

THE OGRE AS LYCOMORPH

A Dissertation

presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

AARON KOEHNEMANN

Dr. Mary Jo Muratore, Dissertation Supervisor

MAY 2010

© Copyright by Aaron Koehnemann 2010

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

The Ogre as Lycomorph

Presented by Aaron Koehnemann

A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

And hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Mary Jo Muratore

Sean Ireton

Dan Sipe

Valerie Kaussen

Carol Lazzaro-Weis

Thanks, Mom and Dad.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Mary Jo Muratore, my dissertation director, advisor, and teacher. Without her continued willingness and extraordinary ability to go above and beyond the call of duty in these functions, this work would never have reached its current state.

Table of Contents:

Acknowledgments.....	ii
List of Tables.....	iv
I. Introduction: definition of terms, purpose and scope.....	1
II. The Wolf:	
A. The Predecessors to the 17 th Century French Literary Wolf:	
1. Medieval Bestiaries.....	12
2. Bisclavret.....	17
3. Le Roman de Renard.....	25
B. The 17 th Century French Historical Wolf:	
1. Lupine Associations at Witch Trials.....	34
C. The 17 th Century French Literary Wolf:	
1. La Fontaine	47
2. Le Petit Chaperon Rouge	64
D. Statistical Analysis and Summary of Wolves.....	71
III. The Ogre:	
A. The Predecessors to the 17 th Century French Ogre:	
1. Origins and Evolutions.....	74
2. Basile.....	88
B. The French Literary Ogre:	
1. Perrault.....	96
2. Aulnoy.....	112
3. Auneuil.....	135
4. Maily.....	146
C. The French Quasi-Ogre	
1. La Barbe Bleue et Le Prince Guerini.....	151
D. Statistical Analysis and Summary of Ogres.....	165
IV. Closing Arguments & Synthesis of Analyses.....	173
Bibliography.....	180
Vita.....	186

LIST OF TABLES

Figure	Page
1. Wolf Traits	71-73
2. Ogre Traits.....	168-172
3. Synthesis.....	178

« L'on voit certains animaux farouches, des males et des femelles, répandus par la campagne, noirs, livides et tout brûlés du soleil, attachés à la terre qu'ils fouillent et qu'ils remuent avec une opiniâtreté invincible ; ils ont comme une voix articulée, et, quand ils se lèvent sur leurs pieds, ils montrent une face humaine, et en effet ils sont des hommes ; ils se retirent la nuit dans les tanières où ils vivent de pain noir, d'eau et de racines ; ils épargnent aux autres hommes la peine de semer, de labourer et de recueillir pour vivre, et méritent ainsi de ne pas manquer de ce pain qu'ils ont semé »

- La Bruyère, Caractère # 128

This *caractère* of La Bruyère is indicative of more than the burgeoning social conscience of the late 17th century. It also juxtaposes man and animal in such a succinct yet significant way that it merits more profound investigation along these lines. The description begins as would any naturalist's observation of an animal in the wild, but when it is revealed that *man* is the subject, the reader cannot help but be stunned at the sudden revelation that man can so easily be mistaken for a beast and distinguished only when his name is invoked. One question that this raises is whether this *caractère* is an example of anthropomorphism or something else. Anthropomorphism, by definition, is the assigning of human traits to animals. Consequently, La Bruyère's characterization is not an example of anthropomorphism. In fact, this *caractère* represents the exact opposite idea: animal traits are conferred onto humans. What is even more intriguing is that this same phenomenon can be found in many of seventeenth century fairy tales as well. In this case, however, it is not man, but an ogre whose traits are bestialized, and more importantly, the animal to which he is most relentlessly compared is the wolf.

As there was no term in Seigneuret's *Dictionary of Literary Themes and motifs* (or indeed, any other dictionary) to describe this phenomenon of ascribing animal traits onto a human figure, I took it upon myself to consider some possibilities: zoomorphism, or even therianthropy. Upon investigation, I learned that both of these terms already exist,

but are typically reserved for a nobler aspiration: assigning animal traits to *deities* in primitive or atavistic cosmologies. Ergo, another term would be needed. I then began to wonder where I might find other examples of these terms as they apply to *man*, and I was surprised to find an abundance of possibilities throughout the works of various authors of the 17th century in the French canon. Indeed, I am not the first literary critic to give thought to the subject.

