny is! What a

horrible night for those inside!], says Benoît, maintaining the spontaneity of his narration until the *dénouement*.

In the *Roman de Troie*, then, there are multiple temporalities, placed somewhere between a visionless present and foreknowledge. Two levels of analysis are possible: the transcendent one, whereby events fit within a grand scheme, and an immanent one, where events are random occurrences. The ambiguous forces of Adventure, Fortune and Destinee lie between the two: they represent both history's arbitrariness and its inevitability. Benoît's own inscription of a sublime experience of history comes through his renunciation of the position of transcendent narratorial mastery. He repeatedly exclaims 'Ha! las!', as though shocked by events. He describes historical battles from within, revealing their chaos, using the *chanson de geste* formulae of 'La oïssiez' and 'La veïssiez' to encourage visualization, and to avoid forcing everything into a predetermined historical scheme. By moving between temporalities, he tells history in its wild, unprocessed, unintellectualized state, denying the inevitability of destruction and death. Benoît's reader can therefore imagine that things could have been different, and events are frequently presented as experienced by many characters – that is, as contingent. As Bruckner shows, the unavoidable is often tied to 'si petite achaison' [such small causes],²⁶ the phrase used, for example, to lament Achilles' fatal love for Polyxena (17,551; see also 10,182 and 19,299). The demise of Troy is overdetermined, in a blur of long-term and short-term causes. Jason and the Argonauts' act of trespass in the Golden Fleece episode and Paris' abduction of Helen are of course important events, but many more offences, loves and rivalries come later. According to Benoît, the fall of Troy was inexorable from the moment of Jason's mission, yet also the product of these subsequent events. Individually, these actions do almost nothing; together, they end an epoch.

Throughout, history's grand narrative is unfolding, but not everyone can perceive it. The fall of Troy strikes Benoît's audience, who are encouraged to identify with those ignorant of their fate. They too could be oblivious, caught in quotidian struggles, failing to realize their place within history. The *Roman de Troie*'s sublime mode of history lies in its creation of a vertiginous sensation around the collapse of a magnificent civilization: the city's elegance stands in counterpoint to its fragility, and its destruction always remains in some sense unimaginable. The *Troie* thus has parallels with Ankersmit's thinking on the French Revolution: it asks its audience to share in the actors' 'feelings of a profound and irreparable loss, of cultural despair, and of hopeless disorientation'.²⁷ As Runia puts it, after a sublime event, history is before (not behind) us, because we lose our sense of history's direction and of our place in it.²⁸ The demise of Troy also fits de Certeau's definition of an historical event,

about which there can be no truth, only a narrative shaped from conflicting imaginations;²⁹ indeed, Benoît starts his account by discussing the existence of multiple narratives about Troy. Thus the *Troie*, set within the context of a lively debate about Troy, aims not just to make the past relevant for the present, but also to make history present, to resurrect a shocking and disturbing reality. In what follows, I will show how this is achieved, arguing that descriptions of buildings, objects and people lay the ground for stimulating the emotions of grief, vengeance and love.

Material presence

The *Roman de Troie*'s long descriptions provide Benoît with moments of artistic freedom from his sources.³⁰ Like much medieval *ekphrasis*, they involve displays of erudition, performing Benoît's authority and allowing for contemplation, instruction and revision.³¹ They have been termed 'excroissances', or 'supplements', the most famous being the alabaster Chamber of Beauties.³² Because of its central position in the text, Penny Sullivan considers it 'a *summa* of the ideal civilisation of Troy', whereas Emmanuèle Baumgartner highlighted the link between *uevres* described in the text and the text itself.³³ Writing parallels the painting and sculpture that it describes, as visual and verbal features grapple with one another. The Chamber symbolizes Benoît's craft, and he uses architectural language to describe his writing: he has 'taillez ... curez ... asis ... e ... posez' (135–46) [shaped, polished, placed and adjusted] the words. The Chamber includes four automata: a girl with a magic mirror which shows true likenesses; another girl who incarnates courtesy and performs acrobatics, juggling and tableaux; a boy who plays twelve instruments, the music chasing away bad intentions, and who spreads flowers which fade but are immediately replaced by more; and finally, another boy who judges correct behaviour. Together, they create continuity between Trojan society and the manners, morals, dress and entertainment of medieval courts. In Jean-Charles Huchet's reading, this is a utopian space built for Paris and Helen to consummate their love, and the automata collapse the distinction between art and life, creating an artificial immersive reality.³⁴

Such descriptions matter as much as the narrative, then, but why? The *ekphrasis* has generally been read in literary terms – as a refuge from the violence – and thus disconnected from the text's working as history. Sarah Kay, however, sees the Chamber as structuring relationships between contraries echoed in the historical battles outside, which form a 'relentless pattern of contrary experiences'.³⁵ Carefully-structured depictions of tombs and cities stand as metaphors for the mind's struggle to comprehend the chaos of history. If

narrative history favours continuity, wholeness and closure, then perhaps such descriptions and recreations favour the opposite: the messy non-closure of the past, its openness to revision, involvement and interaction. Descriptive elements prove absolutely vital to this type of history, I want to suggest, because they form part of a presence culture rather than a meaning culture. Gumbrecht distinguishes the two thus: meaning cultures are mind-focused, with knowledge produced by a subject, whereas presence cultures are body-focused, with knowledge revealed in a subjectless manner.³⁶ In meaning culture, the purely material signifier has no importance once meaning has been revealed, but it remains of interest in presence culture, which inscribes humans in cosmology. Gumbrecht uses the Eucharist to think presence: in the Middle Ages, the body and blood are real presences; later, in the Protestant version, they are representations, introducing historical distance.³⁷ Finally, space has primacy in presence culture, creating continuities, whereas time comes first in meaning culture, because historical difference intervenes. The Chamber of Beauties episode, seen in this light, is a spatial embodiment of the desire for the past, where attempts to trigger imagination and feelings move beyond epistemology. It creates a play between stillness and mobility, distance and closeness, inscribing circularity in the text through its non-linear approach to time.

