

City University of New York (CUNY)

**CUNY Academic Works**

---

Dissertations and Theses

City College of New York

---

2016

## **The Ptolemaic System and the Ramifications of Hierarchical Thinking; The Impact of Medieval Literature**

Mark-Allan Donaldson  
*CUNY City College*

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: [https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cc\\_etds\\_theses/656](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cc_etds_theses/656)

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

---

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).  
Contact: [AcademicWorks@cuny.edu](mailto:AcademicWorks@cuny.edu)

The City College of New York

The Ptolemaic System and the Ramifications of Hierarchical Thinking;  
The Impact of Medieval Literature

Mark-Allan Donaldson

Professor Paul Oppenheimer

12/07/2016

[Donaldson.markallan@gmail.com](mailto:Donaldson.markallan@gmail.com)

“Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts of the City College of the City University of New York.”

## Table of Contents

The Ptolemaic System and the Ramifications of Hierarchical Thinking; Impact of Medieval Literature _____	Page 1
Notes and Citations _____	Page 53
Bibliography _____	Page 56

The *mise-en-page* of a manuscript offers many insights into a text's life beyond the actual content or subject of the writing.<sup>1</sup> It is a reflection of the quality, purpose, and production of the manuscript, and can lend insight into the very culture or time in which the work under study was created. To interpret this information from the face of the manuscript itself, one may study a variety of the paleographical features that can be found on a hand-crafted manuscript. By noting the existence and exorbitance of the rubrication or illumination of a manuscript, the patronage and purpose of a book can be inferred.<sup>2</sup> This is to say that a text that lacks any illuminated letters or rubrication, and is written in a single script, may be thought of as being a personal or cheaply produced book. It may be thought of as a book which was written by its primary owner, and which contains content relevant to the owner's life and fancies. This content might contain anything from family recipes, preferred hymns or other religious texts, to the author's favorite stories. At the other end of the spectrum of book production, a manuscript featuring multi-colored rubricated script, with illuminated letters beginning each paragraph or new section, and with images saturating the text's bordering margins, would be a manuscript which was either produced under the patronage of a wealthy person, religious organization, or ruling class, or was something produced with the intent of being circulated or sold among a wealthy or necessarily literate (for example the clergy) group of people. In addition to these possibilities, the manuscript would be regarded as holding some value beyond the material (for example canonical religious works, including Bibles, prayer books, and books of hours, were often heavily rubricated, illuminated, and illustrated).

The life or circulation of a book (whether a personal text or a text of wider significance), beyond its initial purpose, may also be revealed through an examination of the state of its *mise-*

*en-page*. By analyzing how much marginal space is available around the text, it may be determined how many times a book or pamphlet has been cut down to be rebound. This can be revealed by measuring the text on a page and determining whether it is off-center, or perhaps by noting whether any marginal notes or illustrations (or perhaps even the script of the text itself) have been shaved down, resulting in illustrations which are incomplete. Concluding that a text has been cut and rebound can offer further details beyond the initial revelation that the book in question has experienced a longevity that required some form of maintenance (due to the books' usefulness or value outliving an initial binding). This rebinding could indicate that the text in question has been divided into multiple parts which have then been rebound separately and distributed in volumes, or that a portion of a text has been added to a larger anthology of work, and, in order to fit into the binding, has needed to sacrifice some of its own margins. Beyond this, the binding material itself can be used to determine when a book was first produced. If this information is compared to the script used in the body of the text and the type of material it was written on (be it on a type of parchment, or vellum from sheep, cows, or goats). A paleographer could work out the difference in time between when the work was written, and when it was bound or rebound, as well as where it was produced.

All of this information about the life of a book or text can be inferred through a study of its *mise-en-page*. The paleographical analysis of the page layout of a manuscript reveals the text's history; the date and location of its composition, its ownership, significance, circulation, and longevity. Before a literary study of its contents is undertaken, valuable information on the environment in which a text existed can be gleaned from the physical object itself.

Similarly, beyond the life of one book, the *mise-en-page* can reflect the kind of ideologies at play in the world in which it was created, the kind of thinking that, either passively or actively, can be seen reflected on the surface of the page. Perhaps the most significant of these reflections comes in the form of the so-called Hierarchy of Scripts. During the Carolingian period a practice gained prevalence in manuscripts produced for the purpose of circulation, or which were considered to be of some value (whether spiritual, intellectual, political, or cultural).<sup>3</sup> This practice followed a protocol or model of *mise-en-page* that established a hierarchy and that saw the use of antiquated types of paleographical scripts in prominent places on a manuscript page. For example, Roman Capitals or Square Capitals were utilized for the title of a book or as the heading of a particular section of a text. Both majuscule scripts in which letters were formed using predominantly straight lines and harsh angles as a result of these scripts being developed and utilized when writing was done with chisels on rough surfaces.<sup>4</sup> Given the relevant antiquity of these scripts (Roman capitals being most common between 31 BCE and 600 CE, falling out of popular use some three hundred years before the Carolingian period), the only reason they would appear in manuscripts from the Carolingian period onwards would be due to their perceived value within the strict Hierarchy of Scripts. The subsequent portion of the text, perhaps a sub-heading or a continuation of the main title, would be copied out in a Uncial script, another majuscule script which is the basis for modern capital letters and was most commonly used between the fourth and eighth centuries (300 CE - 800 CE). Rustic Capitals, again a majuscule script with bows, flourishes, and feet, would in turn follow the Uncial, if necessary.<sup>5</sup> Finally, for the main body of the text, a book hand script which was more common to the relative time period would be used; such as, in the case of the

Carolingian period, Caroline Minuscule (a calligraphic script developed circa 780 CE by Benedictine monks with the purpose of making the Latin alphabet easily recognizable).<sup>6</sup>

This way of ordering the scripts during the production of a manuscript was not simply practiced to be aesthetically pleasing, although that was certainly its effect, and was not simply a consequence of a scribe's or patron's personal preference; it was a purposeful and organized strategy. While discussing the evolution of Carolingian minuscule and the structure of scripts in the 9th century, Rosamond McKitterick points out the importance of script beyond the simple matter of beatification.<sup>7</sup> She cites the likelihood that Saint Jerome took special care to ensure that, when his *Chronicon* was copied by other scribes, they did not deviate from his own use of colored script, "lest someone suppose that so great an effort has been attempted for the meaningless pleasure of the eyes."<sup>8</sup> The saint obviously viewed his typographical and paleographical choices as significant to the understanding and structure of his work, beyond their purpose of simply recording his ideas in written words. McKitterick goes on to explain how the scribe of the Scaliger 14 version of Jerome's work followed the Saint's command, indicating not only a respect for the original author, but also for the intention of the various paleographical components of the work itself:

Accordingly, the beginning of the *Chronicon* text in Scaliger 14 sets out the Assyrians in red, the Hebrews are in green; black is used for the Scythians, and the brown for the Egyptians. When the Argives need to be inserted, another colour - dark red - is used. Apart from the differentiation between different peoples and empires by colour, there is also an elaborate hierarchy of

references orchestrated by changes in the script type and size, with entries and headings in differently sized and spaced uncial, historical notes inserted in uncial, but minuscule used for the prefatory matter and for the more substantial sections on Roman history towards the end of the book.<sup>9</sup>

Here Jerome's typographical choices were not meant to be pretty; they were meant to indicate or highlight specific aspects of his work, to guide the reader through the structure of the *Chronicon*. Aside from this example, McKitterick rightly affirms the importance of the Hierarchy of Scripts and its formulated structure. Speaking to this structure, she notes, "In many instances the interplay between different grades of script was formalized as a hierarchy of scripts, particularly at Tours in the ninth century, but familiar in many early medieval books."<sup>10</sup> This description of the system as "formalized" is more than correct, as it establishes the hierarchy as something which is not easily changed or altered depending on the particular scribe or work being produced. It also implies that the hierarchy is something which has been thought about and established, rather than something that was simply done once and then copied mindlessly. McKitterick also makes another pertinent observation as part of a broader discussion of the implementation and spread of Caroline minuscule.

Its [Caroline minuscule's]<sup>11</sup> role as a book hand appears to have consolidated an attitude of the Roman system of scripts already in existence - notably the capitals, uncial and half uncial of the book hands - as a hierarchy of scripts on which scribes could draw in their efforts to bring greater clarity and structure to a text.<sup>12</sup>



This passage provides insight on two important aspects of medieval paleography and the hierarchy of its various scripts. First, it shows how scripts were broadly classified or thought of as having specific purposes (in this case Caroline minuscule's fermentation as a book hand), and how this classification effected the other scripts in use; i.e. the function of Roman scripts were consolidated as the types of scripts which would be used for titles as they could not be a book hands following the establishment of Caroline minuscule. This identifiable cause and effect relationship between the different types within the system of script shows the strictness of the hierarchy. As, if one script (Caroline minuscule) was to be used as a book hand then a different type of script (Roman capitals) could not be used for the same purpose and it must be determined whether the latter script will be given a higher or lower position than the former script. In this case Roman Capitals and indeed the entire Roman system of scripts was elevated to become the script type of titles and headings within a manuscript. Second, McKitterick notes that scribes utilized the Hierarchy of Scripts to add clarity and structure to a text. The importance of scripts beyond a means of making the contents of a text readable, or as a way of beautifying a text's physical appearance (specifically in this case its *mise-en-page*) is indicative of a larger hierarchy of clarity. The Hierarchy of Scripts is a creation in accordance with ideologies which ranged beyond the practice of physical book production. To deviate from this established hierarchy would result in the dilution of the work's clarity and make it structurally unstable within the culture in which it was produced.

During the Carolingian period and onward, scripts were perceived each to have an established value in reference to one another: older majuscule Latin scripts were higher up than minuscule commonplace scripts, or book hands, in the hierarchical chain. The relationships

between these scripts were objective goals in scribal work and the hierarchy itself was an aspect of something far more influential than any one page of a manuscript in which these scripts were ordered. This absolutist way of thinking about objects (in this case scripts) was part of the larger practice of hierarchical thinking which dominated the ideologies of the Medieval European world. The Hierarchy of Scripts was a microcosmic physical reflection of the influence of the Ptolemaic system on the literary world.

During the Medieval period (the fifth to fifteenth century), the universe was believed to be ordered in accordance with the Ptolemaic system, a mathematical model of the universe which was created by the Alexandrian astronomer, astrologer, geographer, and mathematician, Ptolemy around 150 CE. This model of the universe would become highly influential on thinking about a multitude of aspects of life on Earth. Understanding this model and its influence is a key to understanding how and why the medieval world ordered itself, and in turn how this ordering influenced human culture during and after the Middle Ages.

