To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Sandra Jeanne Vasa entitled "A Study of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot and Its Place in Medieval French Drama." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in French.

Paul Barrette

Paul Barrette, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Jacqueline C. Elliott

Harry C. Rutledge

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

A STUDY OF THE FARCE DU GAUDISSEUR ET DU SOT AND ITS PLACE IN MEDIEVAL FRENCH DRAMA

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Sandra Jeanne Vasa

June 1976

1286674

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to provide a study and edition of the manuscript of a fifteenth-century play, the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot, to discuss the play's relationship to certain other comic plays of that era and to understand the place of the play in the development of medieval French drama.

Chapter I traces the development of medieval French drama from its beginnings in the liturgy of the church to the flourishing of comic genres in the fifteenth century when the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot was written.

Chapter II relates the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot to the Sermon Joyeux de Bien Boyre, the Farce des Cris de Paris, the Farce du Povre Jouhan and the Farce du Gentilhomme et son Page. Comparisons are made between the plays on the role of the sot or sot-like character and his relationship to the other character(s) through the dialogue.

Chapter III is a technical study of the manuscript of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot dealing with meter, rhyme, spelling and the other editions of the play.

Chapter IV is the author's edition of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot from the Recueil Trepperel

It is accompanied by notes on the text. A glossary of vocabulary from the play is located in the Appendix.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
INTRODUCTION		1
I.	THE GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH DRAMA INTO COMIC FORM IN THE MIDDLE AGES	2
	Liturgical Origins and Development	2
	Non-Liturgical and Lyric Development	13
	Comic Genres of the Fifteenth Century	23
II.	COMPARISON OF THE FARCE DU GAUDISSEUR ET DU SOT TO OTHER COMIC PLAYS	31
III.	TEXTUAL AND EDITORIAL STUDY OF THE FARCE DU GAUDISSEUR ET DU SOT	42
IV.	NOUVELLE FARCE A DEUX PERSONNAGES DU GAUDISSEUR QUI SE VANTE DE SES FAITZ ET UNG SOT LUY RESPOND AU CONTRAIRE C'EST A SAVOIR: LE GAUDISSEUR, LE SOT	63
	Notes	70
LIST OF REFERENCES		74
APPENDIX		79
Appendix A		80
VITA		88

INTRODUCTION

The original purpose of this study was to edit a manuscript from the Recueil Trepperel of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot. Once it was determined that Eugenie Droz had produced a relatively accurate edition of the play, the scope of the study was expanded to include the relationship of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot to certain other plays of the same era and finally to place the play in the development of medieval French drama.

The thesis itself reverses the process of the research, starting in Chapter I with the development of medieval French drama, then in Chapter II dealing with certain plays and their relationship to the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot. Chapter III is a study of the manuscript, followed by Chapter IV which is this author's edition of the manuscript including notes and a glossary in the Appendix.

Research on this study will be continued when the author is able to obtain a microfilm of the Recueil de Londres manuscript of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot.

CHAPTER I

THE GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH DRAMA INTO COMIC FORM IN THE MIDDLE AGES

I. LITURGICAL ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT

"Le théâtre est né de l'église."[1] It is from the liturgy of the church that the essential elements of French drama were developed in the Middle Ages. This seems paradoxical when one considers the fact that the church had tried to destroy drama by forbidding the performance of any spectacle and in its condemnation of actors.[2] However, the very nature of the liturgy was dramatic:

> At least from the fourth century, the central and most solemn rite of that worship was the Mass, an essentially dramatic commemoration of one of the most critical moments in the life of the Founder.[3]

The seven "offices" of the day were chanted by priests and cantors; the robes of the priests were often quite

---

[1]Gustave Cohen, Anthologie du drame liturgique en France au Moyen Age (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1955), p. 19.

[2]Grace Frank, The Medieval French Drama (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), pp. 4-5.

[3]Edmond Kerchever Chambers, The Mediaeval Stage (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), II, 3.

splendid. It was as if different actors in varying costumes were performing. The church took advantage of these dramatic effects in the liturgy in order to drive home its principles, to extend its influence, and to give "un peu de civilisation au milieu du monde accablé."[4]

The dramatic elements of the liturgy were also used to gain the interest of the public in the services. In particular, Amalius, the Bishop of Metz (780-850) used dramatic concepts in order to give immediacy to religious worship. He "allegorized the Mass into a dramatic rendition--complete with dialogue and gesture--of Christ's ministry, death, and resurrection."[5] Amalius explained to the people that at various moments of the Mass, "the officiating priest represents Christ" and others; "the altar becomes the tomb receiving Christ's body, and then the empty grave."[6] Such a presentation of the mass must have been highly emotional and probably did succeed in elevating the interest of the public.

One essential element of drama, the dialogue, had its origins in the antiphonal or responsive singing,

---

[4]Germain Bapst, Essai sur l'histoire du théâtre (1893; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971), p. 4.

[5]David Bevington, Medieval Drama (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975), p. 4.

[6]Ibid.

first nonworded, then later worded. Around the ninth century, the antiphon developed into the trope, which was a short poem added to the liturgy to increase the interest of the public or to elaborate on a part of the liturgy:

> Tropes were constantly being introduced as a necessary complement to the liturgy and also because lively religious feelings could not be satisfied with old prayers, no matter how beautiful, but needed a constantly renewed expression.[7]

The trope that held the most significance in the development of dramatic dialogue was the Quem quaeritis, or Easter trope, which began as a simple responsus of four lines. The earliest expanded manuscript of the Quem quaeritis, from Limoges, is dated between 923 and 934. It was a conversation between the angels and the Marys at the tomb of Christ. The angels asked whom the Marys were seeking at the sepulchre. The Marys replied that it was Jesus of Nazareth, who had been crucified. The angels answered that Christ was not there, for he had risen.[8]

Sometime during the tenth century, the Quem quaeritis trope was transferred from the Introit, or beginning, of the high Mass to the end of the early morning service of Matins. No longer a simple embellishment of

---

[7]H. F. Muller, "Pre-history of the Medieval Drama," Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, 44 (1925), 573.

[8]Bevington, p. 25.

the Mass, the Easter trope gained dramatic impact:

> Its dialogues were sung by half-choirs, by cantors, or by cantors and choir, who impersonated the characters of the Marys and the angels; they played their roles with appropriate gestures and voice-changes in a setting that thereby became for the audience a suitable mise en scène.[9]

The setting was at the sepulchre, the place in which religious relics were stored at the altar; a sepulchre is also a place of burial.

The drama of the Quem quaeritis trope continued to be developed. Different versions with new scenes were written. Among the various additional scenes were:

1. A scene with persons representing the apostles Peter and John.

2. A Christ scene in which he revealed himself to Mary Magdalen.

3. A scene in which the Marys stopped to buy spices from a spice merchant on the way to the sepulchre. This third scene was the first non-liturgical addition to the Easter trope, which by this time was really a play, although it was still attached to the liturgy.

It was not until the thirteenth century that the Easter play was fully developed, or so it appears from the manuscripts available to us. One manuscript from Origny

---

[9] Frank, The Medieval French Drama, pp. 21-22.

contained both French verse and French stage directions,[10] but until this time, the Easter play had been presented in Latin. A very important reason for the continued expansion of the Quem quaeritis trope into a play was the fact that the language of the people in France had long been moving away from Latin, and developing into a language in its own right:

> Now, as the Latin language became less and less intelligible to the people, special efforts must have been necessary to strengthen the understanding of the services by the unlearned and to make manifest by ceremonials of various kinds the allegorical content of the liturgy.[11]

Similar to the Easter trope was the Christmas trope, or Officium pastorum, which portrayed the shepherds at the crib of the Christ child. Like the Easter trope, the Officium pastorum was also transferred from its original position before the Introit of the high Mass on Christmas day to the end of Matins. The Officium pastorum was quickly merged with the Officium stellae, which was the Epiphany play of the Magi, as evidenced by an eleventh century manuscript.[12] The fusion of the two plays offered possibilities for further plot development. The Magi brought gifts to the mother and child; an angel

---

[10] Ibid, p. 28.

[11] Ibid, p. 22.

[12] Cohen, Anthologie du drame liturgique en France au Moyen Age, p. 137.

warned of the wrath of Herod; finally, Herod ordered the killing of all young children. In a few manuscripts, this scene of the killing of the innocents was even dramatized. Thus, from a simple liturgical trope was eventually developed a very elaborate play.

During the Christmas season, there were other celebrations, which, although probably amusing, had been written mainly to edify the people.[13] The Procession of Prophets was the dramatization of the "summoning of the Jews and pagans to bear witness in their own words to the coming of Christ."[14] Possibly related to this procession was the Feast of Fools, which was a celebration of the lower clergy, first mentioned in the late twelfth century.[15] The Feast of Fools may have carried on traditions of pagan origin. The celebration satirized church services, with the participants in costumes and playing the roles of the higher bishops and other clergy. The revelries eventually moved out of the church and into the towns where the laymen could participate, as well as view them. Elements of these satirical antics appeared later in the various comic genres of the fifteenth century.

---

[13]Louis Petit de Julleville, Les Mystères (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1880), p. 25.

[14]Frank, The Medieval French Drama, p. 39.

[15]Chambers, I, 275.

The church was successful in its attempt to make the liturgy more meaningful to the people:

> C'est une résurrection que je voudrais susciter, celle de ces offices dramatisés, qui, pour les fidèles du XI^e au XIII^e siècles, ont rendu la religion si vivante et plus agissante en animant ses symboles et ses dogmes et en faisant comparaître dans la nef et dans les choeurs, parmi des décors et sous des costumes appropriés, avec les gestes compétents et l'enchantement de la mélodie, les principaux personnages des Evangiles, les Saints, les Prophètes et les témoins de la Foi.[16]

However, the need to include the rapidly developing French language in the plays heightened as fewer people, not even many nobles, understood the liturgical Latin.[17]

The first introduction of the vernacular French into a liturgical play occurred at the end of the eleventh century. Vernacular French was juxtaposed against Latin in the Sponsus, which was a dramatization of the parable of the wise and foolish virgins. Each Latin verse spoken by the virgins was ended with a refrain in French, so that the viewers were able to understand the basic story that the foolish virgins had neglected to buy lamp oil. Also the lines of Gabriel were spoken in French.

The subject matter of liturgical plays expanded

---

[16]Cohen, Anthologie du drame liturgique en France au Moyen Age, p. 19.

[17]Ibid., p. 20

during the twelfth century, as evidenced in the ten plays of the Fleury play book in which there were two New Testament plays, four Saint Nicholas miracle plays, as well as a Christmas and an Easter play. These plays, however, were still completely written in Latin. Not only had the subject matter of the plays expanded, but also the flexibility of presentation of the plays had expanded as well. Hilarius, a wandering scholar of the twelfth century, wrote plays that did not seem to require specific positions in the liturgy. He also used French refrains in some of his works, as well as a regular versification.

Le Mystère d'Adam, from the third quarter of the twelfth century was the first play of which we have a manuscript that is written entirely in vernacular French, with the exception of some stage directions and some liturgical readings in Latin. The manuscript is incomplete at the end; however, the three sections that remain are:

1. The story of Adam and Eve.
2. The story of Cain and Abel.
3. A prophet play of Old Testament characters who predict the coming of Christ.

It is during this last part of the twelfth century and into the thirteenth century that there was an effort

to bring the liturgical drama outside of the church. It is thought that Le Mystère d'Adam was the first play to be performed outside of the church, albeit directly in front of the church doors.[18] By bringing the drama outside of the church, a larger audience would have had an opportunity to see the play. In the thirteenth century, the king of France took part in the movement to place the drama outside of the church:

> Sous l'influence de Saint Louis, le drame se sépara définitivement de l'église. Il resta, il est vrai, l'attribut des corporations plus souvent encore religieuses que laïques, mais peu à peu il quitta son côté exclusivement liturgique.[19]

Beginning in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a number of miracle plays were developed which were dramatizations of the legends of saints' lives, their martyrdom, or of their miracles. These miracle plays were non-biblical in origin; their aim, however, like other liturgical plays was still the edification of the populus.[20] The four miracle plays from the twelfth century Fleury play book all dealt with Saint Nicholas, but they are all in Latin. Between 1199 and 1201, Jean Bodel wrote a Jeu de Saint Nicolas that is the earliest surviving miracle play written in vernacular French.