This perspective casts new light on the text's other descriptions: take, for example, the reconstruction of Troy after its first destruction by the Greeks (which of course prefigures its second, permanent, demise):

Meillor e plus grant la fareient
 E plus defensible e plus fort,
 Qu'il ne criengent ergoil ne tort
 Ne mal voillance de veisin,
 Ne vers rien ne seient acilin,
 Ne de Grezeis n'aient dotance.
 Après porront prendre vengeance
 Del damage qu'on lur at fait.
 Ne firent mie trop lonc plait.
 Ovrers quistrent, assez en orent,
 E, a l'anceis qu'ils onques porent,
 Commencierent le marbre a traire
 E la cité tost a refaire.
 Ce trovent bien li clerc lisant,

E encor est aparissant,
 C'onques en terre n'ot cité
 Qui la resenblast de biauté
 Ne de grandor ne de largece
 Ne de planté ne de richece. (2,980–98)

[They planned to make it better and greater than before, and stronger and easier to defend, such that they would not fear any prideful act or wrong, or their neighbour's ill will, nor would they depend on anyone or have to worry about the Greeks. And afterwards, they would be able to take revenge for the damage done to them. They did not discuss it for very long. They summoned the workers – there were plenty – and as soon as they could they started to extract the marble and to rebuild the city. Clerks who read know – as do many people – that there was never a city on earth that came close to this one for beauty, greatness, generosity, abundance and opulence.]

Presence and absence again struggle against one another. The historical sublime links the city's beauty to its destruction: Benoît frequently says that something could have lasted forever, but did not. Even the greatest human achievements will crumble, he implies. Simultaneously, the city is made materially present in these lengthy descriptions by the movements of poetic language. The tranquil experience of Troy's splendour is always tinged with the terror of its loss. The anaphora of 'ne' here proves ironic: efforts at making the city impregnable will fail, and claims about strength in fact underscore weakness. The hope for future 'venjance' against the Greeks is tainted by awareness that it will be transitory, with its rhyme partner 'dotance' here connoting the fear that the Trojans should have. This colours how we read the rest of the romance, especially the repeated assertions of Troy's irreplaceability. The *Roman d Troie* works to bridge the historical gap, making the twelfth-century audience experience Troy through descriptions, which betray a continuing struggle between motionlessness and movement. The senses are engaged:

Mout la troverent degastee,
 Mais cent tanz mielz l'ont restoree;
 Mout la referent bele e gente.
 Mout i must Prianz grant entente:
 Mout la fist clore de bons murs
 De marbre, hauz, espés e durs.

Mout en erent haut li terrier,
 Au meinz del trait a un archier.
 Aveit granz tors tot environ,
 Faites de chاوز e de sablon.
 De marbre fin e de liois,
 Jaunes e verz, indes e blois
 En esteient tuit li quarrel
 Mout bien entaillié a cisel. (3,001–14)

[They found [the city] completely destroyed, but restored it so it was one hundred times better; they made it very beautiful and elegant. Priam put great effort into it: he had the city enclosed with good walls of marble, high, thick and strong. The parapets were very high, at least as high as an arrow could be fired. There were great towers all around, made of lime and sand. The stones were yellow, green, indigo and blue, made of fine marble and limestone, and they were very carefully chiselled.]

The description of materials captivates our sight, whereas the evocation of care invites a slowing of the reader's engagement and a fixing of attention. Where a painting would use colours and shapes in space, Benoît's poetry uses noises in time to imply the repetitive strokes of building work. The materialization of language via repeated sounds – especially 'm' here – helps to activate the other senses, placing the past within touching distance. Focus is drawn onto the surface of objects, creating a textual version of haptic visuality.³⁸ The workers' handling of the materials works as a proxy for our own touch. The hyperbolic anaphora of 'mout' [greatly, or very] highlights the city's size, especially its height, invoking a sublime experience: the viewer feels small as towers rise above them. Most importantly, the kinetic aspect to the description – we witness not the finished object, but its making – reanimates Troy. We relive the *grandeur* of the lost civilization: its significance is not baldly stated, but rather performed, re-presented, built again. Next, the reciting of the names of the city's six gates gives the description the air of a litany, hinting that everything here is heritage, from the smallest detail up. All this sets the tragic tone for what happens later. In this description, Benoît mobilizes a particularly eloquent pairing of rhyme words – 'degastee / restoree' [destroyed / restored] – preparing for the city's final destruction. These moments of concentrated intensity, of focus and loss in the experience of aesthetics, remove the protective shell of narrative. Troy is decontextualized, with the imperfect tenses connoting process and repetition. There is openness to the past, desire to touch and bodily investment.