Ptolemy's model is an exercise in mathematically arranging and ordering the universe in an attempt to provide logical proofs of his, and others', notions about planetary motion and universal truths. However, what is pertinent to this discussion and the model's importance in the medieval world is the physical structure, or organization, of the universe and its rigidity within this established structure. In its conception Ptolemy utilized statistical information recorded by the Babylonians (who had made seemingly endless records of cosmic regularities but did not put them to any practical use). The model was composed of nine cosmic spheres arranged in a strict hierarchy. At the highest point in the system was the Empyrean, where God, or the burning mind of God, resided. The Empyrean was the source of the *primum mobile* or

Prime Mover, which through its own movement (or through God's notions of movement) propelled everything else in the universe.<sup>13</sup> Beneath the Empyrean was the Stellatum, a sphere with holes through which the fire of God shines all the way down through the rest of the spheres and is visible on earth (this visible light is what we know today as the multitude of stars that are visible from our own solar system).<sup>14</sup> Beneath the Stellatum, and in descending order are the spheres containing Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, the Moon, and finally Earth at the lowest point in this order. Earth was at the unmoving center of this universe, however, its central position did not give it any kind of prestige. The center of the universe was in fact the most dismal point within the Ptolemaic system as it was the furthest away from the Empyrean and God.

Along with the spheres, the universal model also involved an arrangement of nine angels, divided into three groups of three, each of which served a specific purpose. The highest-ranking set was comprised of the angels, Seraphim, Cherubim, and Thrones, who resided in the *primum mobile* and transmuted God's ideas of motion between it and the Empyrean. Beneath the *primum mobile* and occupying the space between it and the Moon were the Dominions, Powers, and Virtues, which were responsible for regulating the movement of the planets. Lastly were the set of angels between the Moon and the Earth: the Principalities who ordered countries and kingdoms; the Archangels who regulated the upper classes of human society; and the Angels who regulated the lower classes of human society.

Aside from the order of the spheres, the celestial bodies within them, and the groups of angels, the other key physical feature of this universe was that it was thought to be finite. Beyond the Empyrean was nothing – it was where physical existence ended. This is vastly

different from our own view, that the universe is infinite and ever expanding. As a result, the people of the Middle Ages had ideas about their place within their universe which differ greatly from our own relationship with the universe. The medieval person would not be plagued by uncertainty with regard to his or her situation in the universe, or question what was beyond his or her realm of knowledge about the cosmos. In their finite and strictly ordered universe they were as comfortable about their position in the space as a person in the modern period would be in a familiar city or county. In fact, this belief in the finite and solidified composition of the universe was so certain to those who subscribed to the Ptolemaic model that they could calculate exactly how far away the Earth was from the Empyrean. It is also important to note that the shape of the universe was a product of much thought. The universe was spherical in nature because the prime mover was inspired by God. As a theological entity or as a philosophical idea, God is intrinsically perfect. It is only reasonable, or indeed logical, that the movement inspired by such an entity would strive towards perfection. The only perfect perpetual movement which can occur is that of circular motion. The universal shape and movement is thus thought of as spherical.

The reason behind this spherical nature is perhaps more important than the nature itself, at least for the purpose of this discussion. The desire to order, or compose, the universe as a reflection, or strive, towards the perfection of God explains not only the spherical and rotational qualities of this universe, but also the reoccurring number three utilized in the system. Three was considered the prime number, it reflected the Christian Trinity and also was able to divide perfectly into itself. Thus in the medieval model of the universe there are both nine spheres and nine individual angels. These angles, as it has been mentioned, are grouped

into groups of three which in turn are also grouped into a larger group of three within the universal hierarchy.

The structure and the emulation of perfection found within the Ptolemaic universe is something that is important to the interpretation of medieval literature and to the analysis of that literature's impact on literature and culture beyond the Middle Ages.

The Ptolemaic system can be seen in the actual structure of some medieval works. Prominent or well-known examples of literature structurally reflecting the Ptolemaic universe are two works by Dante Alighieri, *La vita nova* (1295) and *Divina Commedia* (1320). In both of the epic poetic works the form of the writing follows the form of the universe, which is to say that each is structured in order to reflect a mathematical and physical perfection which would be familiar to one who understood the composition of the Ptolemaic universe. Each work is centered around the number three, either directly or through the number nine which perfectly divides into three groups of three; *Vita Nova* is structured in such a way that the verse and overall structure of the text revolves around the repetition of the number nine; and, the *Divina Commedia* is broken into three sections each dealing with a different subject and location (Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise). Both numbers will be remembered as constantly reoccurring throughout the universal hierarchies; there are nine spheres, and, for the angles, there are nine in total with three major groups which each break down into another group of three individual entities.

Beyond this structural representation, one that is similar to the reflection seen in the Hierarchy of Scripts, the contents of medieval literature were also affected. The narrative worlds that were created and the characters within them would have been vastly different if

their stories were written without the influence of the Ptolemaic system, and most notably its hierarchies.

Due to these hierarchies, each entity (be it a person, culture, race, religion, animal, or plant) within the medieval universe had its fixed position. Like the scripts discussed above this position was not determined subjectively, but was a result of the larger universal structure. An entities position was a mathematically defensible fact, just as Caroline miniscule could not be used as the script of a work's title and Roman Capitals the script of its body, the Earth would never be thought of as being closer to the Empyrean, and the Seraphim would never be placed lower than the Archangels. To understand why this is so important it is helpful to examine other models of the universe which share similar traits to Ptolemy's. In its structure, Ptolemy's universe is similar to earlier models on the shape and arrangement of the universe. As Alistair Crombie points out, in *Medieval and Early Modern Science* (1959), "In its physical conception his [Ptolemy's]<sup>15</sup> system was in fact basically Aristotelian, and Aristotle's influence may be read directly in the preface of the *Almagest*<sup>16</sup>."<sup>17</sup> Crombie, while discussing Aristotle's relevant ideas in his second chapter, "Cosmology and Astronomy," writes about how the Aristotelian cosmos was, like the Ptolemaic, spherical, or comprised of a number of moving concentric spheres, and finite. After a brief description of the ordering of the spheres and the various cosmic bodies within, Crombie notes the most important aspect of the Aristotelian universe, that "each kind of body or substance in this universe had a place that was natural to it and a natural motion in relation to that place."<sup>18</sup> Crombie's repetitive use of the word "natural" (which here can be taken to mean right or correct place in correspondence to the other bodies and substances in the universe) captures the objectivity of these universal hierarchies superbly. The positions and

order of the heavens, planets, and angels was a natural occurrence or fact, not something that could be subjectively argued against or rearranged on a whim.

Such a rigid and hierarchical universe deeply affected people in the medieval period and the manner in which they thought about themselves and the world around them. Beyond the fields of theology, mathematics, and astronomy, the influence of the Ptolemaic system can be seen; thoughts on geography, politics, and identity (be it personal, religious, racial, cultural, or national) were all effected. This influence may be noted through the study of medieval literature both with regard to manuscripts, and the contents of the literature produced during the medieval period. Certainly, in the field of paleography and particularly in the Hierarchy of Scripts this influence is clear, and, it is something that has remained part of the production of texts and the fields of typography today. Books will still dedicate a different font size and type to their title, or perhaps the first letter of a chapter. In the world of computerized fonts, it has become standard knowledge that in professional or academic writing there are some fonts which are acceptable or more highly valued, and others which are best kept for more personal forms of writing, or forms of writing which are not ascribed much value in critical circumstances. For example, Times New Roman is a font which has almost become the standard or rather has become the benchmark font for publishable writing whereas a font such as Comic Sans, which as the name suggests was created based on comic book lettering, is regarded with little respect and its intended purpose is for informal documents and children's material.

The Hierarchy of Scripts is not the only remnant of the Ptolemaic system which, due to its influence on the literature of the medieval period, has impacted the world following the

Renaissance and into the modern period. The influence of this universal model's hierarchies on texts is apparent throughout medieval and Renaissance literature in what is later referred to as the Chain of Being. The notion of everything having its natural place in the universe was one that can be seen reflected in the second book of Chaucer's *House of Fame* (1379/1380):

Every kindly thing that is,  
 Hath a kindly stede ther he  
 May best in it conserved be;  
 Unto which place every thing,  
 Thurgh his kindly enclyning,  
 Moveth for to come to<sup>19</sup>

Chaucer's language here mirrors Aristotle's conception of the universe just as the *mise-en-page* of a manuscript reflects the structure found in the Ptolemaic model of the universe. Chaucer is not simply discussing the planets or spheres. He is discussing all of creation. The line, "May best in it conserved be," captures the rigidity and objectivity of these hierarchies. The line implies that if, unthinkable as it would have been to Chaucer or other medieval peoples, something existed outside of its "kindly stede," (its position in the universe in relation to everything else) it would not be right, well, or to use Chaucer's word, conserved. These same ideas can be seen in literary works two hundred and forty-three years later in the First Folio of *Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies* (1623) – specifically in the play *Macbeth*. In this play the very foundation of the narrative and plot is built upon these hierarchies; Macbeth violently undermines and attempts to circumvent these hierarchical orders when he murders King Duncan. This act disturbs both the old quasi democratic line of succession and Duncan's



newly implemented familial line of succession. Macbeth has disrupted the established chain of being and the result is the tragedy which unfolds.

OLD MAN: 'Tis unnatural,

Even like the deed that's done. On Tuesday last

A falcon, tow'ring in her pride of place,

Was by a mousing owl hawked at and killed.

ROSS: And Duncan's horses - a thing most strange and certain -

Beauteous and swift, the minions of their race,

Turned wild in nature, broke their stalls, flung out,

Contending 'gainst obedience, as they would

Make war with mankind.

OLD MAN: 'Tis said they ate each other.

ROSS: They did so, to th' amazement of mine eyes

That looked upon't.<sup>20</sup>

In this short discussion, following the murder of Duncan and the fleeing of his appointed heirs, it is revealed that nature itself has been thrown out of balance by the disruption of the hierarchies. This is what happens when something or someone moves to a different position than would be considered their "kindly stede." It is a warning against the disturbing of the chain of being, one that is repeated and reverberates throughout the play in various forms; Macbeth's madness, Lady Macbeth's guilt, the political and natural break down of the Scottish Kingdom, the various deaths and murders throughout the tragedy, etc. In both examples, the hierarchies of the universe are presented as fundamental laws of being, they are not

subjectively utilized in order to arrange Chaucer's or Shakespeare's narratives but are rather truths in the universes of the stories and in the worlds of the authors themselves. These works also do not argue against the hierarchies, which is indicative of how highly integrated these ideas were within the cultures of the later Middle Ages and early Renaissance. *The House of Fame* reports these ideas as whole-heartedly as someone would report that water is indeed wet. While *Macbeth* is composed as a defense of this natural order and an exploration of the dangers of interrupting or subverting it.