---

[18]Bapst, p. 5.

[19]Ibid., p. 4.

[20]Lucien Dubech, Histoire générale illustré du théâtre (Paris: Librairie de France, 1931), II, 107.

Bodel adeptly combined a serious religious theme with realistic scenes of low life, of thieves and gamblers, that could be considered comic. Bodel was also skilled in versification and the use of the octosyllabic line.

The second surviving miracle play written in vernacular French was the Miracle de Théophile, written by Rutebeuf about 1261. What made this play so unique was that it was the first time in which the Virgin Mary was portrayed as an "intercessor for erring mortels."[21] This theme was greatly expanded upon during the fourteenth century in the forty Miracles de Notre Dame.

This early period of miracle plays was one of transition between liturgical and non-liturgical plays, between the use of Latin and vernacular French. There was an ever-expanding range of subjects and a more flexible connection to the liturgy. There was a tendency towards realism which included the use of a few comic scenes, and the plays were human and less ecclesiastic in nature, no longer depending on the Bible as their source of inspiration.

From the period between 1339 and 1382, forty Miracles de Notre Dame survived. Although there was great diversity in the plots, the plays all revolved around the same basic concept. In each of these plays, a

---

[21] Frank, The Medieval French Drama, p. 107.

sinner was rescued by the intervention of the Virgin Mary. She appeared in person, usually accompanied by the archangels Gabriel and Michael. The plays appealed to emotion and included elements of surprise. A song was used at the end of some plays so that the actors could leave the stage in a procession. This particular dramatic convention is seen in many of the comic plays of the fifteenth century.

Perhaps the most important development in religious drama during the fourteenth century was the formation and production of the Mystères de la Passion, the basis of which may have been a popular poem about the Passion circulated by the jongleurs during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.[22] The early passion plays dealt with the last days of Christ and the Resurrection. Later passion plays were greatly expanded to include the life of Christ and stories from the Old Testament.[23] The passion plays were performed around Paris and Rouen by confraternities of bourgeois whose sole purpose was to stage the play. It is known from a document of 1380 from Paris that the annual performance of the passion had been well established at that time.[24] The staging of the

---

[22]Ibid., p. 125.

[23]Chambers, II, 77.

[24]Gustave Cohen, "Le Théâtre à Paris et aux environs à la fin du XIVe siècle," Romania, 38 (1909), 587.

passion play was continued at least into the sixteenth century.

The miracle play continued to be written during the fifteenth century. Through modification, the basic idea of the miracle play developed into the morality play. The subject matter of the plays was extended and the theme moved in the direction of the allegory, with the allegorical characters of the Roman de la Rose as an example. Although the intent of the morality play was still religious, its aim was more at ethical cultivation rather than cultivation of religious faith.[25]

Thus, from a strictly liturgical beginning, there was developed religious drama that contained the dramatic conventions of costume, dialogue, and setting, that appear in the secular drama. And, although the basis of the religious drama was for the edification of the people, it did also serve to entertain them.

II. NON-LITURGICAL AND LYRIC DEVELOPMENT

Gustave Cohen suggests that one can define the development of French literature from the eleventh century with the appearance of non-liturgical works written in French.

---

[25] Chambers, II, 151.

> Aucune époque ne mérite mieux en effet celui de siècle de genèses que le XIe et c'est là qu'il faut chercher les origines de notre littérature et en particulier de trois genres: la chanson de geste, la poésie lyrique et la poésie dramatique, sans parler de la littérature en langue latine, qui reste l'autre aspect de ce Janus à deux visages qu'est notre littérature médiévale.[26]

During the eleventh century appeared the Chanson de Roland and in the twelfth century one sees the beginnings of the roman courtois. These genres developed and expanded throughout the twelfth century; they were narrative forms that had the capacity for dramatization.

The second half of the twelfth century was considered by many to be a renaissance. This is best evidenced in the "comédie" latine, a number of comic plays written during this period, whose subjects were borrowed from Plautus and Terrence, as well as other well-known stories.[27] Most of the plays were part narrative, part dialogue. Pauphilus, the tale of a man's travels to find his loved one, contained only a few narrative lines; Babio, the story of a husband who tried unsuccessfully to catch his wife with her lover, contained no narration at all. Aspects of this last work seem to have influenced later plays. The scene in which Babio was

---

[26]Gustave Cohen, Anthologie de la littérature française au Moyen Age (Paris: Delagrave, 1946), p. 15.

[27]Gustave Cohen, La Vie littéraire en France au Moyen Age (Paris: Editions Jules Tallandier, 1949), p. 134.

duped by his valet, who pretended to be someone else by changing his voice, reappeared in Le Garçon et l'Aveugle and Maître Pierre Pathelin.

It was during the thirteenth century in Arras, among other cities, that a great development of non-liturgical, and even comic, literature written in French took place. Gustave Cohen suggests that the environment of a burgeoning industrial city was fundamental in the development of this literature.[28] The rich bourgeoisie of Arras cultivated poetry in its puys or rhetorical societies.

Among the poetic forms with potential dramatic elements that developed from earlier poetic forms of the troubadours were the pastourelle, the tenson, the jeu-parti and the dit as well as various songs on different subjects, such as love, politics and religion.

The pastourelle was a lyric poem which told a story following a basic theme of a knight riding off into the country, seeing a shepherdess tending her flock, attempting to seduce her, whether by permission or by force and occasionally succeeding. The pastourelle was essentially: "une scène de moeurs destinée à ridiculiser les gens de campagne en s'opposant leurs manières à celles

---

[28] Ibid., p. 257.

de la société courtoise."[29] The pastourelle did not simply develop from popular sources, as some have suggested, but seemed rather to have incorporated the concept of pastoral life put forth by Virgil.[30]

The tenson was a game-like debate between two interlocutors dealing with one of many themes: love, politics, personal questions. Statements and replies were exchanged on the given subject, the debate ending with the call for a judge or arbiter to decide whose arguments had been more convincing. The tenson was probably a poetic adaptation of the scholarly debate.

The jeu-parti was a very popular off-shoot of the tenson as evident in the number of jeux-partis that remain today. The first poet would name the subject for discussion in the opening lines of the poem; the other poet had the choice of which side of the argument he would defend. The fact that the tenson and the jeu-parti were probably poetic adaptations of scholarly debates is an indication of the intellectual atmosphere developed in the puys: "Le jeu-parti ne pouvait guère se développer que dans une société raffinée, passionnée pour les discussions

---

[29]M. Delbouille, Les Origines de la Pastourelle (Bruxelles: M. Lamertin, 1926), p. 9.

[30]Ibid., p. 9.

metaphysiques et qui réunissent un grand nombre de poètes."[31]

The dit was a monologue, usually, but not necessarily, written in octosyllabic or alexandine lines. The subject matter seems either to have been of a serious, and sometimes religious nature, or of a comical and possibly satirical nature.

In the environment of the puys, just as the lyrical forms of Latin poetry changed language to French, the poetry changed as it was addressing itself to a new public. There were opportunities for the poems to be performed in front of other members of the puys, and it certainly appears that some of the works had been written with this express purpose.

> Les dits, les jeux-partis ont pu, à la rigueur, être débités sur des théâtres, mais ils n'appartiennent pas à la littérature dramatique. On peut tout dire sur un théâtre . . . mais, où il n'y a nulle action, il n'y a pas proprement théâtre.[32]

Although Petit de Julleville does not consider these poetic genres to be dramatic, their very performance would generate their further development into dramatic form. One can see that elements of these genres were

---

[31]Louis Petit de Julleville, Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française des origines à 1900 (Paris: Armand Colin et Cie, 1896), I, 386.

[32]Ibid., p. 423.

carried into the dramatic forms that did develop.

A number of dramatic works with comic scenes were written during the thirteenth century, beginning with the Jeu de Saint Nicolas by Jean Bodel, performed in 1200. Although this was essentially a religious play, humor was evident in the scenes of thieves and gamblers. Bodel had treated the miracle play in an entirely new fashion, bringing it much closer to the lives of the people who viewed it.

Following the Jeu de Saint Nicolas, sometime before 1228, appeared Courtois d'Arras, the story of the prodigal son. The author of the play made the setting contemporary. Unlike the parable in the Bible, this version was humorous and lifelike because of the author's emphasis on the wanton life led by the prodigal son and the manner in which Courtois was naively duped by two women, thereby losing both his money and clothing. At the end of the play, instead of slaughtering a lamb in honor of the returning son, the father chose a cow, with the other son complaining that his father would not slaughter even a chicken for him.

Because of the narrative passages in Courtois d'Arras, Edmond Faral proposes two possible types of presentation for this play: one with several actors, the

other with a single actor.[33] The play is almost completely dialogued, except for nine lines of narration, and thus its presentation could have utilized several actors; on the other hand, the presence of stage directions, as well as the rapidity of the action, could also indicate that a single actor was to portray all of the roles.

Le Garçon et l'Aveugle, written around 1266, was the first totally slapstick comedy, or farce, of which we have records. However, "bearing as it does the marks of practiced competence, rather than innovating talent, (it) may pretty certainly be reckoned the sole survivor of a considerable family."[34] Grace Frank suggests that it is the verve of the octosyllabic couplets as well as the wit of the verbal exchanges that "suggest that it is a work of a facile and practised author."[35] The play was quite short and had only two characters: a blind man and a boy. Similar to the scene previously identified in Babio in which the servant took advantage of his master by changing his voice and pretending to be someone else, the boy in

---

[33]Edmond Faral, ed., Courtois d'Arras: Jeu du XIII^e siècle (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1922), pp. iii-iv.

[34]Ian Maxwell, The French Farce and John Heywood (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1946), p. 16.

[35]Frank, The Medieval French Drama, p. 223.

the Garçon et l'Aveugle played the same trick on the blind man. The humor of this play lies in the deceptions made by the two characters, one out-smarting the other.

Adam de la Halle, also known as Adam le Bossu, was known particularly for having written the Jeu de la Feuillee and the Jeu de Robin et Marion. In the first play, Adam de la Halle satirized his friends and other townspeople, his father, his wife, and himself, making fun of the lives they led and their ruses and weaknesses. The plot structure was minimal; the satire and wit of the play are precursors of later comedy. "In its salt wit and roving fancy, as well as in the main themes of its satire, the play anticipates the farces and still more, the sotties of a later time."[36] The Jeu de Robin et Marion, called opéra-comique, was simply a dramatized pastourelle in which dialogued conversations were alternated with songs and dances. In the Jeu de Robin et Marion, the shepherdess, Marion, succeeded in fending off the amorous attempts of the chevalier because the inept Robin was her true love. The pastourelle had now been transformed from a lyric poem into an entertaining dramatic presentation, complete with characters, dialogue, and scene changes.

---

[36]Maxwell, p. 15.

Rutebeuf was another author whose works were dramatizations of earlier poetic forms. One piece, the Dit de l'Herberie, was an example of a genre well-liked during much of the Middle Ages, the dramatic monologue or mime. It was a parody of a speech of a charlatan medicine peddlar, written half in verse, half in prose. The speaker attracted the public, telling of his fantastic travels; he listed all of the ailments that he had been able to cure; he proceeded to prescribe cures for various people, then offered his own incredible remedies for sale. The art in such a presentation was the art of mime.

> Le récitant y adopte un personnage d'emprunt, et son rôle comporte évidemment toutes les ressources de l'art de l'acteur, la variété des ton de voix, des expressions du visage, et le plus souvent une gesticulation abondante soulignée de prestes changements de costume.[37]

This art of mime was seen in the ruse of the boy in the Garçon et l'Aveugle and of the valet in Babio. The goal of mime was in the imitation of reality by actions and with voice, without the use of props or settings. Certainly the art of the voice was a most important aspect of mime. There is some confusion about the definition of this genre which was sometimes called mime, other times

---

[37]Albert Pauphilet, ed., Jeux et Sapience du Moyen Age (Paris: Gallimard, 1951), p. 203.

monologue dramatique, as it developed and became more complex.

