ScĐ"Â©narios Communicatifs: Performing Role Plays in French, Levilson C. Reis, Bilingual Editions, 2007, 0977810259, 9780977810253, . .

DOWNLOAD [HERE](#)

, , , , . .

Before coming under Portuguese rule, (Fort) Saint Louis, had been the Brazilian capital of Equinoxial France (La France Ã©quinoxiale). The historical, sculptural, and architectural vestiges of a phantasmatic France have apparently left an imprint on my psyche, have galvanized my interest in French language, literature, and history and the relationships between them, sparked my interest in colonial and postcolonial transnational encounters, and their complementary issues of identity, race, gender, and sexuality (in both literature and film).

Reis, L. C. (2013c). The medieval forms and meanings of Francois: The political and cultural vicissitudes of an ethnonym. French Studies Bulletin: A Quarterly Supplement, 34(3), 58â€"61. DOI:10.1093/frebul/ktt019 (4 pages; note). FSB is published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Society for French Studies, UK. Â FULL PDF URL (restricted to OhioLink patrons) | Extract

Reis, L. C.Â (2011a). Clergie, clerkly studium, and the literary history of ChrÃ©tien de Troyes's romances. Modern Language Review, 106(3), 682â€"696. (15 pages; article) |Â Modern Language Review is the flagship journal of the Modern Humanities Research Association [MHRA], UK. Published online and in print 1 July 2011 |Â FULL PDF URL (restricted to Otterbein University Library patrons). J-STOR preview.

Reis, L. C.Â (2011b). The paratext to ChrÃ©tien de Troyes's CligÃ©s: A reappraisal of the question of authorship and readership in the prologue. French Studies: A Quarterly Review, 65(1), 1â€"16. (16 pages; article). DOI:10.1093/fs/knq178. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Society for French Studies, UK.Â FULL PDF URLÂ (restricted to Otterbein University Library patrons). Abstract

Reis, L. C.Â (2012a). [Review of the book Thinking through ChrÃ©tien de Troyes, by Zrinka Stahuljak, Virginie Greene, Sarah Kay, Sharon Kinoshita, & Peggy McCracken]. French Studies: A Quarterly Review, 66(3), 383â€"383. DOI:10.1093/fs/kns129.Â (1 page, book review [500-word limit]).Â FULL PDF URLÂ (restricted to Otterbein University Library patrons). Extract

Reis, L. C.Â (2012b). [Review of the book Lovely violence: The critical romances of ChrÃ©tien de Troyes, by JÃ¸rgen Bruhn]. French Studies: A Quarterly Review, 66(2), 232â€"232. DOI:10.1093/fs/kns028.Â (1 page; book review [500-word limit]).Â FULL PDF URLÂ (restricted to Otterbein University Library patrons). Extract

The question of the authorship of Guillaume d’Angleterre, a French romance commonly

dated to around 1170, has been discussed for more than a century by eminent medievalists in France and abroad. The main reason for this interest is the potential attribution of the text to Chrétien de Troyes, one of the most important French medieval writers and the so-called "father of French romance". Researchers are not only divided into two camps approving or disapproving Chrétien's authorship, they also entertain diametrically opposite opinions concerning the quality of the writing, in general reflecting their attitude towards its paternity. Some see in this hybrid of hagiography with the adventure romance another example of Chrétien's versatile genius; others think that the Champagne writer would never conceive such a parody of his Arthurian knight romances.

I would argue that there are objective criteria one can apply to a medieval texts to establish its provenance. I will describe such criteria and will demonstrate in this paper how a method of pattern recognition issuing from cybernetics will work for the attribution of literary texts. The method of pattern recognition consists in the identification of a domain of parameters and a measurement of the proximity or distance of texts as located in a multi-dimensional space. The method is holistic rather than analytic. Pattern recognition models make up part of the theory of pattern recognition and are normally included in the research domain of artificial intelligence. These models are used in many areas of analysis where there is need to classify different objects, phenomena, processes, signals, events, and so forth. Among many of their practical applications encountered in everyday life are included for instance face-recognising software in photograph applications and the classification of spam and non-spam e-mails by e-mail box filters. In the present case the method of pattern recognition is adapted to the classification of literary texts by creating models of them using specific parameters based on the syntactic structure of the text, when one extracts an extensive number of syntactic parameters from the compared texts and applies statistical criteria, such as the t criterion of Student and the measurement of Euclidian distances between objects-texts, in order to evaluate their proximity, once the texts are put in an X-dimensional space, where X is a number of relevant distinguishing parameters (see Graph 1 at the end of this article).