For example, Homayoun Mazaheri has juxtaposed and distilled the views of some of the most renowned authors and thinkers of the 17th century concerning the relationship between man and animals in the article “L’animal dans *Les Caractères* de La Bruyère.” Mazaheri recalls Descartes’ opinion that animals are little better than machines, doing what their primitive brains order them to do, and thus are inferior to man and his more sophisticated brain and God-given free will. Mazaheri then notes La Bruyère’s opinion on the subject of animal ability: “Je ne sais point si le chien choisit, s’il se ressouvient, s’il affectionne, s’il craint, s’il imagine, s’il pense” (135). La Bruyère, on the other hand, seems quite prepared, in his caractère #128, to accord animals the same capacities as human peasants. Finally, Mazaheri points out La Fontaine’s position on this topic: « que l’animal pense et raisonne, et que l’homme, en somme, ne diffère guère de lui » (136). This attitude is clearly reflected in his fables where man and animal cohabitate and even interact verbally on occasion. La Bruyère’s suggestion and, more so, La Fontaine’s certainty that animals have intelligence is suggestive of a larger issue concerning many other renowned writers of this period in France’s history: namely, the blurring of the line between man and animal.

One interpretation of the blurring of the line between man and animal, namely, the wolf, is the werewolf, a commonly occurring figure in France (as well as Germany) in the seventeenth century. The wolf is unique among animals for it alone received consideration for melding with man to make a bestial amalgam figure. There is a reason for this: the wolf alone posed such a serious threat to man as to warrant both fear and hatred on a large scale. There were no weretigers in France because no tigers were present to usurp the wolf's place in the forests and therefore did not come into the minds of frightened and baffled Frenchmen searching for psychological and criminological scapegoats for atrocious crimes. There were no werefoxes in France because the fox did not present a credible threat to members of a society who were plagued by larger, more dangerous predators hunting in large packs. Perhaps there would have been no werewolves in France if bears had been more problematic or if wolves had not inhabited that part of the world. Ultimately, figures of imagination, myth and literature are entirely dependant on the geographical and historical reality. By learning which natural resources and animals abound in a given region at a given time, one has a window into the origins of the myths of that particular people. Geographic and temporal particulars aside, there remains a universal tendency of the human imagination to consider and develop relationships between man and animals that bears exploration.

In this dissertation, I explore the representation of wolves and ogres in French literature from medieval times to the late seventeenth century in order to elucidate the blurring of the line between animal and man. Specifically, I will demonstrate that French ogres reveal both human and wolf-like traits, traits that the French have consistently ascribed to a much feared predator. First I will examine the representation of the wolf in

and then the representation of the ogre in order to more closely examine the parallels between the two. It is my hypothesis that seventeenth century French ogres share so many characteristics with mankind that they can be dubbed essentially human, and also that these ogres simultaneously share so many characteristics with (the contemporaneous French conception of) wolves that the ogres can most accurately be labeled as a lycomorph, something blurring the line between man and wolf that is not a werewolf.

A word is necessary to explain the neologism: *lycomorphism*. Ultimately based on the etymological roots ‘lycos’ ‘morphos’ and ‘ism,’ lycomorphism appears to be the most accurate term to refer to the phenomenon of ascribing wolf characteristics to human figures. Because ‘lycos’ is a more appropriate morpheme than the broader ‘zoos’ or ‘therios,’ it thus renders the term “lycomorphism” more specific. I chose the suffix ‘ism’ rather than ‘ology’ because ‘ism’ applies directly to the use of this phenomenon in primary sources, whereas the secondary *study* of lycomorphism would more appropriately be dubbed ‘lycomorphology.’ Therefore, the new literary lexical term that all students of literature might one day learn, along with its corollary, anthropomorphism, is lycomorphism, a subset of zoomorphism.

To be clear, zoomorphism is the opposite of anthropomorphism. Both concepts, according to Wendy Doniger in her work, “Zoomorphism in Ancient India,” share a common goal: “anthropomorphism and zoomorphism are two different attempts to reduce the otherness between humans and animals, to see the sameness beneath the difference” (34). Though anthropomorphism has already been duly studied, zoomorphism is relatively obscure. Doniger defined it simply as: “imagining humans as animals [yet] zoomorphism is more complex: although this time a human being is the explicit object,

the bestial qualities imputed to the human usually reveal an observation of animals more detailed (if not more accurate) than that of anthropomorphism” (17). This phenomenon might be more specifically referred to as zoanthropomorphism, which implies only that the animal is embodied in a human being as opposed to a deity or anything else. It is one specific application of this concept, namely lycomorphism, which is the central focus of this dissertation.