The patterns and beliefs seen in Chaucer, and later in Shakespeare, can be traced to the literary practices of earlier medieval romances and epic poems that were influenced by the Ptolemaic universal model. Throughout the literatures of medieval Europe, a reflection of the Ptolemaic system can be seen. This is crucial to the understanding of literary works and their composition. The reflections of the Ptolemaic hierarchies found in these texts are unlike the reflections of the Hierarchy of Scripts or the structural reflections of Dante's work. These texts utilize the Ptolemaic hierarchies as part of their narrative universes, as a literary tool or archetype. This archetypal use of the hierarchies is not limited to a simple reflection and is susceptible to different interpretations: these interpretations and the texts which use them can fall into two major categories when analyzing the texts with regard to the Ptolemaic universe.

The first category includes texts that represent object hierarchies. Texts which operate, from the viewpoint that the hierarchies are objective truths. This first category represents the universal hierarchies in a non-malicious or non-prejudicial way. In this type of representation, there is no direct or violent denouncement of something which or someone who is lower in the hierarchy than something of someone else. These medieval epic and romantic works, as well as

the authors who wrote them, are simply exploring topics and characters in the narrative world which has been created in accordance with the Ptolemaic universe; much like Shakespeare's later exploration of what would happen to a character who defied this system and its hierarchies as in the previously discussed *Macbeth*.

The second category is almost the antithesis of the first. In this category the hierarchies of the Ptolemaic system are still treated as universal and narrative truths, however, they are represented in an extremely subjective manner. Such texts work from the basis that some peoples, races, or religions occupy a higher spot in the universal order, and conclude that because of this these "lower" peoples, races, or religions are inferior.

An example of the former category of objective representation can be found in such a text as *Parzival* (thirteenth century) by Wolfram Von Eschenbach (1160/80 - 1220). In this German version of the Arthurian Grail quest the most vivid reflections of hierarchical thinking on race and religion may be found in the character of Feirefiz, Parzival's half-brother and the secondary protagonist of the work. Feirefiz is an extremely interesting character due to the duality of his race; he is literally of mixed race, having skin that is black in some parts (from his mother) and white in others (from his father). Feirefiz is also a non-Christian hero in a dominantly Christian text, yet his religious background does not mean he is met with overt scorn or violence within the novel. However, it is made clear in the text that his faith is a detriment. This is evident by Feirefiz's inability to see the Holy Grail due to his status as a non-Christian, which bars him from acquiring the love of a Grail Maiden.

In *Parzival* the Grail or "Gral" is presented as stone whose essence is most pure. "If you have never heard of it, I shall name it for you here. It is called "Lapsit exillis" ... This stone is

called "The Gral."<sup>21</sup> This presentation in itself is a microcosmic representation of the Ptolemaic universe as the Latin name, "Lapsit exillis," roughly translates in a "stone which fell from heaven." Meaning that in the world universe of the narrative a physical object may travel down from heaven to the earth carrying God's ordainments and the destinies of those who will keep the Gral (as this stone does, showing the histories and futures of its keepers, including Parzival's, emblazoned on its side). This is in line with the physical composition of the Ptolemaic universe that was discussed in the description of the universe given above. When Feirefiz first encounters the Gral, that is to say when it is first in his presence, he cannot see it and does not seem to have any knowledge of the object, as he does not know that it is the source food and drink at the feast he is attending.

The Infidel inquired how the empty cup of gold became full at the Table - a marvel he delighted to watch! 'My lord,' replied handsome Anfortas who had been given to him as table-companion, 'do you not see the Gral straight in front of you?' 'I see nothing but an achmardi,' replied the particoloured Infidel.<sup>22</sup>

In this same scene the Gral, and in turn Christianity, is linked to the maiden who Feirefiz loves. She is the maiden who is carrying the Gral, and despite not being able to see it, he can see her. Feirefiz is almost instantaneously taken with the maiden and fall in love with her. This is important, as Feirefiz's love will form the basis for his eventual conversion to Christianity and subsequent advancement in the universal hierarchy.

'My young lady carried it in to us, the one standing there before us, wearing a crown. The sight of her pierces my heart. I imagined

myself so strong that no woman, wed or unwed, could rob me of my happiness. If I was ever the recipient of a noble love, it has become odious to me.<sup>123</sup>

What follows is a condensed, yet familiar, series of emotions, which generally accompany a courtly love scenario. Feirefiz feels deeply affected and pained by his love for the maiden who was only glimpsed from across the room and begins to prioritize his affection for her. This kind of scenario and infatuation is not unfamiliar to Arthurian romances. Feirefiz turns to his half-brother for help in attaining the Gral maiden. Parzival informs him that he will need to convert to Christianity. Feirefiz expected this but is ignorant as to how to go about this process, "If one gets Baptism by fighting, send me there at once and let me deserve her reward. I have always liked the music of splinters flying in jousts and swords ringing on helmets."<sup>24</sup> This is important as his assumptions about how he will have to covert hints at the violence that is normally involved in literary religious conversions. Parzival's reaction to this suggestion with laughter and cheerfully dismisses the suggestion made by his half-brother, telling him that he simply "must forswear all your gods for her sake and be always ready to fight the Adversary of God on high, and faithfully observe God's Commandments."<sup>25</sup> A reasonable and peaceful process of conversion which Feirefiz eagerly accepts.

"Whatever will assure me of winning that maiden shall be done and seen to be done, fully and faithfully,' answered the Infidel."<sup>26</sup>

The significant of this entire scene is that the conversion in the narrative is presented as a nonviolent act which is the decision of the character wishing to convert. It would seem that to Wolframs mind conversation between religions was not a violent act, and therefore was

perhaps a common occurrence in his society. All of this is a part of what makes this text fall into the first objective category. In this narrative world Christianity is thought of as the higher religion, but this does not mean that it will be forced upon anybody. It also does not mean that non-Christians will be harshly persecuted just because they are not Christian. While before converting he is spiritually and physically lower on the hierarchy of human society, Feirefiz is not excluded from the events of the novel nor presented in a villainous light. He is marked as an outsider from Christianity for much of the text by the narrator's reference to him as an "Infidel" or "the Infidel" but this does not detract from his heroic nature or character. His suffering in this area is confined to the racial prejudice of some minor characters. "Seeing him all black and white, the boy did not want to kiss him. Noble children are still said to be prey to fears. The Infidel laughed at this."<sup>27</sup> This reaction to the Feirefiz's skin shows the prejudice which exists in the narrative world (and thus arguably in Wolfram's own society) but it is immediately belittled and labeled as childish. It is undercut within the narrative world by Feirefiz's own laughter and by the fact that more significant characters of the text embrace him welcomingly. These religious and racial prejudices towards Feirefiz should not be overlooked nor labeled as insignificant in discussions of literature's reflections of the physiological truths or opinions of authors and their cultures. However, viewed in the context of this paper these instances do not disprove the fact that this text falls into the first category, which sets about representing the Ptolemaic hierarchies in an objective manner. While characters like the noble child and possibly the narrative voice hold some prejudice against Feirefiz, this does not affect his status in the larger universal hierarchy or Chain of Being, and, this does not hinder him from moving up this hierarchy during his conversion.

The treatment of Feirefiz by the narrator, the characters in the text, and the narrative universe is markedly different from the treatment of races and religions other than Christianity and Caucasians in medieval texts that fall into the second category of representation concerning the Ptolemaic universal hierarchies.

This second category of literature, as has been briefly discussed, is highly subjective. Works that fall into this category often take a prejudicial approach to the representations of cultures, peoples, races, and religions and then justify this treatment through a warped and subjective interpretation of the universal hierarchies. Opposed to the objectivity of the mathematic and scientific Ptolemaic model, and in contrast with texts that reflect this objectivity, second category texts take an aggressive approach to hierarchical thinking and are rife with dichotomies. They present a narrative of culture clash where the narrator, the universe, and the characters of the work behave as if this prejudice is natural and correct within the structure of the universe. In such works one side is presented as unquestionable right or good, no matter their treatment of those they encounter, while the other is irrevocably wrong or evil despite behaving in a comparable manner to the “good side.” One such text that falls into the second category would be the French Epic, *The Song of Roland* (1040-1115).

In *Parzival* the textual evidence seems to support the idea that Wolfram, and the characters he has written, view these racial and religious hierarchies as objective facts; not subjective opinions that demean, or belittle, one race or religion in favor of another (despite how they are now interpreted). These hierarchies in *Parzival* are simply a literary subscription to the Ptolemaic universe where everything has its natural place in relation to everything else. It is only logical that, as this text was written in a Christian society, its representation of the

universe would portray Christianity as the preferable religion. However, *In the Song of Roland*, the objective interpretation is not the standard and the text utilizes the Ptolemaic hierarchies to construct a medieval narrative that is vastly different from the interpretation in *Parzival*.

In *The Song of Roland*, the same strict ordering of the universe as that which structures *Parzival* is seen with a similar ordering of the religions and races. Again the Christian group (led by Charlemagne and championed by the hero Roland) is favored over the Saracens, or pagans (under King Marsile). However, unlike the structure of the German work, the hierarchies in *The Song of Roland* are exceptionally subjective and prejudicial. This can blatantly be seen when the poem is concerning itself with any one of three types of descriptive passages; lines that deal with the introduction of characters, their appearance, and their souls.

*The Song of Roland* opens with character descriptions of the political representatives of the two groups, the Kings Charlemagne and Marsile. In the opening stanza the subjective tone is set, and there can be no question as to which group is the preferred and which is the condemnable.