The method of syntactic pattern recognition has been successfully tested on different Russian and French texts: it has shown, for instance, that Emile Ajar and Romain Gary were the same author[1]; resolved the famous attribution case of And Quiet Flows the Don, signed by the Nobel winner Mikhail Sholokhov, attributing most of it to his collaborator and "teacher" Mikhail Serafimovich; and proved or rejected many cases of attribution of anonymous or pseudonymous writings to Pushkin, Dostoyevsky, Mayakovsky and others.[2] Research into the texts signed by Molière showed that a large part of his work may belong to the pen of Corneille.[3]

The idea of attributing the tale to Chrétien de Troyes stems from of the occurrence of the name "Crestiiens" in the prologue. "Crestiiens se veut entremetre, sans nient oster et sans nient metre, de conter un conte par rime [â€¦]" (v. 1-3) begins Guillaume d'Angleterre. Verse 1 of the romance thus raises the problematics of our research: this "Crestiiens"—is he Chrétien de Troyes, the well-known twelfth-century author who composed five still-popular romances?

Previous analysis of Guillaume d'Angleterre's authorship has mainly occurred in a discussion format. The first big debate took place between Maurice Wilmotte and Frédéric-Joseph Tanquerey in the early twentieth century. Wilmotte [4] is without doubt one of the most ardent defenders of the attribution of the romance to Chrétien de Troyes. He defends his thesis peremptorily, entering into the controversy along with another supporter of the same theory, Wendelin Foerster.[5] The two researchers, while convinced of the correctness of the attribution, have differing views on the place of Guillaume in Chrétien's works. According to Foerster the romance belongs to the final period of his career, and reflects the decline of his creative forces. Wilmotte rejects the proposal in a categorical manner. He insists that the novel is an integral part of the work of Chrétien de Troyes: "The style of Guillaume d'Angleterre is no less rich or less diverse than other works of Chrétien".[6] In his article from 1920 he presents Guillaume as an adventure novel and an aristocratic legend, and insists that it has all the typical features of the Champagne master's works. Wilmotte reveals in the text of Guillaume figures of speech occurring in Chrétien's romances: anadiploseos, chiasmus, synonyms, and

pleonasms, as well as "rare" and "unconscious" rhymes he believes every author uses together with the "conscious" and conventional ones. Having selected 500 rhymes at random in Guillaume, Wilmotte demonstrated that about 50 of them were used by Chrétien in his works of incontestable authorship.

All these described findings provoked great scepticism on the part of Tanquerey.7 He agrees that Guillaume might be an adventure romance, but one of a completely different nature from the adventure romances signed by Chrétien de Troyes. First and foremost, Tanquerey bases his objections on the absence in the romance of the characteristic features of Chrétien de Troyes' style: subtle psychology of the characters, chivalry, and the specific use of the wonderful. While Chrétien uses monologues to show us the inner struggle of the hero before taking a decision or to discover his state of mind, and while those monologues are always highly emotional, the author of Guillaume uses this literary device as a decorative surface which does not clarify the inner life and thoughts of his characters. Nor is Guillaume d'Angleterre "un poème chevaleresque", of the sort that Chrétien is supposed to compose. We do not see Yvain, nor king Arthur and his court, nor tournaments, nor chivalrous exploits. We do not find any manifestations of beauty: no beautiful ladies and knights, no clothes and no lavish precious weapons, no dazzling celebrations. The critic considers significant this lack of the stylistic details so important to Chrétien. Finally, the nature of the wonderful in Guillaume is different from its character in the works of that writer. In the latter, it is a magic wonderful, while in Guillaume it is supernatural, such as the heavenly voice which gives the orders to the characters, and one would never meet such a pattern in the courtly romances. Tanquerey comes to the conclusion that, in terms of the analysis of these three essential themes, Guillaume is based on a completely different model. He admits, of course, that the poet could have written a work so very different from the others, and he also admits that his arguments are not sufficiently definitive to deny Chrétien's authorship, but he underlines that it is not possible to refer to the nature and to the genre of the romance to assign it to the Champagne poet. To respond to Wilmotte's assertion about the resemblance of versification processes in both corpuses of texts, Tanquerey undertakes a new study of rhymes, after which he concludes that if we take 500 verses in Guillaume and compare their rhymes with those of any other work of the same period (provided it is long enough; he compares it to Amadas and the Continuation of Perceval), there will always be a large number of rhymes called "rare". For example, among the forty one rhymes chosen by Wilmotte, he discovered twenty-nine which were either in Amadas or in the Continuation of Perceval, or in both.