> Il arrive que le texte suit dialogué; mais on ne sait si le même acteur mimait deux personnages, ou si l'on employait deux acteurs: en ce cas, rien ne distinguerait un tel mime de ce que sera la farce des XIVe et XVe siècles.[38]

Although Antoine Adam suggests that there were farces written during the fourteenth century, there are no manuscripts to substantiate this. There were references to short amusing interludes in the Passion plays--like the fifteenth century example of the silly, unrelated farce that was interjected into the middle of the Vie de Monsieur Saint Fiacre--but no manuscripts of these interludes remain. The decree by the Provost of Paris, in 1398, forbidding the presentation of "aucune jeux de personnages par maniere de farces, de vies de saint ne autrement, senz le congie du dit seigneur ou de nous"[39] would also support the belief that farces were indeed presented during the fourteenth century. One could probably assume that some of the fifteenth century comic plays had predecessors in the fourteenth century, of which there simply are no records.

---

[38]Antoine Adam, et al., Littérature française (Paris: Larousse, 1967), I, 40.

[39]Cohen, "La Théâtre à Paris et aux environs," p. 590.

III. COMIC GENRES OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

It was only after the end of the Hundred Year War, with the signing of the Treaty of Bretigny in 1460, that comic plays really began to flourish in France.

> The vigor and variety of the thirteenth century theatre no doubt explains the profusion of the period following the Hundred Years War. The interim, however, represents a blank in the records of comedy.[40]

Monologues dramatiques, sermon joyeux, sottis , and farces as well as allegorical morality plays were developed. As in the puys of the thirteenth century, "the playing and writing of comic pieces in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was largely in the hands of societies devoted among other things to that purpose."[41] The Basochiens, a society of law clerks that had been started in the fourteenth century, were known particularly for their satirical plays, sotties. Other groups of students and clerics, such as the Enfants-sans-souci, developed comic plays of all types.

The authors of the fifteenth and sixteenth century comedies portrayed men like themselves. Barbara Bowen believes that the perspective of life at that time was to laugh at the simple things of daily life.[42] By

---

[40]Maxwell, p. 16.

[41]Frank, The Medieval French Drama, p. 249.

[42]Barbara Bowen, Les Caractéristiques essentielles de la farce française et leur survivance dans les années 1550-1620 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), p. 16.

exaggerating, satirizing, or simply by portraying the common events of every-day life, the comedy of the era in all of its forms succeeded in making people laugh.

The dramatic monologue, according to Jacques Nathan, became an actual play in the fifteenth century because the character was in costume and was portraying a dramatic role.[43] There were two types of dramatic monologue: the sermon joyeux and the monologue proper. The sermon joyeux may be traced back to the revelries of the Feast of Fools. It was a parody of a religious sermon, prefaced by a Latin text. The sermon joyeux made a travesty of any biblical text that was used; even the sign of the cross and the Ave Maria were transformed in a slapstick fashion. Placed at the beginning of a presentation of comical plays, the sermon joyeux mimicked the comparable pious exhortation that preceded a mystère. Thus, there was a format of sorts that the sermon joyeux followed, unlike the monologue proper, which was a free discourse. The monologue appears to follow the pattern of the dit of the thirteenth century,[44] although according to Petit de Julleville, "Le monologue a

---

[43]Jacques Nathan, Encyclopédie de la littérature française (Paris: Fernand Nathan, 1952), p. 33.

[44]Emile Picot, "Le Monologue dramatique dans l'ancien théâtre françois," Romania 15 (1886), 358.

pu naître du sermon joyeux, car ôtez du sermon joyeux le texte et les divisions et la parodie d'édification, il reste un monologue."[45]

The character of the dramatic monologue was generally a braggart, recounting extraordinary or comical events. The Franc Archier de Bagnolet is typical of the braggart. The archer portrays himself as being brave and bold, bragging about his imaginary exploits, until he sees what appears to be a soldier. So, fearing his death, he confesses his sins and suggests his epitaph, then discovers that the soldier was really just a scarecrow stuffed with straw. The character of the Monologue du puys by Coquillart suffers, too, from a turn of events. He recounts his amorous escapades and his final success in spending the night with his mistress, only to end up hiding in a well when the husband of his mistress returns unexpectedly. This same story could be a farce, the difference being that instead of one person recounting the event, it would be acted out by the characters and dialogued.

Between the dramatic monologue and the farce was an intermediate type of comedy, "a discourse complicated

---

[45]Petit de Julleville, Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française des origines à 1900, II, 429.

by the presence of a heckler or questioner."[46] Picot still relegates this form to the classification of dramatic monologue, as evident in the plays listed in his long article on the monologue dramatique. "Le rôle des interrupteurs n'est qu'un rôle accessoire uniquement destiné à rompre la monotonie de ce genre de composition."[47] La Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot is one of these plays that is difficult to classify, for although there are two characters, they never address each other directly, yet what one says does have an effect on the response of the other.

Because the farce and the sottie are both satirical in nature, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the differences between them. The title of a play may not be helpful in this differentiation, particularly if it includes both words in it, like the Sottie et Farce nouvelle a trois Personnages, Estourdi, Coquillart et Desgouté from the Recueil Trepperel, Volume I. Eugenie Droz suggests that the main difference between these comic plays is that the sottie is played by fools in fool's costumes of half green and half yellow with clown hats decorated with asses' ears and bells (like a court

---

[46]Maxwell, p. 21.

[47]Picot, "Le Monologue dramatique dans l'ancien théâtre françois," Romania 15 (1886), 358.

jester).[48] She feels that even the Farce du Maître Pierre Pathelin could have been a sottie if it had been played by fools.[49] It seems clear that Droz must have distinguished some differences between the sottie and the farce just by the way in which she chose to edit and publish the plays of the Recueil Trepperel; the first volume contains mainly sotties, the second volume farces, and the third as yet unpublished volume will contain morality plays. Gustave Cohen does not try to differentiate between farces and sotties in his recueil, but he does comment on the nature of the farce: "le genre vise plus a faire rire qu'a instruire."[50] Philipot comments that sotties, unlike farces, can usually be dated because they contain certain historical illusions; "les Farces, au contraire, sont pour la plupart en dehors du temps et de l'espace."[51] Barbara Bowen, in her lengthy study of the farce, demonstrates that the differences between the farce and the sottie are internal, lying in the structure,

---

[48]Eugenie Droz, Le Recueil Trepperel: Les Sotties (Paris: Droz, 1935), I, lxviii.

[49]Droz, I, lxviii.

[50]Bowen, Les Caractéristiques essentielles de la farce, p. 8.

[51]Emile Philipot, Trois Farces du Recueil de Londres (Rennes: Plihon, 1931), p. vi.

in the situation, and in the action of the play.[52] It is true, however, that even though we are able to make these distinctions, they may not necessarily have been evident to the actors or the viewers of these plays.[53] Ian Maxwell shares the same opinion as Bowen: "However confused the frontier, farce and sottie form separate kingdoms."[54]

The underlying idea of the sottie is that the world is composed of fools, "et que la folie de ces fous est faite surtout de sottise et de vanité."[55] In its early stages, the sottie was satirical and slapstick, resembling the inane carnival-like atmosphere of the Feast of Fools. The rapid banter of the speakers, along with their antics and acrobatics, added to the humor; even the costumes were funny to look at. The satire of the sottie was general in nature, against different classes or groups in the society, and the setting was usually vague. The action of the plot was practically nonexistent, contrary to the farce in which the action led to a denouement.

---

[52]Barbara Bowen, Les Caractéristiques essentielles de la Farce et leur survivance dans les années 1550-1620 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), p. 8.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Maxwell, p. 20.

[55]Louis Petit de Julleville, Le Théâtre en France: Histoire de la littérature dramatique depuis ses origines à nos jours (Paris: Armand Colin, 1923), p. 61.

> With few exceptions, it is true to say that the sotties are not grounded in incident and situation, that they mirror manners in the mass and not in particular and present the actual doings of this world casually or by way of illustration.[56]

The characters of the sottie were often called sots, Mère Sot, Prince des Sots, or some other funny name. The later sotties, having some plot action, are much more difficult to distinguish from the farce than the earlier ones.

The early farces were short comic plays in which lines of Latin were interspersed in the dialogue. This aspect of the farce quickly disappeared and the majority of farces that remain today do not contain these Latin lines. The farce was a comic story of human frailty, based in reality and dealing with individual human traits rather than satirizing the ills of society as did the sottie. The farce was never aristocratic; it reflected the life and spirit of its time. The farce showed the pettiness of life without making judgments, its purpose being to make people laugh rather than instruct them. "Acceptation est donc le mot clé de cette perspective sur la vie."[57]

The characters of the farce were "types": the unfaithful wife or husband, philandering priests, inept

---

[56]Maxwell, p. 20.

[57]Bowen, Les Caractéristiques essentielles de la farce, p. 17.

doctors, braggarts. Unlike the sottie, the action usually took place in a precise setting: in a house, in a store, in a garden. And, the action led to a denouement. Often ruse was involved in the comic scenes, an important aspect of which was "à trompeur, trompeur et demi," in which the deceiver was deceived.

Maître Pierre Pathelin is the chef d'oeuvre of the farces, incorporating all of the characteristics of the farce that have been mentioned including the use of Latin and dialects, even meaningless words. There is a balance in the action of the play and the action leads to a denouement. Maitre Pathelin, who in the beginning of the play dupes a cloth merchant, is himself duped at the end by a shepherd.

The popularity of farces, sotties and dramatic monologues diminished with the onset of the Renaissance in the sixteenth century, when antiquity became the source of inspiration. However, they did not totally disappear, and their influence is evident in the comedy that followed in the seventeenth century, particularly in the plays of Molière.

CHAPTER II

COMPARISON OF THE FARCE DU GAUDISSEUR ET DU SOT TO OTHER COMIC PLAYS

La Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot is classified as a sottie rather than a farce as the title implies, because of the lack of dramatic action in the play and because most comical plays of the fifteenth century with sots, or fools, are considered to be sotties. Barbara Bowen and Eugenie Droz both classify this play as a sottie. As Bowen says: "Le Gaudisseur et le Sot serait plutot sottie que farce, malgré les quelques 'fous' des farces qui ont un emploi semblable, puisque la pièce n'a aucun mouvement dramatique."[58] It is evident that Droz has classified this play as a sottie by her inclusion of it in the first volume of the Recueil Trepperal which deals with sotties. Both of these authors are surprised that Emile Picot does not include this play in his comprehensive article, "La Sottie en France," except in comparison to other plays: the Sermon joyeux de Bien Boyre and the Farce Nouvelle, tresbonne et fort recreative pour rire, des Cris de Paris.[59] Picot lists it instead in his study,

---

[58]Bowen, Les Caractéristiques essentielles de la farce, p. 11.

[59]Emile Picot, "La Sottie en France," Romania 7 (1878), 298.

"Le Monologue Dramatique dans l'ancien théâtre françois," placing it for some unknown reason among the monologues d'amoureux.[60] He even goes as far as to suggest that the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot is a sermon joyeux:

> Malgré le titre que porte la seule édition connue, la Farce Joyeuse est en réalite un sermon, mais l'acteur chargé du rôle principal est interrompu à chaque phrase par un sot qui remplit un rôle secondaire.[61]

One should take exception to the suggestion that the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot is in reality a sermon because even if the role of the sot were removed, the play would then become a simple monologue, similar to the dit of the thirteenth century. It would not have the effect of mimicking a religious sermon nor does it contain any Latin texts, as does the Sermon Joyeux de Bien Boyre. Like Picot, Ian Maxwell also lists the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot under the heading "monologues," calling it "a mere gab enlivened by the fool's scathing asides."[62] This description, although accurate, is still not of a monologue because the play does not have just one character. Petit de Julleville lists the play in the Répertoire du Théâtre Comique en France au Moyen Age,

---

[60]Emile Picot, "Le Monologue dramatique dans l'ancien théâtre françois," Romania 16 (1887), 490.