We pay attention ‘to the textual dimension of the forms that envelop us and our bodies as a physical reality – something that can catalyse inner feelings without matters of representation necessarily being involved’.³⁹ The text encourages us to find sources of energy and movement in imaginary artistic creations, and to yield, affectively and bodily, to the wonders of history.

Descriptions of people provide another source of marvels. Benoît says that Dares relayed ‘les senblances ... | E la forme’ (5,096–97) [the appearance and the physique] of those involved because he saw them all and wanted to make his history complete. Such descriptions are largely paratactic, with a catalogue feel. No narrative interrupts several hundred lines of description of first the Greeks – Helen’s nonpareil beauty, then the warrior men, finally Briselda – then the Trojans, starting with Priam. The longest description is accorded to Hector. More Trojan women figure (Hecuba, Andromache, Cassandra, Polyxena), and Benoît praises the Trojans at greater length, giving the work an epitaphial quality: Troilus, Paris and others represent the lost past. In all the portraits, physical attributes (beauty, strength) combine with emotional dispositions (to happiness or moroseness), habits such as jokes or the tendency to fall asleep, abilities such as music, legal understanding and eloquence, personal qualities like courtliness and boldness or arrogance and cruelty. Benoît adeptly finds small details that animate the character, recalling Runia’s argument that metonymy is the trope of ‘presence in absence’.⁴⁰ In metonymy, one aspect is named, but a whole array of traits is evoked. Thus Runia argues that metonymical monuments transfer presence through the incorporation of original material or through naming names: victims’ names connote whole lives, proving more powerful by saying less.⁴¹ Runia describes the Cenotaph as the quintessential metonymic monument, where the name is ‘an abyss in which we may gaze into the fullness of a life that is no more’.⁴² Similarly, Benoît catalogues ships’ captains (5,583–702) and lists leaders of battalions (7,641–8,328).⁴³ These sequences of memorial evocation, with their encyclopaedic quality, stand out from the surrounding narrative, highlighting discontinuity even as they suggest that every element of the Trojan era merits commemoration. Elsewhere, Benoît also lists victims, clearly recognizing the power of naming names.⁴⁴

It is worth examining a particular description in depth:

Des Troïens li plus hardiz
Esteit sans faille Hector sis fiz.

Des Troïens? Voire del mont,
 De ceus qui furent ne qui sunt,
 Ne qui ja mais jor deivent estre.
 Des biens le fist Nature mestre
 E des bontez qu'on puet avoir.
 En lui monstra tot son saveir,
 For que plus bel le poüst fere,
 Mais nus n'en siet meillor retrere.
 S'en lui veer riens mesavint,
 Par le bien faire li covint.
 Ce savez bien, haute pröesce
 Abaisse bien cri de laidece. (5,313–26)

[Of all the Trojans the bravest was certainly Hector, his [that is, Priam's] son. Of the Trojans? Even of the whole world, of all those who lived or who are alive or who will live one day. Nature made him the master of all good qualities and virtues. In him, she showed all her skill, though she could have made him a bit more handsome, still no one could describe a more worthy man. If there was something wrong with his appearance, he made up for it with good deeds. As you know, great prowess strikes down any accusation of ugliness.]

The eternity of Hector's magnificence transcends past, present and future. Nature, that undying force, perfected her work in him. The flaw of looks humanizes him, but he surpasses that via prowess. Overall, there is no economy of words. Instead, a mood of commemoration is created through repetitive, almost formulaic portraits. In these moments, Benoît pauses the plot to alter our affective relationship to it by creating the presence of human bodies and personalities. The portraits just discussed come just after Paris and Helen marry, when the war is brewing. Framed as they are within a narrative of destruction and loss, they create an atmosphere, a predisposition which allows for grief, the primary emotional state we are summoned to experience with the characters.

Emotional contagion

Throughout the text, the pain felt by Greeks and Trojans for their fallen warriors provides both a proxy and a cue for our own mourning. Like Ankersmit, in whose argument the French Revolution is dominant, Benoît focuses on the trauma of history. Both the Revolution and fall

of Troy create chasms, separating a before and an after. Nothing will ever be the same. Thus the lament is the *Roman de Troie*'s key mode: the deaths of major characters, including Patroclus, Hector, Troilus and Paris, are accompanied by long laments, hundreds of lines of direct speech.⁴⁵ The presence of the dead and their power over the living grow as the speeches extend. Anthony Grafton has documented how, in the early modern period, good history meant imagining what actors would have argued or felt, and thus inventing discourses that seemed realistic.⁴⁶ Benoît's text shows that this mode of ventriloquism had medieval roots. He narrates many complaints for the dead, which share the features of an apostrophe to the fallen, expressions of affection and praise, sadness and suffering, and anaphora, Benoît's stylistic tic. Hector's death provides the most developed example. Afterwards, the Trojans 'N'orent ainc puis ne bien ne joie' (16,318) [Never again knew happiness or joy], Benoît announces:

Li doleros destrüement

Sunt avenue e avendront:

Ja ainz li jué ne remaindront. (16,476–78)

[The painful destructions have occurred and will occur: from now on the games will not cease.]