Charles the king, our great emperor, / Has been in Spain for seven  
 long years, / And conquered that proud land as far as the sea. /  
 There is no castle which can resist him, / No city or wall left to be  
 destroyed, / Except for Saragossa, which stands upon a mountain.  
 / It is held by King Marsile, who does not love God; / He serves  
 Muhammad and calls upon Apollo. / He cannot prevent disaster  
 from overtaking him.<sup>28</sup>



The narrator of the poem does not waste time in establishing who should be thought of as more individually, politically, and religiously, elevated. King Marsile is presented as an unloving heathen. Even before Feirefiz became a Christian at the close of *Parzival* he was not degraded in comparison with his Christian counterparts. King Marsile's religion, that of Islam as indicated by his serving of Muhammad, is linked to ancient Greek mythology, no doubt an attempt to further degrade it in comparison to the preferred polytheistic Christianity. Charlemagne on the other hand is presented as a "great" man, a conqueror and champion of Christendom. He demands admiration from the reader and, although it may seem trivial, it is no small coincidence that he is mentioned first and is located at the top of the *mise-en-page*. The introductions of less significant characters follow a similar style with those under Charlemagne's command often being described in a positive and majestic manner. When the Christians hold council the arrival of prominent members of Charlemagne's inner fold are announced as "the valiant Count Acelin of Gascony,... / And Oliver, the valiant and noble."<sup>29</sup> Descriptions which are in contrast with the introduction of pagans which are seen in stanza seventy-six, "A pagan Estorgans is there too, / And so is Estramariz his companion. / They are felons, wretched traitors / Marsile says: 'Lords, come forward.'"<sup>30</sup> The narrator here does not hide his opinions on either group and the author does not miss the opportunity to degrade Marsile further by having him refer to such debauched characters as Lords of his court.

A similar dichotomy occurs in the physical descriptions of the warriors of either side. Characters such as Roland and Oliver are strong and are evidently superb warriors, able to rend enemies in two with a single blow and lay waste to hoards upon hoards of their foes. The same strength can be attributed to pagan warriors such as Chernubles of Munigre who "can carry a

heavier weight for sport, / Than four mules can bear, when they are carrying a burden."<sup>31</sup>

However, this impressive strength in the pagan is immediately undercut by a description of the horrid and unnatural land in which he was born and the allusion to him being a kind of devil.

In the land, it is said, whence he came,

The sun does not shine and wheat cannot grow,

Rain does not fall nor dew collect.

There is no stone which is not completely black. Some say that  
devils live there.<sup>32</sup>

Indeed, this comparison or description of non-Christians as devilish or monstrous is not uncommon in the text, be it in the form of the devilish nature of their homeland as seen above or in the reporting of bodily malformation. An example of the latter being found within stanza ninety-four when a description of Falsaron, the brother of King Marsile, is given; "Between his eyes his brow was spread so broad / Its measure was a good half-foot."<sup>33</sup>

Beyond the character traits and physical descriptors in *The Song of Roland*, passages that deal with the deaths of individuals are also illuminating. These death scenes reveal the bias focus of the text in two ways. In these scenes no matter who is dying and who is killing the majority of the poetic description focuses on the Christian party. The subjects of what happens to the souls of combatants and heroes on the French and Saracen sides also represents the opinion on each group in an elegantly simple way. Quite literally one group of souls goes down while the other group goes up, and it is not difficult to guess which is which. An example of the poetic favoring of Christian characters as well as an example of the fate of pagan souls can be read in the death scene of Malprimis.

"And Gerin strikes Malprimis of Brigal; / His fine shield is not  
 worth a penny. / He shatters its crystal boss / And sends one half  
 flying to the ground. / He rends his hauberk right down to his  
 flesh / And plunges his fine spear deep into his body. / The pagan  
 falls to the ground in a heap; His soul is carried off by Satan."<sup>34</sup>

In these lines, the death of Malprimis is predominantly fixated on the strength of the Christian who killed him, Gerin, who so easily cuts through Malprimis' "fine" armor. The final line dedicated to this character is dismissive and, quite literally, damning. Compare this to the lines that are dedicated to the death of Roland, who dies with grace and nobility, and who's soul goes in an altogether different direction than Malprimis.

With his hands joined he went to his end. / God sent down his  
 angel Cherubin / And with him Saint Michael of the Peril. / With  
 them both came Saint Gabriel. / They bear the count's soul to  
 paradise. / Roland is dead, God has his soul in heaven.<sup>35</sup>

Roland's death scene is precisely focused on him, with line after line devoted to his angelic retrieval and the ascension of his soul into Heaven. This is in deep contrast with the way the pagan death is handled.

Another area of the French epic which throws the difference between texts of the first and second categories into a clear and harsh light is the conversion of the Pagan queen ,Bramimonde, to Christianity. Having been captured at the end of the conflict between the Christians and Pagans, Bramimonde - as decided by Charlemagne - will have to either convert or die. The magnanimous Christian king decides to convert his captured queen after he has

dealt with the traitorous Ganelon and his family. "When the emperor has completed his justice / And appeased his great anger. / He has Bramimonde christened."<sup>36</sup> Unlike Feirefiz, Bramimonde has no agency in the process and the change to the Christian religion is linked to the idea or theme of justice. In converting his prisoner, Charlemagne is simply continuing to doll out justice at the conclusion of the war, and poem, in order to set the universe right. Also unlike Feirefiz's conversion, this conversion is not based on love, but is rather the result of war.

In the essay "Periodization, Race, and Global Contact" (2007) Ania Loomba works from the idea that literature acts as a kind of time capsule, or record book, of whatever time period it was written about or in. Viewing literary works, even fictitious ones, as historically or culturally informative texts for the ideologies of the particular times in which any given work was produced, stating "...literature is a particularly dense repository of cultural memory, which allows special insights into the nature of racial ideologies and their uneven relationship to colonialism."<sup>37</sup> While Loomba, in this essay, is focusing on plays (specifically Shakespeare's *Othello* and its much-discussed aspects of personal interracial relationships and the relationship between race and state), the idea that she is exploring may be aptly utilized in a study of *The Song of Roland* and its use of subjective representations. *The Song of Roland* may be seen as a "repository" of information regarding the attitudes of the time as a way to explain, or at the very least attempt to understand, the sharp contrast between the Christians and Moors/pagans of the text. While the narrative subject of the epic is a battle that occurred almost three hundred years prior to the composition of the text (the Battle of Roncevaux (778)), the culturally significant subject of *The Song of Roland* is the crusade (which was undertaken around the time of the poems composition), and the war for the preservation of Christianity.

Thus, the texts subjective use of Ptolemaic hierarchies stems from the crusader mindset which is not unfamiliar in literature and historical documentation of the time. Both types of writing which utilized similar rhetoric in the discussion and depiction of foreign cultures with the former certainly being influenced by the atmosphere of the time.

This villainization of foreign cultures and peoples springs from the polarizing, propagandist, and ostracizing sentiment and rhetoric which was abundant in Europe at the time of the First Crusade. This kind of demonizing rhetoric is evident in Pope Urban's 1095 call to crusade and became the epicenter of not just the physical clash that would be the Crusades, but the mental, ideological, and literary clash as well. In his call, Pope Urban begins by establishing that there is a difference between those who can identify as part of his race of Franks, and those who cannot. He describes the non-Christian community and their actions in a highly prejudicial and unflattering manner.

...race from the kingdom of the Persians, an accursed race, a race utterly alienated from God, a generation forsooth which has not directed its heart and has not entrusted its spirit to God, has invaded the lands of those Christians and has depopulated them by the sword, pillage and fire... They destroy the altars, after having defiled them with their uncleanness. They circumcise the Christians, and the blood of the circumcision they either spread upon the altars or pour into the vases of the baptismal font.<sup>38</sup>

This polarizing political rhetoric bled into the medieval literature that would be used as the foundation for European nations. It is the driving force behind the sentiments in texts such as

*The Song of Roland*, which has become the French national epic and has influenced the way France interacts with outside cultures. This poem reflects many of the ideologies found in the transcriptions of Pope Urban's call and it is not a far leap between the pontiff's rhetoric and the language of the poem. The earlier mentioned depiction of the Duke Falsaron and his monstrous brow, and the strength and devilry of Chernubles of Munigre play on the same fears as Pope Urban's descriptions of the blasphemies committed by the "race of Persians." Both the poetry and the oration present outside cultures as direct and frightening threats to the predominant religion of the Europeans. Furthermore, as in the Pope's speech, this group of others is represented as a threat to the Christian faith and thus a fundamental aspect of European identity. This poem represents ideologies of prejudice towards outside cultures and the view that different cultures are violently opposed to one another and that their exchanges are strictly acts of aggression.

The attitude of the text, and the crusader rhetoric of Pope Urban's call, is wholly and simply surmised in Roland's memorable cry of "The pagans are wrong and the Christians are right."<sup>39</sup>The sentiment of this statement has not become less relevant since the end of the medieval period. The only difference being that the group which now most identifies with the heroes of the text has become those of French nationality, not simply or generally the Christian group mentioned in Roland's outcry. In an essay which draws its title from this very cry "'Pagans Are Wrong and Christians Are Right': Alterity, Gender, and Nation in the Chanson de Roland" (2001) by Sharon Kinoshita, this attitude is explored as integral to French national identity. Kinoshita discusses the resurgence of the text's importance in France during the Franco-Prussian war, especially when the French were under siege by the German forces. At this

moment of national humiliation, the poem's incantatory evocation of "sweet France" ("douce France") and its glorification of heroism and sacrifice provided historical roots for the French sense of identity."<sup>40</sup> Kinoshita argues that the text's renewed importance during the war is due to its presentation of the French as the indomitable empire. This use of *The Song of Roland* by the French during the eighteenth century confirms the continued impact of the cultural exchanges presented in medieval texts.

This second category of subjective interpretation is the more vivid and violent when it comes to its representation of cultural interaction and its interpretation of the universal hierarchical structure. It is important to note that the two texts that have been chosen to represent the first, or objective, category and the second, or subjective, category represent two different styles of medieval literature. *Parzival* is an Arthurian quest or Grail narrative, focusing more on the title character's journey and destiny. *The Song of Roland* is an epic poem, which deals with a famous historical war, and while it introduces a central character in *Roland*, the narrative is more concerned with large events rather than the development of its character development of its hero (as is the case in *Parzival*). This difference in focus and style could account for the different approaches to the hierarchical representations. However, this does not demean the value of the differences between these representations, and, it does not mean that the Ptolemaic system and hierarchies are any less influential in either of the narratives than they were in the structure of the Hierarchy of Scripts or Dante's works. However, due to these different interpretations, more effort must go into proving that they could both stem from the same inspiration source despite their varying objective and subjective natures.

It would be imprudent simply to accept that such different interpretations have sprung from the same source, especially when considering that the source in question is a system that is meant to be mathematically and logically composed and understood. The literary representations found in *Parzival* and *The Song of Roland* must be put under more scrutiny as they are interpretations of a real world belief system within a narrative universe rather than a simple reflection of that belief system (such as the Hierarchy of Scripts and Dante's poetic structure). It must be asked, how a scientific model can inspire two such different representations when it is something so strictly organized and established?