After this "battle of the giants" of early twentieth century medieval studies, a number of medievalists and critics took one or the other side, supporting or rejecting the previous arguments and basing the analysis on new considerations. Gustave Cohen supports the attribution, acknowledging the absence of Celtic motifs and courtly love and therefore placing the romance in the beginning of the literary career of the writer, but this time without Foerster's pejorative context.8 For Charles Foulon Guillaume is an "aristocratic work par excellence" that can be considered as a hymn to the courtly society and its feudal organisation and therefore absolutely conforming to the philosophy of Chrétien, who during his lifetime had several patrons and protectors and consequently one goal—to please those rich and noble people constituting his audience.9 Fausto Rebuffat points out that Chrétien follows the plot of a narrative he had not invented, and we have to deal in this case, not with his own creation, but with a transformation of a preexisting story.10 The writer has to follow the pre-existing narrative and cannot insert Arthur and his knight into the plot, but he does the revision in his personal style, "embroidering" by his hand the established pattern. Howard Robertson joins Rebuffat's arguments although he admits that the "lack of conclusive evidence forces the decision that the poem is anonymous".11 Nevertheless he enters into polemic with Tanquerey and finds that the "merveilleux magique" of Chrétien de Troyes' romances corresponds quite well to the wonderful as found in the lives of saints.

Linguistic techniques of analysis gave rise to a number of studies claiming to refute Chrétien's authorship too. Wolfgang Brand denies the attribution of Guillaume to Chrétien de Troyes, basing his conclusion on the fact that the two favourite techniques of the writer -

entrelacement (Reihentechnik) and duplication (Doppeltechnik) - are absent in the text, while the romance is long enough to deploy at least one of these devices.20 Brand also has objections to the lexical method of Stefenelli as it is based on a very limited number of words, and suggests that a similar study should be applied to the entire lexicon used by contemporaries of the writer. Lars Lindvall uses Guillaume d'Angleterre to compare its stylistic and syntactic characteristics with those of Chrétien's works.21 When Lindvall compared all six romances (five works by Chrétien de Troyes and Guillaume d'Angleterre), he found that two of them have absolutely nothing in common with the others in terms of selected syntactic markers. Erec et Enide occupies the farthest point from the main corpus and Guillaume is situated between Erec and the other romances. Lindvall's method does not support the idea of Chrétien de Troyes' attribution; in this case, however, it would be logical to deny the attribution of Erec, the only text in which the poet explicitly mentions his full name. The opinion of Domenico d'Allessandro is based on the study of descriptions: he makes the link between the complexity and the structure of the text and the number of descriptions, concluding that the structure of Guillaume is much less complex than that of the other romances.22 For example, in Guillaume d'Alessandro finds only one example of the explicit introduction of a description; the rest of them are inserted ex abrupto. He examines the types of description and described objects and equally comes to the conclusion that there are not many similarities between the works. François Zufferey calls our attention to Picardian features of the text that he considers to be crucial in the attribution of Guillaume, because it leads to the conclusion that the author wasn't from Champagne but from Picardy.23

The latest edition of the text of the romance based on the manuscript P was published in 2007 by Christine Ferlampin-Acher.25 The name of Chrétien de Troyes with a question mark in brackets might make us think that the editor approves the attribution, but this is not the case. She supports the opinion that without the name in the prologue, serving as a basis for the authorship, such an idea would never have arisen among scholars. Besides, Guillaume shouldn't be dated at the end of the twelfth century, but is "definitely a posterior romance, entering [...] the margins of the Arthurian world and demonstrating a renewal of the genre that would belong perhaps more to the early thirteenth century rather than the twelfth."26

It is useful to make this brief survey of the previous scholarship in the field of Guillaume authorship, insofar as we can witness a progressive development of the tools scholars have used. From the intuitive and rather subjective approaches of the first discussions scholarship has moved towards more selective and elaborate—more scientific—methods of authorship investigation. In this article I propose to present another new approach to the stylistic study of the text—using a pattern recognition method derived from cybernetics. The goal of my research is to prove or disprove the attribution of the romance to Chrétien de Troyes by determining whether syntactic patterns in Guillaume d'Angleterre are close to those used by the Champagne poet, based on the conjecture that syntax is the most latent level of language and, consequently, the least exposed to stylistic imitation.