[61]Ibid., pp. 490-491.

[62]Maxwell, p. 21.

suggesting that it be compared to the Farce du Gentilhomme et son Page, but not commenting on the nature of the play nor the kind of comparison that one should make.[63]

Picot compares the dramatic format of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot to that of the Sermon Joyeux de Bien Boyre and the Farce des Cris de Paris. Unlike the third play, the first two are not sotties.

> Ces pièces, il est vrai, ne sont pas des sotties; bien qu'elles soient jouées par deux personnages, nous les rangerons parmi les monologues. Le rôle des interrupteurs n'est qu'un role accessoire, uniquement destiné à rompre la monotonie de ce genre de composition.[64]

The similarity between these three plays lies in the role of the character that interrupts the speaker(s). For the same reason, the inclusion of the sot or sot-like character whose sole purpose is to interrupt the proceedings of the play, Droz suggests that the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot also be compared to the Farce du Povre Jouhan.[65] Although all of these plays contain a character that interrupts the proceedings, there are differences in the ways in which this role is treated. In the Farce du

---

[63]Louis Petit de Julleville, Répertoire du théâtre comique en France au Moyen Age (1886; rpt. Genève: Slatkine, 1967), p. 144.

[64]Picot, "La Sottie en France," p. 298.

[65]Droz, I, 1.

Gaudisseur et du Sot, the Gaudisseur never acknowledges the presence of the Sot. Without the remarks of the Sot, however, the humor would be lost. The dialogue format in this play is one of contradictions. The Gaudisseur brags of his adventures and abilities; the response of the Sot tells the opposite story. For example:

Le gaudisseur
Quant je me trouvë en bataille,
Je frappe d'estoc et de taille
Et secoux bien le pelisson.

Le sot
Tu dis vray, va, baille luy, baille.
Ma foy, il ne vault que de raille
Et se cacher contre ung buisson.[66]

This type of repartee continues throughout the play with the exception of a few one-line replies of the Sot at the end. This same format is followed in the Sermon Joyeux de Bien Boyre, in which a Prescheur expounds upon the virtues of wine, his speeches interlaced with Latin. The Cuysinier interrupts the speeches of the Prescheur, commenting on his drunkenness and revealing his base character to the audience. At first, the Prescheur does not speak directly to the Cuysinier, but rather complains to the audience that a heckler is interrupting his words of wisdom:

---

[66]Lines and words from the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot will be identified by the appropriate line number within the text of the thesis.

Le Prescheur
Et faictes taire cest yvroigne
Que mon sermon puisse parfaire.

Le Cuysinier
Il y auroit beaucoup a faire;
Me taire-je pour ung yvrays?
Quel vaillant prescheur de mes brays!
Ne sçait pas son De profundis.[67]

As the play progresses, the Prescheur and the Cuysinier begin to speak directly to each other; however, this does not change the nature of the remarks that one character makes of the other. As in the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot, there is a relative balance between the speeches of the two characters, in length as well as in subject matter.

The role of the Sot in the Farce nouvelle, tres-bonne et fort recreative pour rire des Cris de Paris is similar to that of the two other plays discussed, in that it serves to interrupt the conversation of the two Gallants. Different than in the other plays, however, the Sot's lines are very short and consist mainly of cris de Paris, the cries of vendors and people that one would hear on the street. The cries, interjected into the dialogue, seem to serve as replies to the philosophizing of the two Gallants.

Le Second
Or ça, si la femme mauldit
Comme une malle fiebvre aygre,
Qu'esse la?

---

[67]M. Viollet Le Duc, Ancien Théâtre François (Paris: P. Jannet, 1854), II, 6.

Le sot
Vinaigre! Vinaigre!

Le premier
Je ne vis oncques tel vinaigre;
Vous ne cesserez de crier.
S'ilz ont tous deux maulvaise teste,
L'une crie, l'autre tempeste;
Tousjours y est procés ouvert.[68]

The only times that the Gallants speak directly to the Sot is when they express their annoyance that his cries interrupt their train of thought and when they tell him to be quiet. There is no dramatic action in this play; the humor lies in the great diversity of subjects that the two Gallants discuss and in the effects that the remarks of the Sot have on their conversation.

The Sot in the Farce du Povre Jouhan is an outside observer, commenting on the action taking place without ever taking part in it himself and without his comments ever having any effect on the action. There is dramatic action in this play and the scenes change. One should, therefore, classify this play as a farce and not a sottie, although one of the characters is a sot. The comments of the Sot interspersed among the dialogue of the other characters are used not only to comment on the action but also to separate the scenes, giving the Sot a functional as well as a comic role. At the end of the first scene, the Sot comments on the fact that the husband, Jouhan,

---

[68]Viollet Le Duc, II, 308.

has unknowingly just helped his wife, Affriquee, to dress for a rendez-vous with her lover.

Le sot
Quelle trainee!
Ho! le povre Jouhan!
Sa femme est adolentee.
Ho! le povre Jouhan!
Jouhan laisse aller sa femme
Partout ou il luy agrée,
Et n'en ose dire mot.
Elle s'en rit a guele bee.
Ho! le povre Jouhan!
Sa femme est abandonnee.[69]

The role of the Sot is similar to that of a Greek chorus, noting and commenting on all that takes place. In a few instances, he does contradict the claims of another character, such as when Affriquee tells her lover, Glorius, that he is her first lover. The Sot replies:

Le sang bieu, vous avez menty,
(Sauve l'honneur des assistans).
Il n'en aura jamais les gans,
Jamais n'en sera la centiesme.[70]

This Sot has a smaller role than the Sot in the Gaudisseur et le Sot or the Cuysinier in the Sermon Joyeux de Bien Boyre. There is not the constant juxtaposition of his comments against those of the other characters, nor is there the relative balance between the role of the sot and the other characters that one finds in the two other plays.

---

[69]Pauphilet, p. 362.

[70]Ibid., p. 364.

In all four plays discussed, the common denominator seems to be in the comic effect created through interruption of the dialogue by the sot. However, in the Farce des Cris de Paris he does not have the role of critic as in the other plays. In the Gaudisseur et le Sot, the Sermon Joyeux de Bien Boyre and in the Farce du Povre Jouhan, the sot not only interrupts the dialogue, but he also plays the role of truth-teller.

Petit de Julleville suggests that the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot be compared to the Farce du Gentilhomme et Son Page without elaborating on the reasons.[71] There are a couple bases for this comparison. Not only is the character of the Gentilhomme much like that of the Gaudisseur, but the Page also plays a role similar to that of the Sot. The format of one character contradicting the statements of the other is also followed, although, unlike the Gaudisseur and the Sot, the Gentilhomme and the Page address each other directly. The Gentilhomme and the Gaudisseur are braggarts, much like the Franc Archier de Bagnolet. The Gentilhomme boasts of his bravery, his war exploits, his riches and even his success with women. The Page, of course, reveals the truth of his statements.

---

[71]Petit de Julleville, Répertoire du théâtre comique en France au Moyen Age, p. 144.

Le gentilhomme
Pour ce que j'estoys espassé
Et hardy en une bataille;
On m'a cassé, car on me baille
Le temps a venir plus grand charge.

Le page
Vous avez beau mentir que perge!
Car je cuyde pour abréger
Que vous estes hors de danger
De rien perdre a l'argent du Roy.[72]

The Gaudisseur tells the same kind of tale, with the Sot replying that in battle, the Gaudisseur actually would hide from the conflict. The balance of statements and contradictions noted in the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot is also evident in the Farce du Gentilhomme et son Page. The two plays are even relatively similar in length, the Gaudisseur et le Sot having 224 lines and the Gentilhomme et son Page with 250 lines.

Not only does Picot compare the dramatic format of the Sermon Joyeux de Bien Boyre to that of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot, but he makes further comparisons about the author and origin of the plays. "Ces deux pieces offrent de grandes analogies, elles sont probablement du même temps, sinon du même auteur."[73] He also believes that both plays are from the region of Lyon because

---

[72]Emile Mabille, Choix de Farces, Soties at Moralités des XV^e et XVI^e siècles (1872; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), p. 199.

[73]Picot, "Le Monologue dramatique dans l'ancien théâtre françois," Romania 16 (1887), 440.

of certain references to that city and the surrounding area.[74] Eugenie Droz comments that Picot's case is quite good but that his insistence on the reference to Lyon in line 131 of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot is not necessarily strong enough. In line 131, "Quant a Lyon fus retourné" Droz believes that the word "Lyon" could easily be replaced with any city name of two syllables, because the word does not affect the rhyme scheme.[75] There is, however, a striking number of similar phrases and references in the two plays. Both plays contain the names of a number of wines. The ones that they share in common are: vin de Beaune (Beaulne), Saint-Porcin (Pourcin), vin claret, vin blanc, Ypocras, and muscadet or muscadeau. The phrase croquer la pye, which has been defined as boire (to drink) is found in both plays, as well as a reference to people drinking so much that they cry: "Beuvons jusques aux yeulx plourer" from the Sermon Joyeux and "Il avoit beu par tel compas/ Qu'il avoit larmes a l'ueil? from the Gaudisseur et le Sot. Another common reference to drinking is "De vin boiront tout a ung trait? from the Sermon Joyeux and similarly, "Voire, pour boire tout d'ung traict" from the Gaudisseur et le Sot. Because of these similarities, it is possible that

---

[74]Ibid., p. 442.

[75]Droz, I, 3.

the two plays were written by the same person. However, there are sufficient questions about the dates of these two plays that one cannot positively conclude that they were indeed written by the same author and about the same time. Picot bases his dates for the two plays, 1540, on the only manuscripts available to him at that time, the Recueil de Londres.[76] Droz, after studying the Recueil Trepperel, dates the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot almost one hundred years earlier than Picot, in 1450.[77]

---

[76]Picot, "Le Monologue dramatique dans l'ancien théâtre françois," Romania 16 (1887), 490.

[77]Droz, I, 3.

CHAPTER III

TEXTUAL AND EDITORIAL STUDY OF THE FARCE DU GAUDISSEUR ET DU SOT

The Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot exists in two manuscripts, one in the Recueil de Londres and the other in the Recueil Trepperel. The Recueil Trepperel manuscript is available in a facsimile edition published by Eugenie Droz in 1966. The Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot has been edited by Droz in the Recueil Trepperel: Les Sotties, tome I, published in 1935. An edited form of the Recueil de Londres manuscript is found in the Ancien Théâtre François published by its editor, Viollet le Duc in 1854.

In editing the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot, Droz carefully follows the Trepperel manuscript, noting, although not always explaining, the changes she makes in transcription. It appears that this care was not taken in the Ancien Théâtre François edition as one might expect from an edition made in the mid-nineteenth century. Droz remarks that the Recueil de Londres was a faithful copy by its Lyonnais publisher of the earlier Trepperel publication, the main difference being in the omission of

line 84 of the text.[78] If this is true, then the numerous spelling differences between the Droz edition and the edition in the Ancien Théâtre François must be blamed on the editor of the Ancien Théâtre François, named on the title page of the first six volumes as Viollet Le Duc. One learns only in the tenth volume that it was not Viollet Le Duc, but rather Anatole de Montaiglon who edited the first three volumes of the Ancien Théâtre François containing the plays from the Recueil de Londres. In the introduction, the editors state that they intend to reproduce manuscripts exactly, even respecting the irregularities in spelling, and that only the errors obviously due to the publishers would be corrected.[79] According to Philipot, who edited three plays from the Recueil de Londres, and also compared his editions to those of the Ancien Théâtre François, there were indeed numerous liberties taken in the Montaiglon editions.[80] The problems stem from the fact that Montaiglon, although a very productive erudite, freely edited the manuscripts, making changes in words as well as spelling:

> Cet érudit si productif ne s'est jamais astreint à copier servilement, et que son attention

---

[78]Droz, I, 15.

[79]Viollet Le Duc, I, xix.

[80]Philipot, pp. 2-3.