To approach the question of whether or not this scientific universe could be as influential in the literary world as it was in the real world an in-depth discussion of the relationship between the medieval world, its books, and its thought is required.

C.S. Lewis and his study of the phenomenon of the presupposed universe's effect on the literary world of the Middle Ages is instrumental in this process. His scholarship is helpful in forming an appreciation for the system's scientific existence that does not detract from its impact or use in literature. This study was conducted as part a lecture series he taught many times at Oxford University and later turned into *The Discarded Image* (1964). The book sets about expanding the aforementioned lecture series and explaining the impact of the scientifically or philosophically composed universe on culture and literature. It offers some possible explanations as to why and how this universal model became as influential and varied in the literary world as it did. The book also offers an explanation as to why the literature itself was so influential on the culture of the day.



Lewis begins his work with an explanation of how the universal model could have become so integral to literature. He does this by making a distinction between the thinking of peoples he identifies as savage (which must be presumed from context to be groups of people who existed without a sophisticated culture or infrastructure and whose “beliefs are thought to be the spontaneous response of a human group to its environment”<sup>41</sup>) and the peoples of the Middle Ages. This is an important distinction to make, as it can be all too easy to view any past society or culture as being flawed in their thinking, or perhaps fault them for their beliefs simply due to the fact that we view ourselves (sometimes correctly and other times incorrectly) as having progressed in a linear fashion along with the passage of time. While such flaws or faults may be correctly applied to the past from an objectively scientific standpoint, that is not the point of Lewis’ work. Thus, he acknowledges the scientific flaws in the thinking of the Middle Ages without undercutting the important influence that thinking had on the cultures of the time.

Medieval man shared many ignorances with the savage, and some of his beliefs may suggest savage parallels to an anthropologist.

But he had not usually reached these beliefs by the same route.<sup>42</sup>

The route by which “medieval man” reached his conclusions was through logic. This goes some way into explaining how these ideas on the universe could become so ingrained in the minds of the authors of the day. For, if an idea is formed by means of a “spontaneous reaction” (which is how Lewis describes the formation of ideas by the “savage”) it may easily be subverted or replaced by a similar, yet different, reaction. However, if an idea were formed through logical

thinking (as was the case with the construction of the Ptolemaic universe) than it may more easily take hold in the minds of a culture, and its influence would grow.

This is not to say that medieval society had no reaction to its environment, simply that the environment they reacted to and the mode, or means, of this reaction was quite different from Lewis' savage groups of people.

If their culture is regarded as a response to environment, then the elements in that environment to which it responded most vigorously were manuscripts. Every writer, if he possibly can, bases himself on an earlier writer, follows an *auctor*: preferably a Latin one.<sup>43</sup>

This suggestion that medieval culture reacted chiefly to manuscripts and writing, and, to writing based on (or purported to be based on) earlier work is something which agrees with the methodology of the Hierarchy of Scripts and its privileging of older Latinate scripts. This also reveals how the Ptolemaic system could become ingrained in the culture and literature. Just as older scripts became favored and revered, so too did the Ptolemaic system, due to the prestige of its author and its continued discussion in scientific and religious discourse, become an established or ingrained aspect of medieval literature. Lewis holds to the belief in relevance of book culture during the Middle Ages so strongly that he views it as an element of medieval society on which their culture is dependent.

But the Middle Ages depended predominantly on books, Though literacy was of course far rarer than now, reading was in one way a more important ingredient of the total culture<sup>44</sup>

Moving away from a more general discussion of thought and book culture during the Middle Ages, Lewis discusses how the Ptolemaic system could be utilized so frequently as a literary tool despite its scientific nature. In the opening of his aptly titled second chapter "Reservations", he admits that in his own work he does not include a scientific history that would resemble the one presented by Crombie. "My account of what I call the Medieval Model ignores all this: ignores even the great change from predominantly Platonic to a predominantly Aristotelian outlook and the direct conflict between Nominalists and Realists."<sup>45</sup> The omission of a detailed scientific history or discussion of the different schools of thought which Lewis mentions is the essence of what makes literary interpretations of the Ptolemaic system possible and is what enables them to remain relevant after the real world science of the system had been disproved or updated. As Lewis goes on to explain, his work does this as these strictly scientific topics have little influence on what was reflected in the literature.

these things, however important for the historian of thought, have hardly any effect on the literary level. The Model, as regard those elements in it which poets and artists could utilize, remained stable.<sup>46</sup>

This suggests that beyond the basic understandings discussed above (that the universe was perfect in nature due to God's influence and that it was comprised of multiple hierarchies) literature did not concern itself with the scientific principles or debates surrounding the Ptolemaic system. This is what allows for the varied interpretation of the system, which occur in *Parzival* and *The Song of Roland*. Despite their differences, both texts base themselves on the principal and basic belief that the universe is hierarchical and that these hierarchies are natural

or perfect; with the former representing this belief in an objective manner while the latter does so in a subjective manner.

It is important to note, so that this occurrence is not thought of as occurring in a vacuum or as an isolated incident, that the Ptolemaic hierarchies were not the only literary elements to undergo this process. The scientific study of animals is also a field in which literary representations became quite separated from the actual science and survived in their own right. As Lewis points out while discussing the zoology of the Middle Ages, the scientific relevance of the various fantastical bestiaries written about during this time is minimal, perhaps even nonexistent, to the zoologist of today. However, the cultural and literary relevance of these bestiaries is a far different story. Whether or not medieval people believed in these creatures is unimportant to this discussion - what is important is that the literary history and continued relevance of these monsters and beasts shows how ideas from Antiquity can survive into the Middle Ages and remain influential. A perfect example of this is the long history of the dragon:

Phaedrus (first century A.D.) was, in intention, merely writing Aesopic fables. But his dragon (iv,xx) – a creature born under evil stars, *dis iratis natus*, and doomed to guard against others the treasure it cannot use itself – would seem to be the ancestor of all those dragons whom we think so Germanic when we meet them in Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse. The image proved so potent an archetype that it engendered belief, and, even when belief faded, men were unwilling to let it go.<sup>47</sup>

Lewis explains that in the two thousand years since Phaedrus' dragon, humanity has not grown tired of this representation or changed it to any great extent; citing the dragons represented in *Beowulf* and in the works of Wagner as evidence of this unchanging model. Even these are not the end of the archetype, with recent authors returning still to the miserly reptile (such as the dragons of Tolkien's fictitious literary universe, the most notable or well-known among them being Smaug, the dragon of *The Hobbit*.)

Lewis's work shows how ideas initially based in a scientific field can be utilized by literature. In his brief discussions of book culture in the Middle Ages and of the archetypal European dragon he shows how once an archetype or something similar has been established in literature, it can become invulnerable against the decaying influence of time. The Ptolemaic hierarchies are one of these such established literary elements during the Middle Ages, and, like the dragon, they continued to be relevant and impactful beyond their initial or early use. The systemic hierarchies of a scientific model can be the inspiration for similar hierarchies in literature, even if that literature moves away from the scientific foundation, borrowing only what it needs in order to subscribe to the same philosophical principles.

This is to argue for medieval literature to be thought of as significantly influential beyond the Middle Ages, an idea that has been met with resistance since the end of the medieval period roughly five hundred years ago.

Lewis confirms that the influence of the Ptolemaic universe on works of medieval literature was profound. He also touches upon the ideas that medieval society and culture relied heavily on books and manuscripts -such as the ones that have been discussed here -in order to form, or reaffirm, their cultural structures and beliefs. However, where Lewis and

other scholars have fallen short is that they did not explore the influence of both the Ptolemaic model of the universe, and of the impact of medieval literature, on culture beyond the medieval period.

the reader will find that I freely illustrate features of the Model which I call 'Medieval' from authors who wrote after the close of the Middle Ages; from Spenser, Donne or Milton. I do so because, at many points the old Model still underlies their work. It was not totally and confidently abandoned till the end of the seventeenth century.<sup>48</sup>

This is not to say that the scientific aspects of the Ptolemaic system (such as the substance of the nine spheres or the finite quality of the universe) are highly influential on contemporary science much beyond the medieval period (and it is not the goal of this paper to argue for the scientific significance of these theories within the current discourse of the scientific fields). It is a goal of this paper to explore the significance of the medieval literary representation of this system, which have been discussed throughout this paper. And to argue against the view that these representations were not relevant far beyond the medieval period.

The medieval period has become something of an insulated time period in the minds of the cultures that followed it. In the modern period deeming something as “medieval” is akin to saying that is “archaic” or “outdated.” It has become particularly popular to link the medieval with third world countries (which themselves are misrepresented as they are thought of as being under-civilized or underprivileged, or simply non-western. Whereas the term "third world" originally meant a country that had not declared itself, in any official capacity, to be a

communist / democratic / capitalist state) are often described as medieval with regard to their natures and practices. "Going medieval" is also a common phrase that is linked with ideas of brutality and uncivilized behavior.

During the Renaissance, or the time when Lewis claims that the "old model" was "confidently abandoned" the medieval period was indeed looked on with some amount of scorn by prominent writers of the day. As documented by Kathryn Jacobs and D'Andra White in their article for *The Chaucer Review*, "Ben Jonson on Shakespeare's Chaucer" (2015), the classicist and poet Benjamin Jonson was seemingly repulsed by any writers who utilized medieval practices in their work. In their work Jacobs and White discuss how Jonson takes issue with the fact that Shakespeare imitates or is inspired by authors of the medieval period, most particularly Chaucer. This criticism by Jonson is evident of the much larger debate between poets and writers who were categorized as "metaphysical" poets, and those, like Jonson, who represented the "classicist" or "intellectual" poets (who preferred to pull inspiration from ancient Greek and Latin texts rather than medieval ones. This attitude is one that has continued since the seventeenth century and is what has contributed to the previously mentioned thinking of the medieval period as isolated in time. This attitude is also an ignorant one as it involves the discounting of an entire era of literature. Unfortunately, for Jonson, Chaucer would indeed survive, both in imitation and in his own right. This survival and the very history of Chaucer's career as an author are evidence for the impact of medieval literature.