The term 'jué' is used in an unusual way, referring to struggles, but also to the way fortune toys with the Trojans. Temporality is again multi-layered. The prophecies both have now come true and are now coming true. Hecuba, Helen and Polyxena all say that Cassandra was right, and Benoît dangles the possibility that the fall of Troy could have been avoided, if Andromache had been listened to: 'Se fust tenuz li suens deviez, | Encor n'eüst Troie nul mal' (16,472–73) [If her warning had been heeded, Troy would not have been harmed at all]. Thus it is not just Hector who dies here; with him perishes the abstract idea of Hector, the undefeatable warrior, and the very possibility of Trojan survival. Paris asks: 'Qui nos sera mes confanons, | Chastiaus, estandarz ne dragons?' (16,381–82) [Who now will be our banner, our fortress, our standard or ensign?]. I have quoted selectively here, but grief accumulates across successive laments: character after character intervenes, retroactively colouring with tragedy the portraits just discussed. The power of the warriors underscores the importance of their loss, turning the Trojans from historical agents into the victims of destiny.

Lamenting forms part of the commemoration that dominates the *Roman de Troie*'s later sections. The long procedure of embalming Hector is described in detail, as is his tomb. Rockwell notes how the mimetic fidelity of tombs is stressed, emphasizing the *Troie*'s self-proclaimed status as skilled artistry. whereas Croizy-Naquet sees the city as macrocosm and the tomb as microcosm.⁴⁷ But tombs also represent collapsed temporality; no sooner does history happen than it is commemorated. Benoît spends as much time narrating the building of memorials to Trojan history as its events. Here he describes the statues at Hector's tomb:

Tres de devant l'autel major,
 Firent trei saive engigneur
 Un tabernacle precïos,
 Riche e estrange e merveillos.
 Quatre ymages firent estanz,
 Igaus de groisses e de granz.
 Lions asistrent soz lur piez,
 D'or esmerez bien entailliez,
 Les ymages d'or ensement.
 Les dous erent de biau jovent,
 Les autres dous, de grant aage. (16,649–59)

[Right in front of the main altar, three wise engineers made a beautiful, opulent, unique and marvellous tabernacle. They erected four statues, of the same size and shape. They placed lions on their feet, of pure gold, well sculpted, and the statues were made of gold too. Two were of beautiful young men, and the other two, of very old men.]

Benoît maps lines of sight, focusing attention on the making of objects. The statues of young and old connote the stages of life, but also time's petrification. Each statue holds in its hand a smaller statue made of a precious stone: the first of dark red jacinth, the second of green quartz, the third of an Egyptian stone, the rarest in the world, and the fourth made when a fruit falls into the river of Paradise. If it remains there for seven years, it will become an exquisite stone:

Vertuz a granz e tiel nature
 Qu'om desvé, sans escient,
 Qui rien ne siet ne rien n'entent,

Rameine tot en sa memoire. (16,688–91)

[It has a great magical power: it can bring back the senses of a madman who has lost his mind and who knows and understands nothing.]

Idioms of restoration, intelligence and memory thus figure once more: the tomb is covered in metaphors for the process it enacts. The foundation of a monastery then brings in another transcendental register. The tomb's columns are wondrously high, and arches vault over them. The canopy of gold and precious stones 'Plus resenbla ciels estelez | Que nule rien qui fust el mond' (16,712–13) [Looks more like the starry sky than anything on earth]. The greatest achievement of Trojan civilization, then, is a recreation of the heavens. Hector's death provides the occasion for Benoît's language to stretch towards the sublime.

All these details connote uniqueness and permanence. The clothing Hector is dressed in allows for a virtual resurrection: 'quant il li orent vestue, | Senblant vos fust qui toz iert vis' (16,526–27) [when they had dressed him, it looked as though he were still alive]. And when Hector's body is brought out, grief is 'refreschi' (16,747) [begun again]. Many die of sorrow, thus enacting an experience of a past too traumatic to assimilate. Hector's irreplaceability is stressed, his epitaph noting that although Achilles killed him, this was not in a one-to-one battle, implying that he technically remained undefeated. Certain of his victims are named, whereas for others 'n'est ore faiz remenbrenz' (16,848) [no commemoration will be made]. This creates a stark contrast between the way Hector is remembered and the oblivion into which he cast others. The anniversary of Hector's death opens a new temporal dimension as the Trojans join the medieval audience in looking back on the Trojan past. People enter the tomb, discovering that the body, like that of a saint, 'gist sans porriture' (17,504) [lay without decay]:

Le jor le virent bel e freis
Chevalier, dames e borgeis:
Ainc ne leidi ne enpira,
Car cil qui aromatiza
L'en gardast de ci qu'au joïse,
Se la chose ne fust malmise. (17,505–10)

[That day knights, ladies and townspeople saw him beautiful and fresh: he had not grown ugly or deteriorated, because the man who embalmed him could have preserved him until Judgment Day, if things had not turned badly.]

Thus the *Roman de Troie* describes both the process of commemoration and the experience of the product. As Runia argues, when we commemorate due to a scarcity of memories, ontological and existential issues of presence and absence figure.⁴⁸ Places in particular provide storehouses of history, and here too, the process of history is cast as stowage and retrieval, and as a flitting between presence and absence. ‘Le jor’ telescopes the great expanses of history into one, visualizable moment, whereas the ‘chevalier, dames e borgeis’ constitute an inscribed audience who embody readers’ participation in remembrance. The skilful embalming connotes both the permanence and the downfall of Troy, implying that the Trojans were capable of building things that would have lasted forever, if the forces of history had not turned against them. Hector symbolizes, once again, the entire civilization. The subsequent sacrifices and services, at which Greeks are present, thus become the commemoration of a fall yet to happen. In its materiality, Hector’s body figures his own greatness and that of Troy. The entire signifier *perdures*, incorruptible, showing the tangibility of history, its appeal beyond the intellectual pleasure of accumulating fact. When Hector is recreated, the past is made present, experientially, for the Trojans and for the audience. The *Troie*, overall, stages commemoration, showing us not just how to understand Trojan history, but how to experience its presence and sublimity.