> subissait de fréquentes éclipses; il travaillait avec la desinvolture des érudits de son temps, qui n'étaient pas encore tout à fait philologues.[81]

A relatively small number of reviews appeared following the publication of the first volume of the Recueil Trepperel: Les Sotties by Droz in 1935, and only two critics, Ph. Aug. Becker and Noël Dupire, concerned themselves with specific details of the editions. P. A. Becker believes that as a reviewer he has much more freedom in commenting on the text and in offering alternate readings of lines than does Droz, who as editor of the manuscript must adhere strictly to it.[82] Droz agrees that the role of an editor is limited: "Jamais je n'ai refait le texte et j'ai toujours scrupuleusement respecté l'orthographe."[83] Noël Dupire, who reviews the Becker article and offers as well some suggestions of his own, believes that Becker goes too far when he reconstructs entire lines; on the other hand, he comments that Droz is too conservative in her editing, and so proposes an editorial policy in between these two extremes:

---

[81]Philipot, p. 2.

[82]Ph. Aug. Becker, "Die Narrenspiele des neuentdeckten Mischbands von Trepperelдrucken," Berichte ueber die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 87, No. 2 (1935), 10.

[83]Droz, I, lxxiii.

> Le Philologue ne perd nullement ses droits, bien au contraire, quand il s'agit d'oeuvres où prédomine la langue parlée. Rien n'empêche, par exemple, de mettre entre paranthèses l'e muet qui ne compte pas dans la mesure du vers, qu'il se trouve à l'intérieur d'un mot ou à la finale des participes passés feminins. Il est également licite de placer entre crochets droits une voyelle, une syllabe, un mot même, que l'on ajoute pour corriger une faute certaine.[84]

One must conclude then, that the role of an editor is mainly that of accurately transcribing a manuscript, except that in dealing with a spoken text, the editor has the freedom to suggest changes in parentheses or brackets that would correct an error in meter or rhyme.

The dates suggested for the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot are subject to further study. Emile Picot, having had the only knowledge of and access to the Recueil de Londres dates the play about 1540[85]; with Droz placing it almost one hundred years earlier, in 1450[86], as noted before. Mario Roques, along with Bowen and Maxwell, agrees with the Droz date in his review of the Recueil Trepperel: Les Sotties, adding this comment on the Picot date:

---

[84]Noël Dupire, rev. of "Die Narrenspiele des neuentdeckten Mischbands von Trepperelldrucken" by Ph. Aug. Becker, Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, 62 (1937), 736.

[85]Picot, "Le Monologue dramatique dans l'ancien théâtre françois," Romania 16 (1887), 490.

[86]Droz, I, 3.

> Les érudits, et notamment Emile Picot, ont eu tendance, par louable réserve à rajeunir les farces dont nous n'avons le plus souvent que des reimpressions peut-être tardives; les farces ont la vie dure; telle bouffonnerie de Courtelane se joue et se reimprime sans cesse depuis des dizaines d'années.[87]

Also supporting the arguments for an earlier date than 1540 is the fact that the plays in the Recueil Trepperel were published between 1502 and 1518 by the printer Jean Trepperel in Paris.[88]

Droz believes that there are several factors that demonstrate that the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot was already old when Trepperel printed it. Critics Dupire and Becker, however, question the strength of Droz' arguments for dating the play as early as 1450. First is her assertion that the original play had been written completely in tercets and that the present form with only fifty of the seventy-seven stanzas remaining tercets and the other stanzas consisting of one, two or four lines, only shows how worn and changed the manuscript was by the time it reached Trepperel. Although this assumption that the original play was composed entirely of tercets cannot either be proved or disproved due to the lack of any earlier manuscript of the play, it can be

---

[87]Mario Roques, rev. of Recueil Trepperel: Les Sotties, tome I, by Eugenie Droz, Romania 60 (1940), 143.

[88]Ibid., p. 141.

challenged by the fact that other plays from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were written with varied rhyme schemes and stanzaic structure; there is no steadfast rule requiring consistency in either. Most important for Droz, and it is on this point that Dupire and Becker disagree with her, is the date of the rondolet that begins the play. Droz notes that this type of song was written by Charles d'Orleans, Christine de Pisan, and others. Citing several examples, she contends that the beginning series of adjectives "Jeune, gente, plaisant et lye" (line 1) was a popular poetic construction until about 1440.[89]

> Il paraît inutile de multiplier les exemples, et nous pouvons affirmer que le gaudisseur du Recueil Trepperel chantait sans s'en douter un rondel vieux d'au moins soixante-dix ans. Il est probable que l'imprimeur nous a transmis servilement la tradition manuscrite, mais, qu'à la représentation, les acteurs remplaçait ces vers par une chanson plus nouvelle.[90]

This is evidenced, she claims, by the use of the word gay rhyming with papegay, a word dating from 1155[91], although according to Droz it comes from the sixteenth century, which had nothing to do with a chanson courtoise like the

---

[89]Droz, I, 2.

[90]Droz, I, 3.

[91]A. J. Greimas, Dictionnaire de l'ancien français jusqu'au milieu du XIVe siècle (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1968), p. 469.

rondolet.[92] Dupire does not agree with Droz on this assumption at all.

> Il parait osé d'affirmer que gay comme un papegay est du XVI^e siècle, alors que papegay est attesté des le douzième, de plus, il était très possible que le gaudisseur reprit, à une epoque bien plus tardive, quelques vers d'une vieille chanson.[93]

It was not uncommon for a farce to begin with a song, as Bowen notes; however, usually just the first line of it is given in the text because the song was probably well-known to the audience.[94] So, it may well be that the song at the beginning of the farce was well-known to the audience when it was first presented in the mid-fifteenth century and that the publisher printed it as it was written, although Droz would insist that the song had been altered by the time the play was published.

From these various arguments it has been possible to establish that the date Picot suggests for the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot is incorrect, except perhaps for dating the publication of the particular manuscript that he used because the play had also been published in the early sixteenth century by Trepperel. The fact that most plays had been around for some time before publication supports Droz' earlier date of 1450, although this can only be an estimate.

---

[92]Droz, I, 3.

[93]Dupire, p. 734.

[94]Barbara Bowen, Four Farces (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967), pp. ix-x.

The manuscript of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot was published in the early sixteenth century in the agenda format. The pages were longer than they were wide and the columns of writing were narrow, a single column consisting of at least fifty-two lines. According to Mario Roques, this seems to have been the predominant format during at least sixty years.[95] The title page includes the full title of the play: Nouvelle farce a Deux Personnages du Gaudisseur qui se vante de ses faitz et ung Sot luy respond au contraire, followed by a listing of the characters, le gaudisseur, le sot. Beneath the title is a drawing of the gaudisseur. The play itself is contained on three pages with two columns of dialogue on each page. There are 224 lines in the play; the Droz edition ends on line 225 only because she miscounted the lines between line 172 and line 176. The Montaiglon edition has 223 lines because one line is missing from the manuscript.

Capital letters are used for the initial letter of each line, with the exception of line 160 and line 166 where y is the first word, and line 217 where the first word is a. Within the text, capital letters are used only three times and only in Latin phrases: "A jesus et

---

[95]Roques, p. 142.

De profundis" (line 204), "A jesus. Ave maria" (line 208), and "A jesus Benedicite" (line 212). There is no consistency in the capitalization of the names of the speakers.

As one might expect from the work of this period, punctuation is practically nonexistent, except for the period in line 208 cited above. In editing the manuscript, however, punctuation has been added, as is normal, to clarify the pauses and breaks in the lines of the individual speakers. Accent marks were not used in the manuscript either. "Avant 1530, les imprimeurs n'emploient ni accent aigu, ni apostrophe, ne cédille, ni tréma, ils les adoptent progressivement à partir de cette date."[96] When the tilde (~) is used in the manuscript, it denotes the omission of a nasal letter: "La signe ~ placé au dessus d'une voyelle remplace un n ou un m suivant. Lorsque la voyelle ainsi marquée est suivie néanmoins par n ou m, il faut conclure à une consonne double."[97] An example of the double consonant is found in line 130 where the word nome appears in the manuscript and would be transcribed as nommé. Certain diacritical marks are used in the editing of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot for phonetic and stress reasons. The diaerisis is

---

[96]Peter Rickard, La Langue française au seizième siècle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 55.

[97]Ibid.

used over a vowel not normally pronounced, but that for reasons of meter must be pronounced as a syllable. The acute accent is used on the final e of certain words to denote pronunciation and also sometimes past tense. It should be noted here that except at the end of a line or in the case of elision, when a word beginning with a vowel follows a word ending with an e, all final e's are pronounced.

There are difficulties in distinguishing between certain letters of the alphabet that are written exactly the same in the manuscript: i and j, and u and v. In the case of u and v, there are three different forms of the letter: as a capital letter beginning a line, the symbol looks like a glorified capital v; as the first letter of a word, other than the first word in a line, the symbol is a small version of the capital letter; in the interior of a word, the symbol used is u. The symbol used for the capital letter i or j looks like a capital j, whereas the symbol for the lower-case letter is the small i. In most instances it is possible to distinguish between the symbols for r and t; however, the top part of the letter t is not always made tall enough to make it distinguishable from r. The symbol used for s at the end of a word is different than an s in another position. In some instances letters are not clearly formed or are

blurred, adding to the difficulty of deciphering the manuscript.

An important consideration in transcribing the manuscript of the play is the fact that the play that reached the publisher was probably not exactly the same as the play that had originally been written.

> Unfortunately, the state in which the pieces of the Recueil Trepperel have come down to us is deplorable. Designed to be heard and not read, most of them probably flouted literary rules from the beginning. In the course of time, due to errors of oral transmission, they must have reached the printer in wretched state, and he, eager to publish as rapidly and as cheaply as possible, further deformed them.[98]

Most likely, the play had been presented many times with changes being made all along. This would account for some of the incorrect meter and for rhymes that are not exactly correct.

The conventions of poetry were probably not as strictly adhered to in the comic drama as in formal poetry. As Bowen comments:

> Dramatic texts of this period show considerable license in their use of rhymes, elision and syllabification. However, it seems probable that the verse line used in these farces was intended to have eight syllables when spoken by the actor.[99]

---

[98]Grace Frank, rev. of Le Recueil Trepperel: Les Farces, tome II, Speculum 37 (1962), 113.

[99]Bowen, Four Farces, p. x.

Although other metric lines were used on occasion, the octosyllabic line was the most commonly used meter in the comic plays for "les octosyllabes se prêtent à la verve de la conversation familière et de la repartie."[100] In the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot, the majority of lines are octosyllabic, the few that are not only vary by one syllable. Bowen suggests that in such cases, perhaps "the lines were falsified by careless copying or printing, or perhaps the author in fact, wrote a line, which while technically not correct, could have been spoken in a way that the audience accepted it."[101] An editor can, as Droz and Montaiglon have done, propose an alternate reading of a line with the correct number of syllables. For example, both Droz and Montaiglon propose the following reading of line 144, adding a syllable in order to correct the meter: "Et sur les tables [de]posées," which reads in the manuscript: "Et sur les tables posées." Brackets are used around an editor's proposed addition to a line; parentheses are used around a syllable or letter already existing in the line that the editor suggests not be pronounced, again in order to correct the meter. In line 96, Droz and

---

[100]Bowen, Les Caractéristiques essentielles de la farce, p. 57.

[101]Bowen, Four Farces, p. x.

Montaiglon use parentheses to correct the meter: "El(le) luy donna deux coups de poing."

A variety of rhyme schemes related to stanzaic length are found in the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot. Droz contends that the original play was written entirely in tercets, yet this variety of rhyme schemes and varied stanza lengths is evident in other comic works, such as the Farce nouvelle, fort joyeuse a trois Personnages, Le Prince, Le Premier Sot, Le Second Sot from Cohen's Recueil de Farces inédites, which begins with the rhyme scheme aabaab which later changes to aabb. The Moralité nouvelle tresbonne et de grant consequence a sept personnages; La quelle demonstre comment Jhesucrist est mis en prison pour racheter le genre humain qui estoit en servitude et captivite en la prison de peche mortel, the eighteenth play from the facsimile edition of the Recueil Trepperel contains a variety of rhymes based on the tercet; beginning with aabaab, the pattern changes to aababb. The rhyme then changes to even another pattern; ababbcbc. The majority of speeches in the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot, fifty out of seventy-seven, are tercets, which are grouped in two's, forming a sixain with the rhyme scheme aabaab. Only one sixain does not follow this pattern exactly and the rhyme is instead aabccb. The general pattern consists of a three-line speech by the Gaudisseur followed by a

speech of the Sot which completes the sixain.