The fact that medieval literature is often overlooked or at least underestimated with regard to its influence on modern thought (as it was overshadowed by the ideas which re-emerge and shaped the Renaissance) is a preposterous oversight. These texts are exceptionally

influential beyond their own time. If one were to doubt this level of influence that a medieval text or author has, one would only need look at the history of the English language to become informed. In particular a single author who through the reproduction of his works after the advent of printing, shaped English culture and language: Geoffrey Chaucer. Despite being overlooked as a writer during his own life time (partly due to the very systems of hierarchies which have been discussed and which viewed writing in the English vernacular as a lesser form of writing than that done in say Latin or French), he has had an unquestionable influence. He is an excellent example of the impact of not only literature, but specifically literature of the medieval period. He is also, with regard to his post mortem creation as an author, an example of how the Ptolemaic system itself fell from practical and real world application after the Middle Ages, but of how the literature it inspired lived on, and thus so did its influence. The Ptolemaic universe's deep influence on the real world was so ingrained that even a man who today is known and remembered throughout the literary and English-speaking world as an author, was better known in his own time as a bureaucrat. However, once his bureaucratic influence or importance decayed in the real world Chaucer survived through his literary works and continues to be highly regarded as an author.

Now considered by scholars, students, and general audiences (both non-academic and academic) as an iconic author within the English literary tradition, Chaucer stands alongside figures such as Shakespeare and Milton. He is firmly cemented in the imaginations of most English speaking and reading people of the modern period as an exceptional and popular author. However, he, like medieval literature, was largely overlooked and his influence went unrecognized for a time. Due to the focus and intended readership of some of Chaucer's works,



and the language in which they were written, the man himself was not identified as a prominent author in the English canon during his lifetime. Although Chaucer was most certainly always a writer, he only became an author in people's minds through the replication, distribution, and survival of his works through their continued popularity after his death around 1400.

It is clear that, during Chaucer's life, he was thought of and better known for his work as a bureaucrat for the various courts that he worked within. It is this work that earned him his current resting place in Westminster Abbey, not his work as a writer. The possibility also exists that if Chaucer had not been such a notable political figure, his writing may not have been as widely known. Again here we see the influence of the Ptolemaic hierarchies, as Chaucer's elevated position within the existing chain of being/objective social hierarchy (a position, again, provided by his bureaucratic, not creative, occupation) meant that his writing was more likely to be published than someone's who had not been higher up in the chain of being. Indeed, his literary texts would never have survived, or been remembered for an extended period of time due to the fact that the intent behind the composition of some of his works was not that they be published and distributed, but rather, they were composed for more personal reasons. The complaint to his purse was written for the eyes of the monarch in power who could decide whether to keep Chaucer financed, not so that it could be read by the masses. His early work "The Book of the Duchess" was written in honor of the death of John of Ghent's first wife, Blanche. While it is likely that this dream vision was performed for an audience, its purpose was, again, not to be distributed among a large body of readers. Even Chaucer's longer and more popular works, *Troilus and Criseyde*, *The House of Fame*, *The Legend of Good Women*, and *The*

*Canterbury Tales*, might not have survived into the modern period if it wasn't for the work of those who simultaneously discovered, manufactured, and created versions of the texts that exist today, as nothing of Chaucer's own physical writing has survived past the author's lifetime.

Due to Chaucer's pre-existing fame and the fact that he was a good writer, scribes began - whether because they were employed to or because they simply wanted to have a copy of Chaucer's texts - to reproduce his work. An example of such work may be seen in the career of the scribe John Shirley.

Shirley operated in the period closely following Chaucer's death and was part of a class of professional scribes that arose after the twelfth century. Before this time, scribes were normally monks. However, according to Richard W. Clement, "Medieval and Renaissance Book Production," a series of reasons (such as the fact that monks had religious as well as scribal duties, and the fact that monks could not travel extensively) led to the creation of the professional scribal class which was often employed by monasteries. It is debated whether or not Shirley could be considered a "professional" scribe. While Timothy A. Shonk refers to Shirley as a professional with regard to the scribe's work in BL MS Harley 7333,<sup>49</sup> Ralph Hanna comes to the opposite conclusion.<sup>50</sup> Hanna writes about Shirley's work that "The hand of the Additional manuscript is awkward and sprawling, if not downright ugly."<sup>51</sup> The question of whether Shirley was or was not a professional scribe has not been a detriment to the part he has played in creating Chaucer's authorship. The scribe was employed by Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick and worked on manuscripts such as the above-mentioned Harley 7333 that is thought to have been produced near Shirley's own death around 1460. The manuscript, which contains a collection of incomplete copies of Chaucer's work including *The Canterbury Tales*

(which breaks off after *The Parson's Tale*), *The Parliament of Fowls* (which lacks its final stanza), and *Anelida and Arcita* (which lacks its final one hundred and twenty lines), was either written at or owned by the abbey of St Mary de Pratis and changed multiple times before being added to The British Library Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts. The circulation of this one manuscript by this one scribe is an indication of the increased exposure that Chaucer, the author, received after his death. In large part due to those such as Shirley and their employers, exposure that would once again increase with the progression of book production.

A contributing factor in the survival of Chaucer's work was an increase in readership by the general population. As time progressed - and the manuscripts produced by Shirley and other scribes began to be duplicated, and as the process of book production became increasingly efficient and commercialized in general - Chaucer's literary works became more available to people outside the previously exclusive circle of readers (those who could either afford to have a manuscript produced for them or those who had the skill, knowledge, and resources to produce manuscripts for themselves). In his article published in the PMLA, "Medieval English Literature and the Idea of the Anthology" (2003), which deals with the origins and idea of literature in the English tradition, Seth Lerer begins by discussing the ideas put forth by A.S.G. Edwards and Derek Pearsall in their work *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375-1475*. Edwards and Pearsall note that with the start of the fifteenth century come new developments in "commercial production of vernacular literature."<sup>52</sup> After 1400 new production methods began to emerge which in turn aided in the creation of an ever increasing audience for the works of Chaucer:

There was now with the mature English writing of Chaucer and Gower (and, in a somewhat different context, Langland), vernacular poetry, in quality, of a kind of capable of attracting paying customers, customers themselves representative of a wider range of the literate public than the traditional court-based literary culture.<sup>53</sup>

The induction of Chaucer into the cycle of commercial book production was also important with regard to the author's survival for academic purposes, and not merely for enjoyment. Hanna comments on this importance in his book, *London Literature, 1300-1380*, when in his introduction he acknowledges the work of Ian Doyle and Malcolm Parkes. Doyle and Parks identified five key scribes in London after 1400 and comments on their involvement in a London book-trade specializing in the works of Chaucer and Gower (whose works Hanna remarks on as being "vitally important to the understanding of the development of English Literature as we know it").<sup>54</sup>Hanna, regarding the scribes producing these influential works, goes on to say that "Their work has stimulated numerous daughter studies and squarely fixed critical attention on the development, in London, of a canon of English Authors."<sup>55</sup>

In the later medieval period, thanks to the earlier work of scribes like Shirley, Chaucer would survive long enough to be included in the texts which would be printed for purchase. This allowed for the author to be created and discovered on a far larger scale than was ever possible. This meant that more people at that time would be exposed to Chaucer and, due to his talent as a literary artist, more people would desire to have copies of his work. Thus, knowledge of him would spread to those outside of the higher echelons of the court structure

and those who associated his name chiefly with that of a dead bureaucrat. This also increased manufacturing of Chaucer's work also allowed for his work to stay in circulation and publication through to the modern era where it could be brought into the academic sphere and utilized in research concerning the man himself and the patterns and social dynamics of time period in which he lived.

Once the ground work had been laid by the physical reproductions of Chaucer both in manuscript form and in the form of the printed word, and once his identity as an author had taken shape, then Chaucer's work could begin to define not only himself, but his nation as well. The author's writing began to become an integral part of the idea of London, and, to a far greater extent England itself as a nation.

In Daniel Hobbins's *Authorship and Publicity Before Print* (2013), which focuses on the writings of Jean Gerson, Hobbins states that a comment by Petrarch had been highly influential in the prologue of a treatise written by Gerson in 1389; "'no one looks beyond Italy for orators and poets.'"<sup>56</sup> The boast by Petrarch led Gerson to evaluate the relative lack of influential writers in his country. He agrees with Petrarch, stating that France:

'has hithero suffered a great famine of worthy and eloquent historians and poet. 'Distinguished by its warriors and its wise men, France has yet lacked writers to record their accomplishments. What gave such fame to Greece, Rome, and Troy, even in ruin, if not the eloquence of their writers? Even as their walls crumbled, these cities escaped oblivion through the power of writing: So writings live and endure longer than cities.'<sup>57</sup>

While Hobbins's text does not discuss Chaucer, the ideas it deals with can be applied to him. This link between influential writings as well as the production of literature is also noted in Benedict Anderson's work, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (2006).

In the third chapter Anderson explores the role of print capitalism in the creation of national consciousness and how the use of popular printed literature may contribute to the creation of an idea:

One of the earlier forms of capitalist enterprise, book publishing, felt all of capitalism's restless search for markets...And since the years 1500-1550 were a period of exceptional European prosperity, publishing shared the general boom. 'More than at any other time' it was 'a great industry under the control of wealthy capitalists.' Naturally, 'book-sellers were primarily concerned to make a profit and to sell their product, and consequently they sought out first and foremost those works which were of interest to the largest possible number of their contemporaries.'<sup>158</sup>

The discussions found in both Hobbins's and Anderson's respective works may be applied to Chaucer in two ways. First, in the way that the critics are discussing: Chaucer's work, once it was elevated to a certain level of popularity, aided in the creation of the human concept of larger ideas such as the nation of England and the English literary canon. The second on a lesser

level – as Chaucer's work gained popularity through commercial printing in the late medieval period, it aided the creation of his identity of an author.

Geoffrey Chaucer was a writer of remarkable skill and talent. His works have become part of the very foundation of the concepts of both the English Nation and English Literature. As James Simpson puts it in his article "Chaucer's Presence and Absence, 1400-1550" (2003), "Chaucer and Malory are the only Middle English writers whose literary afterlife has been pretty continuous from the fifteenth to the twenty-first centuries."<sup>59</sup> However, it was not solely due to the work of the writer that his works survived into the modern period. The reason behind Chaucer's survival, both in regard to his works and identity as an author, is due to the reproduction of his texts after his death. It is thanks to these reproductions, their distribution in manuscript form and their publication in print form, that Chaucer has been continually rediscovered and recreated in the human psyche over the past six hundred and fourteen years.

Despite the fact that initially Chaucer was overlooked as an author, he still managed to become an extreme influence on English and the literary culture in general. The post mortem literary career of Chaucer is indicative of two things pertinent to the argument of this paper.