The text of Guillaume d'Angleterre is preserved in complete version in two manuscripts27. The first, P, resides in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BnF) under number 375 (old numeration: 6987) and also contains two romances by Chrétien de Troyes: Cligès and Erec et Enide. Its year of creation is situated about 1288.28 P is written in the dialect of Picardy. Apparently this is due to the fact that the copyist was a native of Picardy but copied the romance after its version in the dialect of Île de France.29 The second manuscript, C, was discovered in the library of St. John's College Cambridge by Paul Meyer in 1874 and contains La vie de saint Guillaume d'Angleterre, Les Quinze signes de la Fin du Monde, La vie de sainte Paule and other hagiographical stories.30 All the texts were copied at the beginning of the fourteenth century by the same person.31 It is a continental version, composed in the Eastern dialect.

As Grégoire Lozinski has shown, the question of identifying the author of the text and the preference of one manuscript to another are interrelated.32 In many cases, the poor effect produced by the text of Guillaume d'Angleterre on the reader is not due to the lack of talent of the

author, but to the status of the manuscripts, as well as to the changes and mistakes made by copyists. I have based my study on the edition of the romance by Anne Berthelot, published in Å'uvres complÃ¨tes in BibliothÃ¨que de la PlÃ©iade in 1994.33 The collection presents a bilingual edition of complete works by ChrÃ©tien de Troyes

The choice of the PlÃ©iade edition as a source of the texts was made for several reasons. First, all the five romances by ChrÃ©tien de Troyes (but not Guillaume d’Angleterre) are found in the Guiot copy (manuscript P with the number BnF 794) which served as a base manuscript for this edition.Â This manuscript presents the evident advantage of having been copied by the same person, or in the worst case, in the same workshop,34 using identical modes and procedures, something which neutralizes divergences that could appear if the texts were copied by different copyists. The editors chose the manuscript P8 (number BnF 1450) as a control manuscript: it presented the advantage of having as its content, like the manuscript of Guiot, the whole collection of romances of the Champagne author.

Guillaume d’Angleterre doesn’t form part of any of the above-cited manuscripts, and has its own manuscript tradition. The PlÃ©iade editor of the romance, Anne Berthelot, chose manuscript P, although both manuscripts are of equal value, simply because “C was recentlyÂ presented to the public thanks to the edition of Holden”.35Â Nevertheless the general direction of Poirion assured a standard editorial approach applied to all the texts included in the volume.Â The copy of Guiot procured a homogeneity necessary forÂ processing the text with our chosen statistical method. Finally, the critical edition of each romance provided a clear view “through” the text, and gave us a possibility to consult other variants in case of doubt. The method of pattern recognition is based on the analysis of the syntactic aspect of the text, and we found that the abundance of variants rarely concerned the structure of the text and were often limited to different lexical choices.

By comparing syntactic structures used by “Crestiiens” in Guillaume d’Angleterre with those that the “father of French courtly romance” used to describe the adventures of his usual protagonists King Arthur, Queen Guinevere and the knights of the Round Table,Â my aim is to establish how closely distributed the texts are once they are set in a several-dimensional space created by the method of pattern recognition.

There are several advantages to using a syntax-based methodology forÂ authorship research into a medieval text.Â The first is closely related to the problem mentioned in the previous part â€"the choice and status of manuscripts. Every text written before the era of print comes to us as a manuscript, transcribed by a person usually other than its author, normally in a version not reviewed by the author. Scribes would often change some features of the texts, adding or omitting words, and even whole passages. By comparing different versions of the same text we can frequently identify added or omitted parts, and not take them into consideration. More work and attention is required to compare the lexical structures of the texts, which also could be easily modified by scribes, voluntarily or involuntarily (it is not difficult to imagine a tired clerk substituting by mistake one word by another, or intentionally expressing his own preferences by choosing a more modern word, more suiting his own stylistic feeling or just more popular in that region). On the other hand, syntactic textual structures are more constant and thus lessÂ exposed to accidental or deliberate modification by a copyist.

http://edufb.net/3179.pdf
http://edufb.net/845.pdf
http://edufb.net/2697.pdf
http://edufb.net/2873.pdf
http://edufb.net/2345.pdf
http://edufb.net/1498.pdf
http://edufb.net/694.pdf
http://edufb.net/1432.pdf
http://edufb.net/1667.pdf
http://edufb.net/3543.pdf
http://edufb.net/3261.pdf