Le Gaudisseur
Pour faire gambades a plaisance a
Il n'y a homme en toute France a
Que moy, pour faire promptement. b

Le Sot
Et il a fait sa male meschance a
Il a le brodier et la pance a
Plus pesant que nostre jument. b

A second rhyme scheme scattered throughout the play is the alternating rhyme (rimes croisées) with the pattern abab, in which the speech of the Gaudisseur has only two lines, followed by a two-line reply of the Sot.

Le Gaudisseur
Pensez que fus esbahy a
Quant au pertoys fus descendu. b

Le Sot
C'estoit la ou il fut banny a
Et fut appellé, pres rendu. b

The third pattern of rhyme, beginning with the tirade on wine by the Gaudisseur in line 173 and continuing until line 220, consists of rhymed couplets, aabb.

Le Gaudisseur
Vin blanc, vin clairet de Lyon a
Des potz en eut ung million. a
Vin d'Alican, de Rommanie, b
Vin Bastard qui fait chiere lye, b

When the last line of one speaker is rhymed with the following line of the next speaker, as in the next example, then it is a mnemonic rhyme.

Le Gaudisseur
Tous ces vins si vindrent en place. a

Le Sot

186 Sang bieu, ce n'estoit pas fallace. a

A certain number of rhymes in the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot appear, at first glance, to be faulty. However, after consulting various sources on the rhymes, pronunciation and spelling of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it is possible to demonstrate that these rhymes are correct, based on rules and examples from other works. The rhyme estroit: traict (lines 45:46), for example, is an acceptable rhyme. First, Chatelain established that a c preceding a t is silent.[102] Then, he notes that the diphtongues ai and oi are considered to have the same pronunciation.[103] Serayne and avoine (lines 84:85) rhyme because the diphtongues ai and oi placed before an n rhyme together,[104] the ay in serayne having the same phonetic value as ai. The letters m and n, when final consonants of words rhyme, as in commune: plume,[105], and the vowels preceding a nasal consonant, as in en: an are also rhymed together as in

[102]Henri Chatelain, Recherches sur le vers français au XVe siècle (1908; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971), p. 47.

[103]Ibid., p. 7.

[104]Ibid., p. 30.

[105]Ibid., p. 62.

chiens: champs[106] or arragans: mandemans.[107] These examples explain why Jherusalem (line 57) is rhymed with Jehan (line 58). The pairing together of different liquid consonants, such as l and r in guelle: demeure (lines 195:196) forms an unexpected rhyme; however, there are other examples of this type of rhyme which Chatelain classifies as either Piccard or Lorraine.[108] For example, amere is rhymed with cruelle[109] and veullent is rhymed with meurent.[110] An r preceding a t is not pronounced, as evident in the following examples: trotte: reporte[111] and date: varte,[112] thus explaining why Roserte (line 177) can be rhymed with Eguebellette (line 178). The same principle is true for an r preceding a d in the rhyme malade: halebarde (lines 24:25), or in

---

[106]Ibid., p. 1, taken from Le Mystère de Saint Clement, p. 38.

[107]Ibid., p. 1, taken from Le Mystère des Troit Doms, lines 1377-9.

[108]Ibid., p. 64.

[109]Ibid., p. 64, taken from the Mystère de la Passion d'Arras, lines 16781-2.

[110]Ibid., p. 64, taken from Le Mystère de Saint Crespin et Saint Crespinien, p. 55.

[111]Ibid., p. 52, taken from Le Mystère de Saint Remi, lines 11212-3.

[112]Ibid., p. 51, taken from Le Jugement du povre triste amant banny, lines 1241-3.

sourdre: foudre.[113] The pairing of Espargne (line 128) with Cocaigne (line 129) can be explained first by the fact that the diphtongue ai can be rhymed with a,[114] and secondly by noting that the r preceding the nasal gn is not pronounced, an assertion supported by the following examples: espargne: baigne,[115] and espergne: preigne.[116] In the final questionable rhyme, Escosse: mousse (lines 109:112), the diphtongue ou is rhymed with o as in the pairs of trouble: noble,[117] note: toute, joute: crotte and cotte: toute.[118] Thus, with examples from other works of the late Middle Ages and with certain principles of pronunciation, it has been possible to explain as correct those rhymes in the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot that appear to be unusual. The remainder of the rhymes in the play seems to be correct.

---

[113]Ibid., p. 19, taken from Georges Chastellain, Oeuvres, VIII, 335.

[114]Ibid., p. 6.

[115]Ibid., p. 52, taken from Guillaume Gretin, Poésies, p. 55.

[116]Ibid., p. 51, taken from Charles d'Orleans, Poésies Complètes, II, p. 185.

[117]Ibid., p. 19, taken from Georges Chastellain, Oeuvres, VI, p. 2.

[118]Ibid., p. 19, taken from La Passion Nostre Seigneur Jhesus Christ, copied at Semur, lines 5470-1, 2257-8, 7519-20.

Certain poetic and dramatic conventions and techniques have been used in the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot. The use of octosyllabic meter which lends itself to conversation and the use of varied patterns of rhyme and stanza length have already been illustrated. Directly related to the rhyme and stanza length is the somewhat formal symmetry of the dialogue. A tercet of the Gaudisseur is followed by a tercet of the Sot; the same is true of couplets and one-line speeches. It is only in the latter part of the play, beginning with the Gaudisseur's tirade on wine, that the pattern of balanced stanza lengths between the two speakers is broken. There is also a balance in the subject matter of the dialogue; the Gaudisseur makes a statement, then the Sot refutes it. The speeches of the two characters parallel each other, with the Gaudisseur being serious and the Sot making fun of him.

Le Gaudisseur
On me fist assoir a la table
Comme ung roi ou ung connestable
Et servir a mode de court.

Le Sot
Par ma foy, vecy bonne fable.
On le fist mettre en une estable,
Pres les latrines de la court.

This balance of parallel speeches is carried into the enumeration by the Gaudisseur of the foods that he was served at the banquet in his honor and of the manner in

which he was entertained, followed by the Sot's similar but comical enumerations. The use of such long enumerations is a comic technique that can be quite effective, especially in this situation where the Sot mimics the tirade of the Gaudisseur, but in slightly changing the words, makes the speech funny.

The use of proverbs and popular sayings can sometimes produce comic results. The Gaudisseur describes himself using a simile that is known even today, "lẽger comme une plume," then the Sot repeats it, changing some of the words.

Le Gaudisseur.
Je suis ligier comme une plume
Et fait comme ung esmerillon.

Le Sot
Il est legier comme une enclume
Et fait commë ung corbillon.

Other comparisons used to describe the Gaudisseur are humorous as well. When bragging of his valor in battle, the Gaudisseur describes his prowess; the Sot carries his description and analogy even further.

Le Gaudisseur
Quant je me treuvë en la guerre,
Je tue, je gette par terre,
Comme fait le boucher ung veau.

Le Sot
Voire, a jouster contre ung verre,
Puis se laisser cheoir par terre
Et s'endormir comme ung porceau.

Again and again, the Sot refutes the boasts of the Gaudisseur.

The introduction and the conclusion of the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot follow the formulas commonly used in other plays of the period. The play begins with a song, "Le Gaudisseur, en chantant" just as the Farce nouvelle de celuy qui se confesse a sa voisine qui est habille en habit de prestre qui est le ribault marié, ou maugré jalousie from Cohen's Recueil de Farces inédites du XV^e siècle (Cambridge, Mass: Medieval Academy of America, 1949) begins with "Le Mary, en chantant" and the Farce Nouvelle a six personnages from the same collection begins with "Regnault commence, en chantant." As Bowen has noted, "many farces begin with a song."[119]

A farce usually ends with one of three statements:

1. "Une chanson pour dire adieu."

2. "Prenez en gré l'esbatement" or "Prenez en gré nos esbatz."

3. "Adieu toute la compaignie" or "Adieu dames et damoyselles."[120]

In the Farce du Gaudisseur et du Sot, the Gaudisseur exist first, saying: "A Dieu vous dy, car je m'en voys" (line 217). The concluding strophe of the Sot

---

[119]Bowen, Four Farces, p. ix.

[120]Bowen, Les Caractéristiques essentielles de la farce, p. 121.

contains two of the three closing formulas:

> Prenez en gré l'esbatement,
> Seigneurs et dames, je vous prie.
> Apres luy m'en voys vistement,
> A Dieu toute la compaignie.

And with this last line, the Sot makes his exit from the stage.

CHAPTER IV

NOUVELLE FARCE A DEUX PERSONNAGES DU GAUDISSEUR QUI SE VANTE DE SES FAITZ ET UNG SOT LUY RESPOND AU CONTRAIRE C'EST A SAVOIR: LE GAUDISSEUR, LE SOT.

Le Gaudisseur, en chantant
Jeune, gente, plaisant et lye,
Je suis vostre loyal servent
Et le seray toute ma vie.

Quelque chose que l'on en dye
Tousjours seray mignon et gay,
Aussi gent comme ung papegay
Fringant a la mode qui court.

Le Sot
Voire, pour remplir sa vecie,
Puis apres tant crocquer la pie
Qu'il s'endormit en une court.

Le Gaudisseur
Pour faire gambades a plaisance
Il n'y a homme en toute France
Que moy, pour faire promptement.

Le Sot
Et il fait sa male meschance,
Il a le brodier et la pance
Plus pesant que nostre jument.

Le Gaudisseur
Je suis ligier comme une plume
Et fait comme ung esmerillon.

Le Sot
Il est legier comme une enclume
Et fait commë ung corbillon.

Le Gaudisseur
Quant sus ma test ay ma salade
Pour a coup faire une passade
Homme n'en crains dessus la terre.

Le Sot
Voire, pour batrë ung malade
Quant il a sa grant halebarde,
Et pour casser a coup ung voirre.

Le Gaudisseur
Quant je me treuve sur les rens
Chascun si me dit: je me rens,
Monseigneur, a vostre mercy.

Le Sot
Quant il se treuvë avec gens
Pour a coup menger six harens,
Jamais n'en a nulz a mercy.

Le Gaudisseur
Quant je me treuvë en la guerre,
Je tue, je gette par terre,
Comme fait le boucher ung veau.

Le Sot
Voire, a jouster contre ung verre,
Puis se laisser chëoir par terre
Et s'endormir comme ung porceau.

Le Gaudisseur
Pour dancer, chanter a plaisance,
Pour donner de grans coups de lance,
Abille en suis, quoy que l'on die.

Le Sot
Pour menger oultre habondance
Si fort que luy tire la pance,
Il est maistre, je vous affie.

Le Gaudisseur
Quant je me trouvë a l'estroit,
A plaisance tirer ung traict,
Homme n'en crains, quoy qu'on en grongne.

Le Sot
Voire, pour boire tout d'ung traict
Ung pot de vin quant il est traict,
Et s'endormir comme ung yvrongne.

Le Gaudisseur
Quant je me trouvë en bataille,
Je frappe d'estoc et de taille
Et secoux bien le pelisson.

Le Sot
Tu dis vray, va, baille luy, baille.
Ma foy, il ne vault que de raille
Et se cacher contre ung buisson.

Le Gaudisseur
J'ay esté en Jherusalem,
En la terre de Prestre Jehan,
En Babiloyne, en Albanie.

Le Sot
(Et) il a fait son sanglant mal an.
Il ne fut oncques, par Sainct Jehan,
Plus loing d'une lieue et demye.

Le Gaudisseur
J'ay chevauché la grant mer rouge,
Et allay au trou Sainct Patris.

Le Sot
Il y engrossa une gouge
Qui avoit nom dame Bietrix.