Languages of hate and love

In the *Roman de Troie*, emotions provide a point of contact with the past, without allowing for control. The immediacy of emotions – untied from their moorings in the past – bring out our shared humanity with the protagonists, who have no grip on events. Human action appears ultimately futile because humans cannot control the course of history, but the *Troie* avoids a sense of anarchy by having meaning crystallize in individual and collective emotions, which anchor the action within a recognizable symbolic order. Likewise, Ankersmit argues that ‘moods and feelings define the place where the transition from past to present [...] will preferably be enacted’.⁴⁹ Indeed, in describing hate and love, the *Troie* collapses the difference between antique and twelfth-century ‘emotional communities’, implying shared norms of emotional expression in order to create links to the past.⁵⁰ First, the *Troie* draws on a language of vengeance redolent of *chansons de geste*. The pattern of strike

and counter-strike is driven by honour and shame, and concepts of right and wrong, which give the characters an illusion of control. For example, Helen's capture is designed to avenge the seizure of Hesiona. Paris dreams that the gods promise success for his revenge mission (3,845–928), and when baleful prophecies are made, they are ignored. The language of revenge subsequently drives the mission by the Greeks who seek to get Helen back. In such moments, the *Troie* works by escalation: hostilities simmer, then boil over, with repeated violent acts calling for vengeance. Indeed, laments often also mention desire for vengeance: for example, Achilles' desire to avenge Patroclus, proclaimed in his complaint, will lead to Hector's death. In turn, after Hector's death, Paris laments: 'qui venjera mes nos morz?' (16,380) [who will now avenge our dead?]. The cycle of vengeance seems to be closed, yet Hector's preserved body holds a sword, signifying retaliation (16,791–93). His tomb thus points towards the future as well as the past. Although in the *Troie* it is generally men who combine laments with calls to vengeance, Hecuba will later organize vengeance for Hector by sending Paris to kill Achilles, before the cycle is completed when Hecuba and Polyxena, the *femme fatale* who lured Achilles, die at the hands of the Greeks. Throughout, the telling of history is structured in a way familiar to a twelfth-century audience, thanks to idioms of vengeance.

Similarly, the text uses the twelfth century's language of love. Ovidian and troubadour influences encourage empathy with the couples whose passionate affairs the *Troie* narrates: Jason and Medea, Paris and Helen, Briselda and first Troilus then Diomedes (after she changes camp), and Achilles and Polyxena. I will concentrate here on Achilles and Polyxena, because their narrative shapes the final days of Troy. At the anniversary of Hector's death, Achilles sees Polyxena, and the narrator immediately announces that 'il fu destreiz par fine amor' (17,547) [he was destroyed by true love]. He needs help, but 'cest secors avra il a tart' (17,634) [succour will come to him too late]. The play between the past ('fu destreiz') and future ('avra') tenses shapes the present we witness here. The clichés of *fîn' amor* are then performed. Contradictory emotional states texture Benoît's telling: Polyxena's beauty makes an 'estencele' (17,554) [spark] in Achilles's heart, consuming him with fire, though he is also frozen. The declaration that Achilles 'en son cuer l'a descrite e peinte' (17,557) [has described and painted her in his heart], encapsulates the text's belief that descriptions can construct emotions. Love causes him a 'mortiel plaie' (17,562) [mortal wound] and 'descepline' (17,570) [suffering], and gives 'tiel fes' (17,630) [such a burden]. As Achilles stands transfixed, he changes colour. The impossible love between a Greek and a Trojan here provides a conduit for sublime historical experience, as the *Troie* confronts its

audience with the familiar contradictions of love. As Gumbrecht argues, presence culture needs a concept of event without surprise; for example, when the orchestra starts to play it strikes us, but does not surprise us.⁵¹ Achilles's *plaintes*, too, move without surprising: couched in customary terms, they provide a mode of access to emotions shared with past actors.

One of Achilles' laments weaves together enmity towards the Trojans and desire for Polyxena: she is the lover/enemy who will be his downfall, as the repeated rhyme 'mortel ennemie / amie' (17,657–58) [mortal enemy / friend] suggests. After the death of Hector, Polyxena is the only Trojan who can avenge Hector. Love will do what violence could not. Achilles laments:

Ha! las, fait il, tant mar i mui!
 Tant mar alai veeir les lor!
 Tant mar i vi la resplendor
 Dont mis cuers sent mortel dolor
 E main e seir e nuit e jor! (17,638–42)

[Alas, he says, I should never have gone there! I rue the day I went to see them! I should never have seen the magnificence which has brought mortal suffering into my heart, morning and evening, night and day!]