The starting point of this work, La Bruyère’s depiction of man as an animal, reflects a recurring trend in late seventeenth century literature and a bit of a reversal of its anthropomorphic literary antecedents. In this dissertation, I explore how the most common adversary in the tales of the 17th century, the ogre, is linked to an earlier literary adversary, the wolf. To convincingly do so requires the exploration of both the wolf’s and the ogre’s characteristic portrayals throughout French literature and recorded history. A chronological progression of sources reveals to what extent the wolf was the original antagonist in literature and history and was replaced as such in the late seventeenth century.

The first period of recorded literature and history, medieval times, saw a depiction of the wolf as the primary threat to man. In many medieval bestiaries, I examine how he is seen as obsessively hungry, cruel, man-eating, sexually rapacious, and linked to the underworld. Next I examine a representation of the wolf in the form of a werewolf in Marie de France’s *Bisclavret*, which also portrays the wolf as a potentially dangerous enemy with the power of transformation. The authors of another popular work of the time, *Le Roman de Renard*, add an additional component to the wolf’s portrayal: inferior intelligence. In the *Fables* of La Fontaine, the wolf retains most of these negative

characteristics, though he is provided with some redeeming traits (an uncompromising desire for freedom, for example). In general, however, he remains the most dangerous and most feared member of the animal world, and hence, the greatest threat to mankind. In addition to these literary portraits, I will also examine the wolf's recurring negative associations recalled in historical records of various Witch Trials from the early seventeenth century in Lorraine to further cement the link between wolves and the underworld, in this case, the Hell of the Christian Devil.

In a sudden reversal of this trend depicting wolves as the primary antagonist, the late 17th century contes, with the notable exception of *Le Petit chaperon rouge*, tend to cast the ogre as the primary antagonist instead. This is in part because these tales were influenced heavily by the Italian writer Giambattista Basile, who introduced the term and the character to the European community around this time. But we will note that the French writers modified Basile's model extensively. As indicated in the tables I attach regarding wolf and ogre characteristics, Basile's ogres were noted primarily for four dehumanizing traits: their aversion to sunlight, their isolation from the human community, their magical powers, and their hideous, often inhuman appearance. To better contextualize the ogre figure in general, I will also examine its origins and evolutions since its predecessors in Antiquity: Giant-kin.

The decision to shift the principal literary antagonist from wolves to ogres in the 17th century is curious and bears closer scrutiny. One motivating factor is the issue of imitation. The Italian writer Basile first used a form of the ogre in a number of popular folk tales. Basile's popularity in France was such that Perrault and other fairy tale writers were no doubt familiar with his work and perhaps inspired by his example to use ogres in

their tales as well. Ogres, as many other Italian exports, might be seen as the (literary) vogue of the times and therefore in high demand.

But there are perhaps other interesting reasons for the switch from wolves to ogres as well, some of which can be attributed to the newly-created genre itself. It will be noted that in literary antecedents the anthropomorphism of wolves traditionally had a moralistic function that derived in part from the literature of Antiquity. Aesop's (and La Fontaine's) fables used animals to communicate a moral that would guide human behavior. This moralistic value present in *Le Petit Chaperon Rouge* perhaps explains Perrault's unique use of a wolf as antagonist and not an ogre. Perrault, a partisan of the moderns in the celebrated "Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes", was interested in wresting literature away from its Greek and Roman antecedents in order to create a literature that would better reflect the issues and concerns of contemporary times. Morality may be constant even in ogre tales, but a number of contemporary issues and problems, such as the acquisition of wealth, marriage, the allegory of nobility, etc. were not specifically linked to conventional precepts governing moralistic tales in Antiquity. Perhaps he felt this new ogre, a purely created character with no link to mimetic reality at all, was better suited to his literary principles. Unlike the wolf, the ogre did not bind him to any specific behavioral model or literary antecedent. The ogre was effectively a blank slate which would allow for more innovation and experimentation.