Le Gaudisseur
J'entray dedans le monastere
Ou je rencontray ung beau pere
Qui oncques ne me sonna motz.

Le Sot
Il entra par l'uys de derriere
Ou il roba une chauldiere,
Une escuelle, ung plat et ung pot.

Le Gaudisseur
Pensez que fus bien esbahy
Quant ou pertuys fus descendu.

Le Sot
C'estoit la ou il fut banny
Et fut appellé, pres rendu.

Le Gaudisseur
Je descendis tout pas a pas,
Sans y veoir lune ne souleil.

Le Sot
Il avoit beu par tel compas
Qu'il avoit les larmes a l'ueil.

Le Gaudisseur
Je me trouvay en une plaine,
La ou je souffri mainte peine
Que me fist maistre Grimouart.

Le Sot
Ma foy, ce fut a la serayne,
La ou il serchoit de l'avoine
Pour donner a son bidouart.

Le Gaudisseur
A moy, tantost, vint ung preudhomme
Qui m'a dist en demanda comme
Dedans se lieu entré j'estoye.

Le Sot
Par le vray Sainct Pierre de Romme,
C'estoit une femme, en somme,
Qui demandoit de la monnoye.

Le Gaudisseur
Je luy respondis fierement
Et luy dis: arriere villain.

Le Sot
Par le vray bieu, le ribault ment.
El(le) luy donna deux coups de poing.

Le Gaudisseur
Je fis tant que je m'eschappé
Et sortis hors du monastere.

Le Sot
Il avoit peur d'estre happé,
Car on l'eust batu a l'enchere.

Le Gaudisseur
Je m'en allay sans plus attendre,
Tant que jambes peurent estandre,
Mon chemin tout droit a Sainct-Jaques.

Le Sot
Pensez que se on l'eüst peu prendre,
On luy eüst fait conte rendre
Ou il avoit robé se saques.

Le Gaudisseur
Je cheminay par mer, par terre,
Tant que j'alay en Angleterre,
Et de la au pays d'Escosse.

Le Sot
Je croy qu'il voulait faire guerre
Encontre ung pot ou contre ung verre
Qui est trestout couvert de mousse.

Le Gaudisseur
Je descendis par Picardie,
Par Henault, faisant chere lye,
Et puis passay par Vermandoys.

Le Lot
De quelque chose qu'il vous die,
Il n'a pas bien crocqué la pie,
Il souffle souvent en ses dois.

Le Gaudisseur
De la, je m'en allay en France,
En Lombardie et en Prouvence,
A Romme, a Naples, a Venise.

Le Sot
Par Saincte Marie, quant g'y pense,
Pour bien mentir a sa plaisance,
N'a son pareil d'icy a Pise.

Le Gaudisseur
Puis m'en allay en Allemaigne,
En Ynde, en Turquie, en Bretaigne,
A Paris, a Rouen, a Lyon.

Le Sot
A bien boutter, il ne s'espargne,
Mais il a oublié Cocaigne
Ou il fut nommé coquillon.

Le Gaudisseur
Quant a Lyon fus retourné,
C'estoit le lieu ou je fus né,
Chascun me presentoit des biens.

Le Sot
Oncques ne luy fut mot sonné
Fors que: au diable soit il donné
Et mengé des pourceaux et chiens.

Le Gaudisseur
Je fus receu honnestement
De gens de bien qui vistement
Vindrent apres moy par expres.

Le Sot
Dieu mette en mal an qui en ment.
Oncques nul ne vint au devant,
Sinon deux malastrus racletz.

Le Gaudisseur
Viandes si furent apportées
Et sur les tables [de]posées
Assez pour servir dix roys.

Le Sot
On luy bailla pour dignée
Une tres grosse fricassée
De deux feves et de deux pois.

Le Gaudisseur
On me fist assoir a la table
Comme ung roi ou ung connestable
Et servir a mode de court.

Le Sot
Par ma foy, vecy bonne fable.
On le fist mettre en une estable
Pres les latrines de la court.

Le Gaudisseur
Chappons, poulles, canars, poussins,
Cochons, pigeons, lievres, conins,
Oyes grasses, perdrix, becasses.

Le Sot
Pourceaulx, chevres, loups et matins,
Chatz, chattes, souris, ratz, ratins
Y venoient de toutes places.

Le Gaudisseur
Tabourins aussi menestriés,
Joueurs de lucz et d'eschiquiers
Vindrent la pour me faire feste.

Le Sot
Porchiers, vachers, aussi vociers,
Coquins, maraulx, larrons, murtriers
Y venoient sans faire arreste.

Le Gaudisseur
Venaison de sangliers et serfz,
De biches qui sont es desers,
Chevreux, chevreaulx et aussi dains.

Le Sot
Loups, regnars se sont tenus pres,
Louves, louveaulx si vont apres,
Et herissons suyvans le train.

Le Gaudisseur
Vin blanc, vin clairet de Lyon,
Des potz en eut ung million.
Vin d'Alican, de Rommanie,
Vin Bastard qui fait chiere lye
Vin d'Arragon, vin de Roserte,
Vin qui croist prest d'Eguebellette.
Vin d'Anjou, vin de Sainct-Porcin,
Vin de Beaulnë et vin de coing,
Malvoisië et muscadeau,
Vin d'Auserre qui est tant beau,
Et aussi bon vin d'Ypocras.

Le Sot
Je n'en boy que le mardy gras.

Le Gaudisseur
Tous ses vins si vindrent en place.

Le Sot
Sang bieu, ce n'estoit pas fallace.

Le Gaudisseur
Je fuz servy mignonnement.

Le Sot
Dieu mette en mal an qui en ment.
Tant de vins sont trop frigaletz.
Ma foy, il a eu pour tous metz
De la servoise ou du bouillon
Dont il a remply son couillon.
J'aperçoy bien, par mon serment,
Que trestour son fet ne vault neant,
Si non a dire motz de guelle.

Le Gaudisseur
A celle fin que ne demeure
Pastez et aussi fricassées,
Pain blanc, miches, tartes sucrées,
Tout cela si fut apporté.

Le Sot
A Jesus! Benedicite.

Le Gaudisseur
L'eaue rose a laver les mains.
Apres disner furent les baingz
Bien preparez par beaulx conduitz.

Le Sot
A Jesus! et de Profundis.

Le Gaudisseur
Le lit on fist tost preparer,
La ou je m'alay reposer.
Puis la fillë on me bailla.

Le Sot
A Jesus! Ave Maria.

Le Gaudisseur
Quatre foys, sans point contredire,
Je luy feis, sans souffrir martire.
Voire plus, car je l'ay conté.

Le Sot
A Jesus! Benedicite.

Le Gaudisseur
Messeigneurs pour vous faire fin,
Je fus servy a la plaisance.
Quant vint le lendemain matin,
Je me rendy en l'Observance.
A Dieu vous dy, car je m'en voys
Tourner le rost en la cuisine,
La ou je mengeré des pois
Empres une bonne geline.

Le Sot
Prenez en gré l'esbatement
Seigneurs et dames, je vous prie.
Apres luy m'en voys vistement,
A Dieu toute la compaignie.

FINIS

I. NOTES

line 18 The simile "léger comme une plume" is still in use; a parody of it appears in line 20.

line 20 Dupire notes that fait in this line signifies "bienfait, élégant, or joli."[121]

line 23 Droz writes ne instead of n'en.

line 30 Droz has written treuue instead of treuve as it appears in line 27 and line 33, which is inconsistent, especially since the word is written in the exact same manner in all three lines of the manuscript.

line 53 Droz has changed the spelling of secoux to secoue. Dupire notes that there is no reason to change the spelling because the conjugation is correct for the verb escourre.[122] Also, Beaulieux comments that in conjugating a verb, other than -er verbs, the ending of the first person singular in the present and perfect tenses is s (or z or x).[123] Droz says that pelisson is pronounced in two syllables, citing another play as her example. If the original spelling of secoux is kept, then pelisson is pronounced with three syllables.

line 58 Prêtre Jehan was a legendary Christian king whose realm was located by the far (eastern)

---

[121]Dupire, 736.

[122]Ibid., p. 737.

[123]Charles Beaulieux, Histoire de l'orthographe française (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1927), I.

borders of the countries ruled by the Moslems.[124]

line 63 Droz says that the grant mer rouge is really the lac rouge on an island in Ireland where the purgatory of Saint Patrick is located.[125]

line 64 The trou Sainct Patris is purgatory or hell.

line 73 The manuscript identifies the speaker of this line as La gaudisseur instead of le.

line 76 Droz says that this line is incomprehensible.[126] Dupire explains it in the following manner: "le gaudisseur raconte qu'il est entre dans le monastere; le sot, tournant en derision ses paroles, dit qu'il y fut banni et qu'il fut appell presque rendu, un rendu etant un moine."[127]

line 86 Bidouart is defined as a mare. However, the word also has an erotic connotation, as indicated by the pejorative suffix -art.[128]

line 88 Line might read "Qui me dist . . ." since the

---

[124]J. Richard, "Prêtre Jean," Dictionnaire des lettres français: Le Moyen Age, ed. Robert Boussuat, et al. (Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1964), IV, 605.

[125]Droz, I, 15.

[126]Ibid.

[127]Dupire, p. 737.

[128]Ibid.

other verbs are in passé simple.

lines 93-94 This speech of the Gaudisseur does not seem to follow his previous speech; if he was speaking to a preudhomme, it is unlikely that he would cry: "arriere villain," and therefore must be responding to the Sot's remarks.

lines 110-12 This description of the Gaudisseur portrays him as a bumbling idiot, and it is quite funny to imagine.

line 116 The speaker of this line is identified as le fol rather than le sot.

line 145 Line is missing one syllable.

line 146 Drox has changed dignée to desjunée in order to correct the meter. However, there is a later reference in line 202 apres disner that would suggest that dignée should not be replaced. Perhaps the line could read ". . . pour sa dignée."

line 184 The pace of the dialogue quickens with this line, followed by a group of one-line speeches.

lines 200, 204, 208, 212 The Sot evidently could not find any manner in which to make fun of the Gaudisseur's claims at this point, and is left with short exclamations in Latin.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adam, Antoine, Georges Lerminier, and Edward Morot-Sir. Littérature française, Vol. I. Paris: Larousse, 1967.

Bapst, Germain. Essai sur l'histoire du théâtre. 1893; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971.

Beaulieux, Charles. Histoire de l'orthographe française. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1927.

Becker, Ph. Aug. "Die Narrenspiele des neuentdeckten Mischbands von Trepperеldrucken," Berichte üeber die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 87, No. 2, 1935, pp. 1-52.

Bevington, David. Medieval Drama. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Bowen, Barbara. Four Farces. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.

Bowen, Barbara. Les Caractéristiques essentielles de la farce française et leur survivance dans les années 1550-1620. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, No. 45. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964.

Chambers, Edmond Kerchever. The Medieval Stage. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.

Chatelain, Henri. Recherches sur le vers français au XV^{e} siècle: rime, metres et strophes. 1908; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971.

Cohen, Gustave. Anthologie de la littérature française du Moyen Age. Paris, Delagrave, 1946.

Cohen, Gustave. Anthologie du drame liturgique en France au Moyen Age. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1955.

Cohen, Gustave. La Comédie latine en France au XIII^{e} Siècle. 2 vols. Paris: Société d'Edition "Les Belles-Lettres," 1931.

Cohen, Gustave. "Le Théâtre à Paris et aux environs à la fin du XIV^{e} siècle," Romania. 38, October 1909, pp. 587-595.

Cohen, Gustave. Recueil de Farces inédites du XV^e siècle. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Medieval Academy of America, 1949.

Cotgrave, Randle. A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues. 1611; rpt. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Caroline Press, 1950.

Delbouille, M. Les Origines de la Pastourelle. Bruxelles: M. Lamertin, 1926.

Droz, Eugenie, ed. Le Recueil Trepperel, a facsimile edition. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1966.

Droz, Eugenie. Le Recueil Trepperel: Les Sotties. Vol. 1. Bibliographie Sociale d'Histoire du Théâtre, No. 8. Paris: Droz, 1935.