The anaphora of 'tant mar', the evocation of sight as fatal, the ambiguity of 'resplendor' [magnificence], which could refer to Troy itself as well as to the Trojan *femme fatale*, and the polysyndeton at the end, all stress Achilles's endless suffering. For Ankersmit, historical experience involves decontextualization on the level of the subject, and the feeling of being enraptured, caught up in the intensity of an experience.⁵² Here, too, spatial and temporal demarcations have been lifted: although in one breath Achilles declares that his suffering is unique, in another he universalizes his experience via a comparison to Narcissus (17,691–96), before rebelling against this parallel.⁵³ Throughout, Benoît adopts a universalizing tone, describing the 'servizes' [tasks] and 'rente' [payments] love demands (18,020). But this is exemplarity without a moral, since love can conquer anyone. This fits with the poem's overall oscillation between exemplarity and uniqueness, between the unrepeatability of Troy's fall and the inevitability of its repetition.

Achilles now offers Hecuba peace in exchange for her daughter's hand. This pause in the historical narrative is filled with literary love, as Achilles suffers the 'jeuz' (18,005) [games; but here, torments] of love. Though Achilles's offer is accepted, his men refuse to concede. Achilles forbids them to fight but later relents, and many are wounded or killed. Love chastises him for disrespecting his 'secroi' (20,710) [secret agreement]. Polyxena complains to love and Achilles is therefore tormented: 'Des jeus partis n'a pas le choix' (20783) [He does not have any choice in the debate]. This reference to a debate poem opposing contrary positions encapsulates his subsequent comportment: he switches between fighting and yielding. But eventually, he kills Troilus, leading Hecuba to seek vengeance. She offers him Polyxena's hand. Achilles, suspecting nothing because love blinds him, is ambushed and killed by Paris. This key historical moment has been retold in a familiar language of love and revenge.

The laments for Achilles match those for Hector. Most intriguingly, his great tomb includes a statue of Polyxena, who is alive:

Formee l'unt en tiel maniere
 Que molt en fait dolente chiere.
 Si fist ele, ce sachez bien,
 Qu'il l'en pesa sor tote rien. (22,443–46)

[They sculpted it such that she had an absolutely sorrowful face. And know that she really was like that, and that [his death] made her suffer more than anything.]

Polyxena's narrative weaves together love, hate and the power of art, in its prescience, to prove more real than reality. She actually is sorrowful, her sculpture voicing this hidden truth. Her death is prefigured: the omnipresence of commemoration means she, like the other Trojans, now lives in an eternal present. Hartog thinks that the late twentieth-century vogue for heritage means that the present devours everything. Every occurrence, he argues, is documented, archived and commemorated because the present worries incessantly about how it will be remembered.⁵⁴ In the *Troie* too, the Greeks and Trojans are preoccupied with writing their own legacies. Polyxena's tomb, in particular, represents the metonymical presence of the narrative future. Her statue holds a vessel into which Achilles' ashes are placed. However, later, there is unfinished business: the Greeks cannot leave, because the Furies, who want vengeance for Achilles, cause a storm. Polyxena's tomb has been made, but

the present cannot be pushed into the past until she lies in it. Antenor, aiming to complete the cycle of vengeance, betrays her to Ulysses. Polyxena is lamented even before she dies:

Quant que Nature ot de beauté
 Mist ele en li par grant loisir.
 De sa beauté m'estuet taisir
 Quar ne la porreie descrire
 En demi jor trestot a tire. (26,452–56)

[All the beauty that Nature possessed, she placed in her with a free hand. But I must stop talking of her beauty since I could not describe it fully even if I had half a day to do so.]

Benoît's muteness about her beauty marks the end, the winding down of his *amplificatio*, which has driven our contact with history. Polyxena claims innocence, presenting her death as an unnecessary supplement:

Ocis avez Priant le rei,
 Ses fiz, ses freres, ses nevoz
 E ses autres bons amis toz:
 D'ocire e d'espandre cerveles
 E d'estre en sanc e en boëles
 Deüssiez estre si saol,
 E aveir en atel refoi
 Qu'un meis entire avez esté
 Si cruelment ensanglenté
 De l'ocise des cors dampnez
 Que c'est merveille qu'or avez
 De ma mort faim ne desirier. (26,488–99)

[You have killed King Priam, his sons, his brothers, his nephews and all his other close allies. You must be so sick of killing and spilling brains and of wallowing in blood and bowels, and you must be disgusted after spending a whole month covered in blood from the bodies of those you killed – it is a marvel that you now hunger for and desire my death.]

The aesthetics are as grim as earlier descriptions were beautiful. Polyxena, given material and emotional presence, stands witness to history's violence. Thus the Trojan past is made

available to medieval readers, not as a story with a fixed meaning, but as an emotional experience, entangled in distant but recognizable subjectivities. An inscribed audience sympathizes with Polyxena, as she dies with her virginity. She defies the Greeks whose bloodlust is thus sexualized (26,504–26).⁵⁵ Benoît makes Polyxena a saint, highlighting once more her unique beauty, purity and wisdom. Polyxena's narrative imbricates love, vengeance and the omnipresence of commemoration in the *Troie*'s conflicting temporalities. In one sense, she becomes the final Trojan object crushed by history; in another, she lives forever. She encapsulates the way the city succumbs to desires for love and vengeance, as Benoît makes the death of Troy a beautiful suicide, whilst colouring the Greek victory with treachery and illegitimacy. Understanding history, for Benoît, means sharing in its traumas. In the narratives of Hector, Achilles and Polyxena, love affairs and wars of vengeance provide him with conduits for historical experience that encourage not distance, but rather emotional engagement with the past.