What the ogre figure most facilitates in Perrault's (and other French fairy tale writers') narratives is an even closer alliance between man and beast, a sense of hybridity. Whereas the wolf is easily distinguishable from man, the ogre, especially in the French fairy tale, is clearly more closely linked to man than animal, physically and

socially. The ogre's close resemblance to humans allows Perrault and other fairy tale writers to exploit the devolving concept of man so prevalent in late seventeenth century France. The ogre, unlike the wolf, has a life-style quite similar to his human counterparts and has adopted many of his traits, including the capacity for language. When wolves speak in literature, they become purely allegorical figures. When ogres speak, on the other hand, readers seem to accept that speaking understandable French is normal behavior. Likewise, ogres, unlike wolves, are more interested in acquiring wealth, and many choose to live in castles rather than dens.

What is curious, however, is that beyond these surface similarities to humans, ogres continue to reveal wolf-like tendencies and instincts. That is to say, they are lycomorphized, and consequently, every bit as dangerous to humans as their dreaded predecessor. Arguably, this lycomorphism allows the modernists to use the non-human adversary to move the debate from a moralistic perspective (the conventional target for anthropomorphized wolves) to one where contemporary social behaviors become the target of the author's critique. We will see that in the fairy tales, the lycomorphized ogre is often used to address newly emerging issues of class and gender that were spilling over into the public debate. For women writers, ogres are often cast in the role of brutal and tyrannical husbands. Ogres are also cast as exploiters of the working class and as members of a tyrannical aristocracy. Social issues of this sort could never be articulated using the wolf as an adversary because these concerns are not part of the wolf's natural tendencies. Whereas the wolf can easily be used to condemn moral flaws such as sexual rapaciousness, greed, brutality, and predatory behavior in general, he is less effective in critiquing aristocratic abuses and tyrannical husbands, both issues of contemporary

interest. In order to address these more modern concerns, an updated character was necessary: the ogre.

After reviewing examples of wolf and ogre predecessors, I will study in depth how the French fairy tales, beginning with Perrault, move the ogre closer to humanity in appearance, in life-style and in place of residence. There are even examples of intermarriage between ogres and humans. They also often share the same culinary customs and tastes (cooking with butter and delighting in “Sauce Robert”), and they are cast as heads of families. They live nearer to humans, many even living in splendid castles and appear to be of a high social rank, and some have some sort of relationship (positive or negative) with the human King. In their outward form and daily lifestyles, the French ogres, in contrast to Basile’s ogres and the giants of Antiquity, resemble humans more than animals, on a physical level at the very least. Their instincts, however, align them more with animals and one animal in particular: the wolf. French ogres are therefore lycomorphized in that they are essentially human but are ascribed traits that were previously identified with wolves.

Many of the traits on which the French writers focus derive from their own historic and literary traditions. Namely, these French ogre traits include (1) a ravenous appetite and his inability to satisfy himself no matter how much he eats. His instinct for self-preservation (and nourishment) causes him to eat his own children in two of the tales. Additionally, French ogres prey on the weakest of mankind, preferring small children to grown adults. (2) And though the French ogres, like Basile’s, have magical powers, they rely on magic less than they rely on their physical supremacy to triumph over their foes. When they do rely on their magic, it is usually in the form of physical

transformation, a shape-shifting talent that aligns them with the werewolf represented by Marie de France. (3) The ogre's links to the underworld can be traced back to associations dating back to the medieval bestiaries and reiterated during the witch trials of the 16th and 17th century. (4) French writers also often lay great emphasis on the ogres' inferior intellect relative to their human counterparts. Though they are physically superior, they are less able strategists, and are easily defeated, much as most wolves were in previous centuries. The ogre's intellectual deficiencies recall Ysengrin's habitual defeat at the hands of the wily Renard. (5) We will note also that the French ogres are often depicted as having some sort of unsavory relationship with women, kidnapping or holding them hostage. It is not a great logical leap to see a sexual allegory in these abductions, calling to mind their earlier reputation as sexually licentious beasts. (6) Finally, the French tales include many ogresses, who, like the wolves in the bestiaries, are seen in a more positive light than their male counterparts.