Droz, Eugenie and Halina Lewicka. Le Recueil Trepperel: Les Farces. Vol. 2. Travaux d'Humanisme et de Renaissance, Genève: Droz, 1961.

Dubech, Lucien. Histoire générale illustré du théâtre. 5 vols. Paris: Librairie de France, 1931.

Dupire, Noël. Rev. of "Die Narrenspiele des neuentdeckten Mischbands von Treppereldrucken" by Ph. Aug. Becker, Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie. 62, 1937, pp. 733-743.

Faral, Edmond, ed. Courtois d'Arras: Jeu du XIII^e siècle. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1922.

Frank, Grace. The Medieval French Drama. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Frank, Grace. Rev. of Le Recueil Trepperel: Les Farces, tome II by E. Droz and H. Lewicka, Speculum. 37, 1962, pp. 112-114.

Freeman, M. J., ed. Guillaume Coquillart--Oeuvres, suivies d'oeuvres attribuées à l'auteur. Paris: Droz, 1975.

Greimas, A. J. Dictionnaire de l'ancien français jusqu'au milieu du XIV^e siècle. Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1968.

Godefroy, Frederic. Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IX^e au XV^e siècle. 10 vols. Paris: Librairie des Sciences et des Arts, 1937.

Huguet, Edmond. Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle. 7 vols. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1925-1966.

Lewicka, Halina. La Langue et le style du théâtre comique français des XV^e et XVI^e siècles: La Dérivation. Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1960.

Mabille, Emile, ed. Choix de Farces, Soties et Moralités des XV^e et XVI^e siècles. 2 vols. 1872; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.

Maxwell, Ian. The French Farce and John Heywood. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1946.

Muller, H. F. "Pre-history of the Medieval Drama," Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie. 44, 1925, pp. 544-657.

Nathan, Jacques. Encyclopédie de la littérature française. Paris: Fernand Nathan, 1952.

Pauphilet, Albert, ed. Jeux et Sapience du Moyen Age. Paris: Gallimard, 1951.

Petit de Julleville, Louis. Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française des origines à 1900. 2 vols. Paris: Armand Colin et Cie., 1896.

Petit de Julleville, Louis. Les Mystères. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1880.

Petit de Julleville, Louis. Le Théâtre en France: Histoire de la littérature dramatique depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours. Paris: Armand Colin, 1923.

Petit de Julleville, Louis. Répertoire du théâtre comique en France au Moyen Age. 1886; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1967.

Philipot, Emile. Trois Farces du Recuiel de Londres. Rennes: Plihon, 1931.

Picot, Emile. "La Sottie en France," Romania. 7, 1878, pp. 236-326.

Picot, Emile. "Le Monologue dramatique dans l'ancien théâtre françois," Romania. 15, 1886, pp. 358-422; 16, 1887, pp. 438-542; 17, 1888, pp. 207-275.

Richard, J. "Prêtre Jean," Dictionnaire des lettres français: Le Moyen Age, Vol. IV. Ed. Robert Bossuat, Msgr. Louis Pichard and Guy Raynaud De Lage. Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1964.

Rickard, Peter. La Langue française au seizième siècle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Roques, Mario. Rev. of Le Recueil Trepperel: Les Sotties, tome I, Romania. 60, 1940, pp. 141-145.

Simon, Andre L. Wine in Shakespeare's Days and Shakespeare's Plays. London: Curwen Press, 1964.

Tobler, Adolf and Erhard Lommatzsch. Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch. 10 vols. Berlin: Weidmannsch Buchhandlung, 1925-1975.

Viollet Le Duc, M. Ancien Théâtre François. 10 vols. Paris: P. Jannet, 1854.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

Note: Words listed in this glossary are those words that are no longer spelled the same in modern French or those words that are no longer in use today and words that might make the reading of the text easier.

abille (line 41) - clever, skillful, cunning

affie, afier (line 42) - to assure

Alican (line 175) - Alicante, a port city in Spain

Ausserre (line 182) - Auxerre, a city in north central France noted for extensive trade in chablis and other burgundy wines

avoine (line 85) - oats

baille, baillier (lines 54, 146, 207) - trap, seize, lead

baingz (line 202) - bath

Bastard, vin Bastard (line 176) - an amber wine containing the gout de rancio that is the distinguishing flavor of port

Beauine (line 180) - Beaune, town in east central France noted for burgundy wine

becasse (line 157) - woodcock

beu, boire (line 79) - to drink, swill, quaff

biche (line 86) - a hind, a female stag

bidouart (line 86) - a horse that trots

bieu (line 95)- replacement for Dieu in an oath or profanity

boutter (line 128) - to thrust, push forward

bovier (line 164) - cowherd or drover

brodier (line 128) - one's behind, derriere

buisson (line 56) - bush, briar, thicket

canar (line 155) - drake

chappon (line 155) - capon

chauldiere (line 71) - measure of coal or the container itself

cheminay, cheminer (line 107) - to travel, voyage

chevauché, chevaucher (line 63) - to ride across

chevreux, chevreaulx (line 169) - kid or young goat

clairet (line 173) - a variety of red wines

Cocaigne, pays de Cocaigne (line 129) - the land of milk and honey, an imaginary place where everything that happens is good

coing (line 180) - quince; vin de coing - a strong liquor made with fermented quince

compas (line 79) - a measure of distance; par compas - steadily, regularly

conduitz (line 203) - escorts, persons that accompany someone

conin (line 165) - young rabbit

connestable (line 150) - constable, the principal officer of the crown

coquillon (line 130) - a fool's hat or a fool wearing the hat

coquin (line 165) - rogue, rascal, vagabond

corbillon (line 20) - small round basket

couillon (line 20) - cod-liece

coup, a coup (lines 22, 25, 31) - promptly

croquer la pie (lines 9, 117) - drink

dain (line 169) - deer

deser (line 168) - desert, wilderness

Eguebellette (line 178) - Aiguebellette or Aiguebelle, city in southeast of France

empres (line 220) - beside or after

enchere, a l'enchere (line 100) - with ardour, fervently

enclume (line 19) - anvil

engrossa, engrossir (line 65) - to make pregnant

es (line 168) - contraction of en les, in the

esbahy, esbaïr (line 73) - astonished, scared, surprised

esbatement (line 221) - divertissement, revels, playing

eschiquiers (line 162) - a kind of musical instrument

escuelle (line 72) - dish, porringer, bowl

esmerillon (line 18) - merlin, a small falcon

espargne (line 128) - frugality, saving

estoc (line 52) - a sword; frapper d'estoc et de taille - to cut up and thrust with both the point and the edge of the sword

estroict, a l'estroict (line 45) - to be cramped for space, to be badly off

fallace (line 186) - deceit, crafty trick, fallacy

feve (line 148) - a type of bean

fors que (line 135) - except

frigaletz (line 189) - delicate, dainty

fringant (line 7) - brilliant, lively spirited

gambades (line 11) - leap, gambol, cut capers

gaudisseur - libertine, one who likes mockery, also a glutton or drunken good fellow

geline (line 220) - hen

gent (line 6) - kind, likeable

gette, jeter (line 34) - to throw or toss

gouge (line 65) - a whore that follows the camp, a servant

grimouart (line 83) - a disdainful facial expression; grimouche - a grotesque face; hence Maistre Grimouart - a devil

grongne, grongnir (line 47) - to grumble, grouse, growl

guelle (line 195) - gule, the heraldic color red

habondance (line 42) - copiously, plenty

halebarde (line 25) - halbert, a battle ax and pike mounted on a handle about six feet long

happé (line 99) - caught, seized, trapped

harens (line 31) - herring

Henault (line 114) - Hainaut, a province in southwest Belgium

herisson (line 172) - hedgehog, urchin

jouster (line 36) - to joust, jilt, tourney

jument (line 16) - a mare, a beast of burden

larron (line 165) - thief, felon

legier, ligier (lines, 17, 19) - light

louves, louveaulx (line 171) - she-wolf, young wolf

lucz (line 162) - lute

lye (lines 114, 176) - happy, content; faire chere lye - to be jocund

mainte (line 82) - many, in great quantity

malastrus (line 165) - rude, disagreeable

Malvoisie (line 181) - a sweet and highly alcoholic wine, originally made in Greece

maraulx (line 165) - beggar, scoundrel, vagabond

matin (line 158) - mastiff, a large mongrel

menestrie (line 161) - minstrel

meschance (line 14) - wickedness, naughtiness; faire sa meschance - to make one's own misfortune, to lead to one's demise

metz (line 190) - food

miche (line 198) - small white bread, cake

muscadeau (line 181) - possible the muscat-flavored wine, muscadel

Observance (line 216) - name of a convent in Lyon and in other places

oncques (lines 61, 134, 141) - never

ou (line 74) - au, in the

oultre (line 42) - in addition

oye (line 156) - goose

pance (lines 15, 43) - part of the armor that is to cover the abdomen, the stomach itself

papegay (line 6) - parrot

par expres (line 139) - particularly, especially

passade (line 22) - to gallop a horse forward and then suddenly back

pelisson (line 53) - a fur-lined cloak; secoeur le pelisson - to treat roughly, to browbeat, to bully

perdrix (line 157) - partridge

pertuys (line 74) - hole, cavern

plaisance, a plaisance (line 11) - with pleasure, with good will

pois (line 148) - pea, a kind of legume

porceau, porceaulx (line 158) - hog, swine, pork

porchier (line 164) - swineherd

poussin (line 155) - spring chicken

pres (line 76) - presque, almost nearly

racletz (line 142) - bald men, fig. an unhappy man, a fool

raille (line 55) - merriment, pleasantries

ratz, ratins (line 159) - field mouse or rat

rendu (line 76) - monk

rens (line 27) - ranks

rens, se rendre (line 28) - to give oneself up

ribault (line 95) - ribald, vagabond

roba, rober (lines 71, 106) - to steal, pillage

Roserte (line 177) - Rosette, vin rose

Sainct-Porcin (line 179) - Saint-Pourçain-sur-Sioule, a town in central France near Vichy

salade (line 21) - helmet, headpiece

sanglier (line 176) - wild boar

saques (line 106) - a small sack

se (lines 89, 106) - ce, this

se (line 104) - si, if

secoux, secouer (line 53) - to shake, toss vehemently; see pelisson

serayne (line 84) - fresh, cool evening air or evening itself

serchoit, serchier (line 85) - chercher, to look for

serf (line 167) - cerf, male deer, stag, hart

servoise (line 191) - cervoise, beer

si (line 171) - ainsi, in the same manner

sot - fool

souffle, souffler (line 118) - to blow or breathe, also to brag vainly

tabourin (line 161) - drummer, also a kind of drum

trestout (lines 112, 194) - all, every one

trou (line 64) - a narrow passage, a hole

uys (line 70) - door

vacher (line 164) - cowherd

vecie (line 8) - vessie, bladder

Vermandoys (line 115) - Vermandois, a town in northern France, in Picardy

voire (lines 8, 24, 48) - actually, in reality

voirre (line 26) - wild boar, fig. a dragon

Ypocras (line 183) - mulled wine

yvrongne (line 507) - ivrogne, drunkard

VITA

Sandra Jeanne Vasa was born in Great Lakes, Illinois on July 4, 1950. In 1956, her family moved to Kensington, Maryland. She attended elementary and junior high schools in that town and was graduated from Albert Einstein High School in June 1968. During the summer of 1967, she spent seven weeks in Europe studying French and traveling. In September 1968, she entered The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and in August 1971 she received a Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in French and a minor in Political Science. In the fall of 1971 she accepted a teaching assistantship at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in the Department of Romance Languages and began study towards a Master's degree in French. She spent the summer of 1972 in France at the University of Aix-en Provence where she received a Certificat de Hautes Etudes in French civilization and a prix d'honneur for the examinations taken there. She returned to The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in the fall to begin her second year as a teaching assistant, which was completed in the summer of 1973. After almost three years, she returned to The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, to write the thesis needed to complete the requirements for a Master of Arts degree in French, which she received in June 1976.

She presently resides in Avon, Connecticut with her husband, Antonios G. Sideris.