Conclusion

The *Roman de Troie* does not tame the past as de Certeau thinks modern academic history does, but embraces its wildness, as affective links complicate our epistemological relationship to the past. My argument could, I believe, be extended to the other *romans antiques*. Are they part of a regime of historicity that was left behind? Hartog's broad-brush argument certainly needs complicating: there is more than one premodern regime of history, and even within the *Troie*, the relationship between past, present and future is repeatedly refigured. Ankersmit considers the development of historical writing as a series of experiments with language.⁵⁶ The *romans antiques* certainly deserve their place within that, but their simultaneously enchanting and traumatic model of history was largely replaced by desiccated history in the thirteenth century. The specificity of Benoît's verse as an emotional and sensual engagement with the past comes out clearly in comparison to the thirteenth-century prose *Troie*, a vastly popular text which relegates Benoît's romance to the status of fictional fable, whilst drawing on his translation from Latin, retaining the speeches but dispensing with his visual and auditory aesthetics by curtailing the spectacular descriptions. Critical distance is encouraged, whereas seductive, emotional elements are subdued in favour of moralizations condemning passions and vices. Troy is temporally situated, allowing for an eschatological view of its destruction, as part of a Christian historical ethos emphasizing the inevitable decline of decadent civilizations.⁵⁷ Thus the shift to an historical culture of meaning arguably began in the thirteenth century. De Certeau shows how it reached its peak

in the fifteenth century, when nobles tried to control history to justify their privileges and assert their genealogies.⁵⁸ Knowledge about the past was thus securely placed within a marshalled system of erudition. This mode of history was long-lived, but I have shown, I hope, that the twentieth- and twenty-first-century turn against epistemological history can help grasp twelfth-century historical texts. If we recognize that the boundary between history and literature was porous, then we need more rigorous thought about what this actually means. Other genres, such as epic, could be usefully discussed in this light. Ankersmit argues that history, so long rationalized, should be romanticized once more,⁵⁹ and Benoît de Sainte-Maure undoubtedly knew how to make history enthralling, harrowing and moving.

*School of Modern Languages & Cultures
Durham University
New Elvet
Durham DH1 3JT
United Kingdom
luke.sunderland@durham.ac.uk*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Miranda Griffin for her insightful comments on a draft of this article.

NOTES

¹ Most recently, by Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner: 'Remembering the Trojan War: Violence Past, Present, and Future in Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie*', *Speculum*, 90.2 (2015), 366–90 (p. 366).

² See David Rollo, 'Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie*: Historiography, Forgery, and Fiction', *Comparative Literature Studies*, 32.2 (1995), 191–225. Critical work treating the *Troie* as history has focused overwhelmingly on truth claims.

³ Aimé Petit covers Benoît's reinvention of his sources: *L'Anachronisme dans les romans antiques du XII^e siècle: le 'Roman de Thèbes', le 'Roman d'Énéas', le 'Roman de Troie', le 'Roman d'Alexandre'* (Paris: Champion, 2002).

⁴ See Marilyn Desmond, 'History and Fiction: The Narrativity and Historiography of the Matter of Troy', in *The Cambridge History of French Literature*, ed. by William Burgwinkle, Nicholas Hammond and Emma Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 139–44 (p. 141).

⁵ Desmond, 'History and Fiction', p. 144.

⁶ Janet Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 289.

⁷ Ibid., p. 558.

⁸ I quote throughout from the edition by Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Françoise Vieliard, *Le Roman de Troie* (Paris: Lettres gothiques, 1998). Translations are my own.

⁹ See Bruckner, 'Remembering the Trojan War'.

¹⁰ On this capacity of literary texts, see Gregor Vogt-Spira, 'Senses, Imagination, and Literature', in *Rethinking the Medieval Senses: Heritage, Fascinations, Frames*, ed. by Stephen G. Nichols and others (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), pp. 51–72.

¹¹ Hans-Ulrich Gumbrecht, *Atmosphere, Mood, Stimmung: On a Hidden Potential of Literature*, trans. by Erik Butler (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012).

¹² Eelco Runia, *Moved by the Past: Discontinuity and Historical Mutation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), pp. xiv–xv.

¹³ One model for Ankersmit is Johan Huizinga, for whom history can arouse spiritual enjoyment, similar to artistic experience; another is Jacob Burckhardt, who offers 'a past that we encounter as we look at a painting and where all that truly counts happens between the painting and ourselves': F. R. Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005), p. 168.

¹⁴ Quoted by Paul Vincent Rockwell, 'Remembering *Troie*: The Implications of *Ymages* in the *Roman de Troie* and the Prose *Lancelot*', *Arthuriana*, 7.3 (1997), 20–35 (p. 24).

¹⁵ Barbara Rosenwein argues that each epoch creates an 'emotional community'; see Barbara Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

¹⁶ Michel de Certeau, *L'Écriture de l'histoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975).

¹⁷ Noah Guynn also dialogues with de Certeau in 'Historicizing Shame, Shaming History: Origination and Negativity in the *Eneas*', *L'Esprit Créateur*, 39.4 (1999), 112–27.

¹⁸ Michel de Certeau, *Régimes d'historicité: présentisme et expériences du temps* (Paris: Seuil, 2012).

¹⁹ Gabrielle Spiegel argues that medieval historiography involves creating continuity with the classical past via acts of intellectual will and anachronisms that make the past a repository of precedents: *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), pp. 103–11.

²⁰ Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience*, p. 368.