First, the fact that Chaucer's writing was not as widely recognized or available during his own time (due to the fact that he wrote in Middle English as opposed to one of the more popular Romance languages and to the fact that the printing press did not yet exist) shows the influence of the hierarchical thinking stemming from the Ptolemaic system. Just as these hierarchies prioritized certain types of scripts, races, and religions, it prioritized languages; Latin had always held a lofty position in the literature cultures of Europe, and, following the Norman invasion French was the language of the aristocracy, literature, and law while English was seen

as vulgar and base. As Chaucer wrote in English his work would not have been prioritized for mass scribal reproduction and it would have to wait until the printing press to be produced in large quantities. This lack of literary recognition also confirms that in some regard Lewis was correct when he said that the model had been abandoned by the seventeenth century (although Lewis should have recognized that this abandonment only occurred in the beliefs of the real world and did not diminish the influence of the system moving forward from the seventeenth century.)

Second, the impact that Chaucer, as an author, had on the English language shows just how important medieval writing can be beyond its own time and past the evolution of the culture in which it was produced. Contrary to what Simpson claims, Chaucer and Malory are not the only writers who have continued to be impactful. These two authors may be the most easily recognizable, or perhaps be the two authors whose works are still read en masse outside of academic circles, but they are certainly not the only remnants of the Middle Ages.

Beyond the pages of the texts that have been discussed, the Ptolemaic system would continue to be an influential force. Through the literature of the Middle Ages, the parts of this system which were most heavily utilized, the hierarchies, have continued to play an important role in the shaping of many literary, cultural, and national aspects.

Like Chaucer, and like the dragon, the literary works of the medieval period have survived into the modern period. It may be true that contemporary writers no longer create narrative worlds that exactly echo the structure of the Ptolemaic system, however, the ideas of hierarchical thinking which were brought into the literary tradition by medieval works are still impactful and important with regard to human culture and Identity.



Texts such as *The Song of Roland* would later be reproduced and distributed, in the same manner as Chaucer, as a means (either consciously or sub-consciously) of forming and solidifying national, religious, racial, and personal identities. This means that the hierarchical structure within these texts would be influential in the formation of these various identities. Certainly both the subjective and objective representations of hierarchies in the Middle Ages would be familiar to any scholar interested in the study of identities both national and individual. The way in which this kind of literature can affect identity formation is explored in Michel Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language* (1993). In this work Foucault suggests that literature and the production / reproduction of texts is fundamental to the formation of ideas and how one imagines the world both historically and contemporarily - an idea which echoes Lewis' thoughts on how medieval culture organized itself in relation to the books and manuscripts it produced. Anderson's work also lends insight into how the narrative worlds of the Middle Ages may affect the formation of a national identity. Anderson explains his belief that communities and cultures exist largely in the minds and imaginations of individuals. The composition of these existing communities, their knowledge and what defines them, is influenced by the ideas that are spread through literature. This dissemination of culturally important information through the processes of literary reproduction and discovery is what was discussed and valued by Foucault. Both writers hold that these literary representations of a group are what a given community identifies with, and uses to cement its own ideologies and identities. *The Song of Roland* would be one of the pieces of literature which is used in the manner described by Foucault and Anderson. Just as the crusader and Eurocentric ideologies in the *Roland* have affirmed Christian and French identity, and have

stayed relevant to modern French identity, the Ptolemaic hierarchies within medieval literature have aided in the formation of hierarchical thinking in the modern period.

This kind of thinking, even in its most innocent or objective form, as seen in *Parzival*, has aided in the production of modern cultures which relate to one another through a seemingly establish universal hierarchy, which no longer has any scientific foundation. However, it is important to note that impact of the hierarchies has been formed from the type of hierarchies found in the subjective category of representation. This can be most easily identified in the discourse surrounding the two macro political, and cultural climates that are The East and The West.

The impact of the subjective hierarchies can be recognized in the rhetoric of the clash of civilizations. This topic is the focus of the eighth chapter ("The West and the Rest: Intercivilizational Issues") of Samuel Huntington's book *The Clash of Civilizations Remaking of World Order* (1998). The opening sentence of this chapter presents a view of world civilizations is almost as opposing as the intercultural relations within the *Roland* itself. "In the emerging world, the relations between states and groups from different civilizations will not be close and will often be antagonistic."<sup>60</sup> Here Huntington again ends up dividing the world in macro communities of Western civilization and what he categorizes as the "the rest." His description of the future of global conflict is similarly described in a neat and simple way which, again, could leave someone confused as to whether he is talking about actual contemporary global conflict or the type of subjective hierarchical literature which *The Song of Roland* represents. "The dangerous clashes of the future are likely to arise from the interaction of Western arrogance, Islamic intolerance, and Sinic assertiveness."<sup>61</sup> Even acknowledging the fact that

Huntington is discussing these issues on a “Macro” level, these homogeneous distinctions seem over simplified. This is the kind of analysis that springs from the foundation built by the Ptolemaic hierarchies of medieval literature, and more specifically the subjective category of these representations.

This is not surprising. Due to the dramatic nature of the source material it stays in the mind both of the individual and the collective mind of the culture and can be utilized to affirm their identity in times of crisis; remember the discussion of the resurgence in *The Song of Roland's* popularity during the Franco-Prussian war outlined by Kinoshita. Thus, this nature gives birth to the sort of criticism presented by Huntington. As a result of this the medieval world - which is often cited as the source of these types of conflicts - is seen to be divisive, homogeneous, and intrinsically conflicting.

However, it must be remembered that there is the objective category of literature that submits to these hierarchical patterns without failing to represent the medieval world and its literature as abundant in peaceful interactions between peoples of different races and religions. The Middle Ages - while certainly not being devoid of wars, racism, and prejudice - was certainly not a homogeneous environment. It was not completely insulated and similar, with groups existing as self contained entities which acted aggressively towards anything or anyone which differed or varied in an identifiable way. Feirefiz was not skewered for his blackness by the first white knight he encountered and, just as the Ptolemaic hierarchies within *Parzival* represent a real world scientific model, Feirefiz's existence in the text is indicative of the existence of non-white and non-Christian people's living peacefully in Wolfram von Eschenbach's society.

This use of the subjective category is not something that has gone unnoticed in criticism. In Kinoshita's essay, the cultural representations found in the *Roland* are put into the larger context of European history. She discusses how the rhetoric in the text is part of the history of prejudice or racism in Europe;

This is not to say that the Franks did not notice physiognomy or skin color, and indeed at first glance many of the *Roland's gent paienur* seem to belong to a long tradition of demonizing the foreign other. With skin as hard as iron and bodies covered by porcine bristles, people like the Occians and the Micenes recall the monstrous figures...that, in the account of Pliny and his followers, populate far-flung lands...Though some of these images are easy to dismiss as products of medieval ignorance, prejudice, and superstition others are susceptible to being gathered up by later discourses of European racism.<sup>62</sup>

Racism is something which is based on subjective prejudice and so it is fundamentally and logically flawed. As *The Song of Roland* is inspired by, or comes from the same vein of thought, as the prejudice of the crusades to is also flawed in its representation of cultural interactions. Thus, the simplistic critical mindset of "culture clash" is problematic as it is based on a flawed representation springing from a moment in history of deeply subjective and prejudice sentiments.

The critical analysis of the *Roland* is echoed by Edward Said in *Orientalism* (1979). This book rejects the homogenizing sentiments of past texts such as *The Song of Roland* and the

contemporary criticism of Huntington. In his book Said is looking at the relationship between the West and East - or Orient - and how there is a fictitious idea of the Orient which has been created and perpetrated in the region's study and representation in European scholarship and literature. Said's notions on cultural interactions are still scholastically debated, with some in the academic community regarding his ideas as simplistic or perhaps one sided. Despite the ongoing debate, the structure of his argument and the presentation of the East and West in Said's work shows the remaining influence of the Ptolemaic hierarchies. In his description, Said states that "The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic being, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences."<sup>63</sup> In his depiction of the relationship between the Orient and the West he claims that "The Orient's special place in European Western experience...the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience."<sup>64</sup> Whether or not Said is wholly correct in his analysis of the history of scholarship between the East and West, what is important is that he reveals the hierarchy which is at play within this scholarship. In European or Western literature and thought the West is the dominant, or higher entity, within this scholarly work and the East is the other, lower, outside culture. With the opposite being the case from the perspective of the East.

Despite the somewhat different focuses of Kinoshita's and Said's work, they are similar in two respects. They both operate from the belief that there is a presented subjective hierarchical order at work (within the literature itself and within the cultures this literature has impacted). In addition, they both understand that this hierarchy, its representation, and its adaption is incomplete or flawed. Be it the hierarchy which sees Christians as right and pagans

as wrong (the one which supports feelings of heroism and honor in the French in the face of their monstrous enemy), or one which is part of a tradition of Eurocentrism and Orientalism (which discusses the western literature and thoughts of non-western cultures as an opposite to what is presupposed as normal, i.e. western culture). This scholarship is taking a step towards recognizing that the type of rhetoric continued from *The Song of Roland* and into the modern period does not offer a complete picture.

These ongoing academic debates and explorations of critical opinions concerning cultural identity and interaction, and the role which literature plays in these areas reveals the relevance of medieval literature. The Ptolemaic hierarchies and the medieval literary works which represented, and utilized, these hierarchies in their structure and narrative are still crucial and relevant to the composition of modern culture. The discussions of medieval literature, such as those in Kinoshita's and Lewis's works, show that the Middle Ages and its literary works are still impactful and important (despite becoming somewhat diminished in relevance during the Renaissance). The impact of medieval literature was not obliterated by the reemerging ideas of the Renaissance, it was just simply overshadowed by the renewal of interest in classic literature and philosophy. Due to this overshadowing the impact or relevance of medieval thought and literature is sometimes forgotten or sidelined in favor of Lewis's view that after the medieval period ended, its ideologies were abandoned.

On an empirical level, we think of our universe as an ever-expanding and, to the best of our knowledge, infinite environment. Earth is not at the center of this universe, nor is it at the center of our galaxy or solar system. As a species, our scientific knowledge has moved on from the belief in the Ptolemaic system and the neatly ordered universe. This means we have also,

logically, moved on from a belief in this system's hierarchies and the chain of being extending from God down to Humanity and beyond. However, it does not mean that this order is no longer relevant to human society and culture. The Ptolemaic system had a profound and deep impact on medieval literature, and given that this literature had – and has – influenced the creation of national, religious, cultural, racial, and individual identities through its reproduction in the era of print. Thus, with literature as its mode of transport, the Ptolemaic system has continued to be impact society and be relevant to modern cultures. The Ptolemaic system and its hierarchical manner of thinking, has survived. It has continued to effect how different groups interact with one another and how they identify in relation to one another. Like the dragon these hierarchies were conceived in antiquity, carried over into the minds of the medieval period, and survived into the modern imagination, using literature as the vehicle for this epic odyssey through time.