The fact that the ogre adversaries in French fairy tales are lycomorphized, that is to say, he looks like a human but acts like a wolf, is significant for it provides evidence that in late seventeenth century, writers considered that the most serious threat to man came not from the animal world, but from a more closely related species: the ogre. Whereas anthropomorphism has the effect of raising the animal to the level of man, lycomorphism effectively lowers man to the level of beast, an indication that the medieval attitude has undergone a major reversal by the late seventeenth century. The devolution suggested by lycomorphism indicates a re-positioning of former attitudes concerning mankind's nature. Whereas in the medieval period, man had only vicious

animal predators to fear, in the seventeenth century, it is men, or at least a de-evolved version of men, i.e. ogres, that constitutes the real threat.

II A 1: Medieval Bestiaries

Before examining to what extent the wolf's portrayal in 17th century French literature is diverse, ambiguous and even paradoxical, it is useful to explore his depiction in the quasi-ecological bestiaries of medieval thought. In addition to providing the aesthetic appeal of literature, these bestiaries also supply, for their time, a zoological perspective. Naturalists as well as authors of the time might have come to rely upon these texts as genuine and accurate depictions of animals, including wolves, though today we have quite a different understanding of wolves. For better or for worse, however, this chapter discusses the medieval and antiquated mentality regarding *Canis Lupus* that later French authors would inevitably inherit.

According to the collection at <http://bestiary.ca/beasts/beast180.htm>, the wolf is represented in a variety of bestiaries, from renowned sources including Pliny the Elder [1st century CE], Gaius Julius Solinus [4th century CE] (*Collectanea rerum memorabilium*), and Isidore of Seville [7th century CE] (*Etymologies*, Book 12, 2:23-24). Many French medieval bestiaries take their material, quite often verbatim, from these chronologically and geographically diverse sources. Identical accounts of wolves recur in the works of Pierre de Beauvais c.1218, (*Natural History*, Book 8, 34) and Bartholomaeus Anglicus [c. 1240-1250 CE] (*De proprietatibus rerum*, book 18). However, two notable exceptions to this concurrence are Philippe de Thaon and Guillaume Leclerc, who did not include wolves in their bestiaries (c.1119).¹ The source which is of most interest to this work is another identical copy of these previous works

¹ I cannot imagine why not. The exclusion of the wolf implies its negligibility in the authors' worlds, yet such mythological beasts as "monocerus" appear in these same works. Perhaps the wolf's exclusion was deliberate and not an oversight, for reasons we shall maybe never ascertain.

that appears under the title: *The Book of Beasts being a translation from a Latin Bestiary of the twelfth century*, edited by T.H. White.

Regarding the bestiaries' depiction of the wolf, the first sentence found therein emphasizes the animal's violent and rapacious nature:

And they called [Licus] in Greek on account of their bites, because they massacre anybody who passes by with a fury of greediness. Others maintain that they are called 'Lupus' from 'lion-paws', because, as with lions, their powers are in their paws. Whatever they pounce on, dies" (56).²

The initial sense that casual perusal of this description is that the creatures in question are nothing more than dangerous predators, the foes of all other animals, including mankind. According to the above passage, wolves offer nothing more than a brutal, bloody death. It would not be a great logical leap for readers to assume that it is better to kill these beasts than to be killed by them. In this regard, the wolf resembles the ogre of the 17th century and his giant-kin as depicted in antiquity, as we will see again in future chapters. In all cases, the relationship between man and the wolf or the ogre is one of open hostility.

In addition to the description of wolves as rapacious in terms of violence, authors make sure to depict the wolf by association with another sort of sordid rapacity: wanton lasciviousness. White states:

Wolves are known for their rapacity, and for this reason we call prostitutes wolves, because they devastate the possessions of their lovers. Moreover, a wolf is a rapacious beast, and hankering for gore. He keeps his strength in his chest and jaws; in his loins there is really very little" (56-57).

The practice of calling prostitutes she-wolves is an old one that dates at least back to the Roman Republic. Yet by diminishing the wolves' supposed 'loin' power, it seems that this comparison is also a paradox, since prostitutes depend on their loins for their

² For some reason, the author seems to ignore the obvious linguistic difference of Greek vs. Latin as explanation for 'licus' [sic] vs. 'lupus.' The source of his blatantly wrong translations remain a mystery.

livelihood and weak loins would suggest a corresponding lack of success. Nonetheless, the sexual connotations of the wolf will remain in literature well into the 17th century, most notably in the tale *Le Petit Chaperon Rouge*, which will be discussed in a future chapter. Further concerning the sexual associations of wolves, White also had the following to report from the bestiaries: “on the backside of this animal there is a small patch of aphrodisiac hair, which it plucks off with its teeth if it happens to be afraid of being caught, nor is this aphrodisiac hair for which people are trying to catch it of any use unless taken off alive” (58). And though today these claims may seem dubious, such were beliefs held by diverse medieval and antiquated authors who were quite willing to entertain any notion concerning wolves’ sexual associations.