²¹ I agree with Christopher Baswell that the *romans d'antiquité* betray a fear of history, displaying an apocalyptic view of foundings and endings: 'Fearful Histories: The Past Contained in the Romances of Antiquity', in *Romance and History: Imagining Time from the Medieval to the Early Modern Period*, ed. by Jon Whitman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 23–39 (p. 25).

²² For Spiegel, the *romans d'antiquité* begin the process of historicizing chivalric ideology, creating a secular genealogy of ethics (*Romancing the Past*, pp. 152–53).

²³ The Lettres gothiques edition omits these lines; they can be consulted in *Le Roman de Troie*, ed. by Léopold Constans, 6 vols (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1904–12), IV (1908), ll. 23,175–301.

²⁴ de Certeau, *Régimes d'historicité*, p. 71.

²⁵ David Rollo, 'Political Violence and Sexual Violation in the Work of Benoît de Sainte-Maure', in *Violence and the Writing of History in the Medieval Francophone World*, ed. by Noah D. Guynn and Zrinka Stahuljak (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2013), pp. 117–32 (p. 123).

²⁶ 'Between Prophecy and *Plainte* in the *Roman de Troie*', *Electronic Antiquity*, 14.1 (2010), 127–49 (p. 128); see also her 'Remembering the Trojan War'.

²⁷ Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience*, p. 324.

²⁸ Runia, *Moved by the Past*, p. 8.

²⁹ Rollo, *Violence and the Writing of History*, pp. xiv–xv.

³⁰ See Baumgartner and Viellard's edition of the *Le Roman de Troie*, p. 10; Catherine Croizy-Naquet, *Thèbes, Troie et Carthage: poétique de la ville dans le roman antique au XII^e siècle* (Paris: Champion, 1994), p. 18.

³¹ See Claire Barbetti, *Ekphrastic Medieval Visions: A New Discussion in Interarts Theory* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 8.

³² Jean-Charles Huchet, 'La Beauté littéraire dans le *Roman de Troie* de Benoît de Sainte-Maure', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 142 (1993), 141–49 (p. 142); Bruckner, 'Remembering *Troie*', p. 22. Rockwell notes that the Chamber did not exist before Priam's time. It is added to Troy during the rebuilding, just as Benoît adds its description to Dare.

³³ Emmanuèle Baumgartner, 'Medieval Automata: The "Chambre de Beautés" in Benoît's *Roman de Troie*', *Romance Studies*, 3.2 (1985), 1–20 (p. 12). 'Benoît de Sainte-Maure et l'œuvre de Troie', in *The Medieval Opus: Imitation, Rewriting, and Transmission in the French Tradition*, ed. by Douglas Kelly (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 15–28.

³⁴ Huchet, 'La Beauté littéraire', p. 149.

³⁵ Sarah Kay, *Courtly Contradictions: The Emergence of the Literary Object in the Twelfth Century* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), p. 119.

³⁶ Hans-Ulrich Gumbrecht, *Production of Presence: What Meaning Cannot Convey* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 80–83.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 28–30.

³⁸ The concept is Laura U. Marks's; see *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000).

³⁹ Gumbrecht, *Atmosphere, Mood, Stimmung*, p. 5.

⁴⁰ Runia, *Moved by the Past*, p. 55.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁴³ These lines do not feature in the Lettres gothiques edition; see the Constans edition.

-
- ⁴⁴ See for example ll. 10,399–416, omitted from the *Lettres gothiques* edition.
- ⁴⁵ For Bruckner, ‘prophecies, dream visions, divine oracles look forward to future action; the mourner’s *planctus* turns back toward the past and confirms prophecy’s fulfillment’ (‘Between Prophecy and *Plainte*’, p. 129).
- ⁴⁶ Anthony Grafton, *What was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 36.
- ⁴⁷ Bruckner, ‘Remembering *Troie*’, p. 25. Croizy-Naquet, *Thèbes, Troie et Carthage*, p. 15.
- ⁴⁸ Runia, *Moved by the Past*, p. 12.
- ⁴⁹ Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience*, p. 309.
- ⁵⁰ I draw here on Barbara Rosenwein’s *Emotional Communities*.
- ⁵¹ Hans-Ulrich Gumbrecht, *Production of Presence*, p. 84.
- ⁵² Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience*, p. 128.
- ⁵³ Jane Gilbert shows how medieval characters tend to identify with Narcissus, and simultaneously to deny this identification: “‘I Am Not He’: Narcissus and Ironic Performativity in Medieval French Literature’, *Modern Language Review*, 100 (2005), 940–53.
- ⁵⁴ de Certeau, *Régimes d’historicité*, p. 248.
- ⁵⁵ Rollo, ‘Political Violence’, p. 121.
- ⁵⁶ Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience*, p. 138.
- ⁵⁷ Croizy-Naquet, ‘Troy and Rome: Two Narrative Presentations of History in the Thirteenth Century: The *Roman de Troie en prose* and the *Faits des Romains*’, trans. by Jonathan Stavsky, in *Romance and History*, ed. Whitman, pp. 40–52. Spiegel contrasts the *romans d’antiquité*, with their eroticized view of the antique period, to thirteenth-century chronicles focusing more on martial and chivalric aspects (*Romancing the Past*, p. 112).
- ⁵⁸ Rollo, *Violence and the Writing of History*, p. 73.
- ⁵⁹ Ankersmit, *Sublime Historical Experience*, p. 191.

[LUKE SUNDERLAND

EMOTIONS, HISTORY AND PRESENCE IN THE *ROMAN DE TROIE*]