## Notes and Citations:

<sup>1</sup> *Mise-en-page* literally translated from the French means layout, or placement on the page. In paleographical terminology it refers to the specific layout of a manuscript page and involves the aesthetic elements of said page; i.e. the script, rubrication, illuminations, and marginalia.

<sup>2</sup> Rubrications are highlighted, often in red, sections of script such as headings and initials which are added to a manuscript by a rubricator after the initial scribe as completed the initial work. Illuminations are decorative paintings or pen work found often done in gold.

<sup>3</sup> The Carolingian Period, or Carolingian Renaissance refers to a roughly one hundred and twenty-year period between 780 and 900 CE during the reign of Charlemagne and his immediate heirs.

<sup>4</sup> Majuscule simply refers to scripts or individual letters which are written in the upper case.

<sup>5</sup> These descriptive adjectives are used as categories during the process of distinguishing and identifying of a particular script. For example, a script can either be classified as one with feet (which are small upward strokes of the pen at the bottom of a letter), or *sine pedibus* (without feet). This is helpful when attempting to determine a script's type as often when dealing with different scribes it can be difficult to determine a script without these details.

<sup>6</sup> Miniscule simply refers to scripts or individual letters which are written in the lower case.

<sup>7</sup> This discussion takes place in "*Glossaries and Other Innovations in Carolingian Book Production*" (her contribution to *Turning Over a New Leaf - Change & Development in the Medieval Book* (2012))

<sup>8</sup> "Erik Kwakkel, Rosamond McKitterick & Rodney Thomson. *Turning Over a New Leaf - Change & Development in the Medieval Book* (Leiden UP, 2012). Web. Page 36

<sup>9</sup> McKitterick, Page 38.

<sup>10</sup> McKitterick, Page 27.

<sup>11</sup> Brackets added by author.

<sup>12</sup> McKitterick. Page 32.

<sup>13</sup> A concept which is at the heart of the first of Saint Thomas Aquinas' Five Ways, or Five Proofs of God's Existence, "The Argument From Change."

<sup>14</sup> Stellatum, from the Latin word *stella, stellae* meaning star.

<sup>15</sup> Brackets added by author.

<sup>16</sup> The *Almagest* is Ptolemy's mathematical and astronomical treatise on the structure of the universe and the movements of the stars and planets.

<sup>17</sup> Crombie, *Medieval and Early Modern Science*, Page 82.

<sup>18</sup> Crombie, *Medieval and Early Modern Science*. Page 76.

<sup>19</sup> Chaucer, *The House of Fame*, Book II. Lines 730-735.

<sup>20</sup> Shakespeare, *Macbeth*. II.iv, 10-21.

<sup>21</sup> Eschenbach, Wolfram Von. *Parzival*. Trans. A. T. Hatto. Reprint edition. Harmondsworth, Eng. ; New York, N.Y: Penguin, 1980. Print. Page 239.

<sup>22</sup> *Parzival*. 402.

<sup>23</sup> *Parzival*. 402.

<sup>24</sup> *Parzival*. 404.

<sup>25</sup> *Parzival*. 405.

<sup>26</sup> *Parzival*. 405.

<sup>27</sup> *Parzival*. 400.



- <sup>28</sup> Burgess, Glyn, ed. *The Song of Roland*. Penguin, 2015. Print. Lines 1-9.
- <sup>29</sup> *The Song of Roland*. Lines 172-177.
- <sup>30</sup> *The Song of Roland*. Lines 940-942.
- <sup>31</sup> *The Song of Roland*. Lines 977-978.
- <sup>32</sup> *The Song of Roland*. Lines 980-983.
- <sup>33</sup> *The Song of Roland*. Lines 1217-1218.
- <sup>34</sup> *The Song of Roland*. Lines 1261-1268.
- <sup>35</sup> *The Song of Roland*. Lines 2392-2397.
- <sup>36</sup> *The Song of Roland*. Lines 3988-3990
- <sup>37</sup> Loomba, Ania. "Periodization, Race, and Global Contact." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 37.3 (2007): 595–620. Web. Page 596.
- <sup>38</sup> From "Medieval Sourcebook: Urban II: Speech at Council of Clermont, 1095, according to Fulcher of Chartres." which is comprised of five versions of the speech. The quotes are pulled from Robert the Monk's recollection of the speech. It is based on what is known as the Gesta Version (ca. 1100-1101).
- <sup>39</sup> *The Song of Roland*. Line 1015.
- <sup>40</sup> Kinoshita, Sharon. "'Pagans Are Wrong and Christians Are Right': Alterity, Gender, and Nation in the Chanson de Roland." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31.1 (2001): 79–111. Print. Page 80
- <sup>41</sup> Lewis, C. S. *The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature*. Reprint edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Print. Page 1
- <sup>42</sup> Lewis. 1
- <sup>43</sup> Lewis. 5
- <sup>44</sup> Lewis. 5
- <sup>45</sup> Lewis. 13.
- <sup>46</sup> Lewis. 13.
- <sup>47</sup> Lewis. 147-148
- <sup>48</sup> Lewis. 13.
- <sup>49</sup> This reference is made in Shonk's article "The 'Publication' of Chaucer in Rural Areas," and concerns itself with Shirley's work in BL MS Harley 7333.
- <sup>50</sup> In "John Shirley and British Library, MS. Additional 16165"
- <sup>51</sup> Hanna, Ralph, III. "John Shirley And British Library, MS. Additional 16165." *Studies In Bibliography: Papers Of The Bibliographical Society Of The University Of Virginia* 49. (1996): 95-105. MLA International Bibliography. Web. Page 95
- <sup>52</sup> Griffiths, Jeremy, and Derek Pearsall. *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375-1475*. 1 edition. Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print. Page 257
- <sup>53</sup> Griffiths. Page 258
- <sup>54</sup> Hanna, Ralph. *London Literature, 1300-1380*. 1 edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print. Page 1
- <sup>55</sup> Hanna. Page 1
- <sup>56</sup> Hobbins, Daniel. *Authorship and Publicity Before Print: Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013. Print. Page 1
- <sup>57</sup> Hobbins. Page 1
- <sup>58</sup> Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Revised Edition*. Revised edition. London ; New York: Verso, 2006. Print. Page 38

---

<sup>59</sup> Simpson, James. "Chaucer's Presence And Absence, 1400-1550." *The Cambridge Companion to Chaucer*. 251-269. Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 2003. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web.

<sup>60</sup> Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order 1st (first) Edition Text Only*. Simon & Schuster, 1998. Print. Page 183.

<sup>61</sup> Huntington. Page 183.

<sup>62</sup> Kinoshita. Page 82.

<sup>63</sup> Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. 1st Vintage Books ed edition. New York: Vintage, 1979. Print. Page 1

<sup>64</sup> Said. Page 2.

## Bibliography

- Alighieri, Dante. *Dante's Vita Nuova*. Trans. Mark Musa. New edition. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973. Print.
- . *The Divine Comedy*. Trans. John Ciardi. The Inferno, The Purgatorio, and The Paradiso edition. New York: NAL, 2003. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Revised Edition*. Revised edition. London ; New York: Verso, 2006. Print.
- "Bartholomew's World - Paleography Glossary." N.p., n.d. Web. 23 Sept. 2016.
- Burgess, Glyn, ed. *The Song of Roland*. Penguin, 2015. Print.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, Stephen A Barney, and Giovanni Boccaccio. *Troilus and Criseyde, with Facing-Page Il Filostrato / Authoritative Texts / The Testament of Cresseid / by Robert Henryson / Criticism ; Edited by Stephen A. Barney*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2006. Print.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, V. A Kolve, and Glending Olson. *The Canterbury Tales: Fifteen Tales and the General Prologue : Authoritative Text, Sources and Backgrounds, Criticism*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2005. Print.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, and Kathryn L. Lynch. *Dream Visions and Other Poems*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2006. Print.
- Clement, Richard W. "A Survey Of Antique, Medieval, And Renaissance Book Production." *Art into Life: Collected Papers from the Kresge Art Museum Medieval Symposia*. 9-47. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State UP, 1995. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web.
- Crombie, A. C. *Medieval and Early Modern Science [volumes I & II]*. Doubleday Anchor Book, 1959. Print.

- “Erik Kwakkel, Rosamond McKitterick & Rodney Thomson\_Turning Over a New Leaf - Change & Development in the Medieval Book (Leiden UP, 2012).pdf.” *Google Docs*. Web.
- Eschenbach, Wolfram Von. *Parzival*. Trans. A. T. Hatto. Reprint edition. Harmondsworth, Eng. ; New York, N.Y: Penguin, 1980. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1993. Print.
- Griffiths, Jeremy, and Derek Pearsall. *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375-1475*. 1 edition. Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print.
- Hanna, Ralph. *London Literature, 1300-1380*. 1 edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.
- Hanna, Ralph, III. "John Shirley And British Library, MS. Additional 16165." *Studies In Bibliography: Papers Of The Bibliographical Society Of The University Of Virginia* 49.(1996): 95-105. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web.
- Hobbins, Daniel. *Authorship and Publicity Before Print: Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013. Print.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order 1st (first) Edition Text Only*. Simon & Schuster, 1998. Print.
- Jacobs, Kathryn, and D’andra White. “Ben Jonson on Shakespeare’s Chaucer.” *The Chaucer Review* 50.1 (2015): 198–215. Print.
- Kinoshita, Sharon. “‘Pagans Are Wrong and Christians Are Right’: Alterity, Gender, and Nation in the Chanson de Roland.” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31.1 (2001): 79–111. Print.

Lerer, Seth. "Medieval English Literature and the Idea of Anthology." *PMLA* 118. 5 (2003): 1251-1267.

Print.

Lewis, C. S. *The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature*. Reprint

edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Print.

Loomba, Ania. "Periodization, Race, and Global Contact." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern*

*Studies* 37.3 (2007): 595–620. Web.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. 1st Vintage Books ed edition. New York: Vintage, 1979. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth*. Ed. Robert S. Miola. 2 edition. W. W. Norton & Company, 2013.

Print.

Shonk, Timothy. "The 'Publication' of Chaucer in Rural Areas." *Essays in Medieval Studies* 15. (1998):

81. Print.

Simpson, James. "Chaucer's Presence And Absence, 1400-1550." *The Cambridge Companion to*

*Chaucer*. 251-269. Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 2003. *MLA International Bibliography*.

Web.

Wight, C. "Details of an Item from the British Library Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts." Text. N.

p., n.d. Web.