Yet even in such predominantly negative accounts, the authors of the bestiaries do not deny the female wolf her merits as well. White states:

So great is her [the female wolf’s] cunning that she does not catch food for her whelps near home, but from far away. And if it is needful to take prey at night, she goes like a tame dog to the fold, at a foot’s pace and, lest the sheepdog wake up, she goes upwind. And if a twig or anything else should make a noise when her foot presses it, she punishes her own foot with a regular nip (57-58).

The authors recognize that in addition to being a cunning hunter, the wolf shows herself to be a competent parent and provider for her children. One cannot say that the authors did not give the Devil his due. It is important to distinguish the she-wolf from her masculine equivalent, so a similar distinction will be made between the ogress and the ogre: positive traits tend to find association with the females rather than the males.

In addition to these claims, the Bestiaries’ authors bear a more supernatural contention concerning wolves. White states: “A wolf’s eyes shine at night like lamps, and its nature is that, if it sees a man first, it strikes him dumb and triumphs over him like a

victor over the voiceless. But, also, if it feels itself to have been seen first, it loses its own ferocity and cannot run” (58). In a metaphorical sense, this claim may prove true: if a man becomes absolutely frozen with the primal terror of confronting a superior predator in his natural habitat. The final line implies the wolf’s cowardice, in that without the element of surprise, he does not have the heart to directly confront man. Altogether, wolves receive a predominantly negative portrait. This supernatural association will be shared by many ogres, who have access to magic and an ancestor in the underworld.

At this point, it becomes increasingly valid to attribute the medieval Christian authors’ negative lupine characterization to the depiction of the wolf as a ravenous glutton found throughout any version of any Bible. The wolf is therein referred to in the now cliché aphorism: the false prophet, as a “wolf in sheep’s clothing,” stated in Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount. Even more bluntly, Satan has been associated with the wolf in the allegory of Jesus as a shepherd over a human flock. As with any other medieval malediction, religious zealotry is likely a significant influence on this negative lupine perception and portrayal.

As Christians, it would be impossible for any of these medieval authors to ignore the supernatural applications of their faith. When finished describing the wolf on a literal level, many authors proceed to accuse the wolf of villainy on a metaphorical level as well:

The devil bears the similitude of a wolf: he who is always looking over the human race with his evil eye, and darkly prowling round the sheepfolds of the faithful so that they may afflict and ruin their souls...Now all this is to be understood in a spiritual manner, and you have to say it allegorically, to the higher sense. For what can we mean by the Wolf except the Devil (White 59-60).

No greater slander could exist in the minds of the medieval and/or the Christian than to cast a character in a diabolical light, and nothing could better motivate unthinking mobs to torture and murder those cast in such a light, as will become evident in the next chapter of this work, which is dedicated to lupine allusions and connotations at Witch trials.

In conclusion, the wolf's portrayal in medieval European bestiaries ranges significantly: from the positive to the negative, from the natural to the supernatural. Though quite different from modern ecological understandings, such portrayals, for better, or more often for worse, were the stereotyped reputation that dogged the lupine predator for centuries. Man's contemptuous attitude is perhaps in part responsible for pushing of the wolf to near extinction in Europe.

In later chapters of this work I will compare the depictions of wolves as antagonists in the tales of the 17th century France. It is interesting to consider to what extent the traditional representation of the wolf found in medieval bestiaries remains in the works of the 17th century. Since his original portrayal in literature, the wolf has received some consistent associations: brutal violence and often, but not always, rapacious sexuality. Additionally, females are sometimes valorized over males, but both genders have supernatural associations. These traits all contribute to linking the wolf with the ogre.

II A 2: Bisclavret

To help better establish the prevailing French attitude towards wolf-kind that was inherited by 17th century authors, it is relevant to examine in some detail another chronological predecessor. This particular case study involves the lai “Bisclavret” from Marie de France, dated roughly to the 12th century. Though it deals with a “werewolf” and not a wolf per se, the state of the “werewolf” in lupine form is, for all intents and purposes, a wolf. As such, it provides a unique medieval example of French attitude towards wolves and man. The particular version of Bisclavret used in this work is the translation of Judith P. Shoaf, 1996.

Shoaf prefaces her work with a note that underlines a key observation of Marie de France’s work: “The horror the garwolf arouses in the introduction turns out to be irrelevant to this tale, in which the real horror is the woman who betrays the man she has loved.” As typical with de France, any assault on love is the true villain of the tale, more so than even the traditionally despised wolf. In fact, since this wolf character represents noble love, he must be considered the hero of her tale. While this is quite a departure from the typical portrayal of wolves in the Middle Ages, several shared traits reappear in both the lai and the bestiaries, namely, sexuality and violence.

We are told nothing of the background of the main character, named Bisclavret, except that this hero *malgré lui* is inexplicably cursed (or blessed) with lycanthropy. He voluntarily becomes the Bisclavret, one of many terms for werewolf, synonymous with *bzu*, *garwolf* and *loup garou*, by doing nothing more than removing his clothing. Sexual interpretations may be made at this point which provides another example of associating wolves with sexuality, as broached by bestiaries, and as will be discussed again in the

chapter dedicated to *Le Petit chaperon rouge*. Lupine associations with the naked man may allegorize exceptional sexual prowess.

For three days each week, Bisclavret chooses to turn lupine and to “live on what prey I can get” (<http://www.english.ufl.edu/exemplaria/marie/bisclavret.pdf>). The nature of this prey is never specified, be it human or animal, culinary or sexual, and raises the significant question of his motivation to become a wolf, which soon becomes clearer. He reveals his secret ability only to his beloved wife and only when she asks about his weekly disappearances: “my lady, I turn Bisclavret; I plunge into that great forest. In thick woods I like it best” (ibid.). Here is a hint of his motivation to become a wolf: he simply enjoys being a wolf in the wilderness, more so even than being a Lord in his own keep. For him, it is not a matter of blood, sport or violence; it is rather a means of liberating himself from the trappings and responsibilities of humanity. Bisclavret’s desire for freedom from human society and responsibilities by assuming wolf form will again be associated with a wolf in a fable from La Fontaine, *Le Loup et le Chien*, suggesting a shared association between wolves and freedom.

To support the allegorical sense, Bisclavret’s desire to transform himself into a wolf from time to time coupled with his devotion to his wife underscores a Jungian conception of man’s archetypal duality: a capacity for both elevated and base desires. The desire to indulge base, self-centered or instinctual behaviors, e.g. lascivious and sinful human nature inherited from Adam, manifests itself in Bisclavret’s decision to become a wolf and thereby isolate himself from the human community in order to vent his animal instincts in a more appropriate setting. Indeed, it will be remembered that after the fall, the pre-lapse nakedness of Adam and Eve was replaced by a need for clothing to cover or

hide the shame of their lascivious bodies. By removing his clothing, Bisclavret indulges in his baser instincts without fear of the consequences humans would incur for the primal, wolflike actions. In other words, Bisclavret sublimates his animal instincts by venting them in a harmless (non-human) setting. Without his clothes, without consciously laboring to stifle his bestial instincts, Bisclavret is more wolf than human. The wolf, then, represents the uncontrollable and primal impulses in man that constitute an ever-present threat to the civilized world. It is therefore not impossible that this man-to-wolf “transformation” is entirely allegorical: a nobleman chooses to abandon his role and expectations in order to become a savage man, so brutish that he can only be described as a “wolf,” for whom sexuality and violence are not only permissible, they are expected. This permits Bisclavret to retain his higher humanity within his human form and in human society.

When he reveals his secret transformations to his wife, he also reveals a dangerous weakness: without his clothes, he would have to remain a wolf. This admission demonstrates the extent of his trust and by extension, love for his wife: “For if I lost them [my clothes] by this mistake, from that moment on, I’d know I’d stay a Bisclavret forever; Nothing could help me, I’d never change back till I got them again” (ibid.). Bisclavret suffers from (or perhaps enjoys) a unique form of lycanthropy: his clothes are the key to his reassuming human form. Clothes here are more than a covering; they are the symbol of (his) humanity. They function as the animal skins worn by berserkers but in reverse. It is safe to assume that his natural form is not that of a wolf, who is transformed by donning human clothes, but rather that of a human who is cursed or blessed with lupine shape upon rejection of civilization’s trappings. It is also possible

that these particular clothes are inherently magic, and whosoever dons them would change form. The lai, unfortunately, does not specify. Possession of magical items, however, will become a fairly common trope among ogres and therefore significant in this lupine portrayal for that reason.

Shoaf offers the following hypothesis concerning the nature of the clothing: “Clothes [act] as both a unit, like skin itself, and clothes [act] as the precious social identity that allows a man to be recognized as a man” (ibid.). In this sense, clothes might be understood to be metaphoric rather than literal, and ultimately irrelevant to a unique individual with the power as well as the desire to change his shape at will. The shedding of clothes might function merely as a ritual or a catalyst to facilitate the magical ceremony of transmogrification. The transformation is physical, however, and not simply a product of the protagonists’ mind, as others will come to perceive him as a wolf rather than a man. This power of transformation is significant because it will become a common trait of many ogres as well.

The plot progresses when his unfaithful wife, perhaps aghast at her husband’s ability and desire to change his shape, marries another knight. Worse still, she hides Bisclavret’s clothes, trapping the man in lupine form and forcing him to remain in the woods, away from society and the court. He remains there until the King’s hunting party happens upon him one day. Immediately, they set upon the wolf with the intent to kill him, and would have done so, if he had been any regular wolf who behaved in normal lupine manner. But though physically a wolf, he retains his human mind and manners. “They would have torn him to rags but then he picked out the king and ran there for mercy. To beg, he seizes the king’s stirrup-ring, and kisses his foot and leg” (ibid.). This

passage is perhaps the most revelatory regarding prevalent French attitudes towards wolves. A human's immediate reaction is to hunt and kill any (were)wolf on sight. Only by acting human is Bisclavret spared. Even as a wolf he is recognizable as a man by his actions, i.e. total self-control and homage to the King. He is a man who merely looks like a wolf. It is one of the many lessons of the lai that one's social behavior determines one's true identity and not one's appearance. Man is first and foremost a rational being and can control his impulses and actions, regardless of his bodily form. By acting in a human way rather than a lupine way, Bisclavret is returned to society and his higher human self without the need of his clothing.

So surprised is the King when confronted with such an unusual wolf that he adopts him on the spot. The king is so fond of his new pet that he brings him to court and favors him with protection and preferential treatment. Human docility and obedience to authority are the virtues that save Bisclavret. Had he resisted in the slightest, he would have been killed such lupine behavior. At court, the wolf is accepted thanks to his genteel manners and human mental facilities. The fact that this potentially vicious animal can resume his humanity at court underscores the civilizing effect a benevolent King can have on a disordered society. Not only is the King astute and intelligent enough to look beyond Bisclavret's appearance, but Bisclavret, though maintaining the form of a wolf, manages to re-claim his human status. Even the most rapacious of men, it appears, can be civilized if surrounded by a just and benevolent King in a well-mannered and civilized court. Because of his well-mannered behavior, everyone treats Bisclavret with tolerance and respect. Consequently, "every man thinks it a precious thing, for it's so gentle, well-bred, polite, it never would do what isn't right" (ibid.). The wolf is always on his best

behavior and is therefore accepted. Again, only his outward appearance is lupine; his mind remains fully human

Bisclavret might have remained in this condition to the end of his days if his treacherous wife and her lover had not come to call on the court one day. Upon sighting them, Bisclavret immediately springs upon them with all the savagery of a jilted lover, comparable to that of a ravenous wolf. “Bisclavret saw him standing around, he made for him with a single bound, bit into him and dragged him off...Bisclavret’s wife knew it...when Bisclavret saw her entrance, no man could have held him back; he ran like mad to the attack- listen now to his fine vengeance: he tore her nose right off her face” (ibid.). Finally, there is the violence for which wolves had become so notorious. However, the impetus towards violence does not stem from hunger or defense as with wolves; rather it stems from revenge, an entirely human emotion.

Instead of destroying Bisclavret for being a vicious animal, the members of the court realize that this attack is isolated and thus specifically provoked and justified. At that point, it is not so great a logical leap to consider Bisclavret’s latent humanity. On that suspicion, they torture the unfaithful wife into revealing the motivation for her attack. She thereupon confesses to having hidden his clothes. The court has clearly sided with the “wolf” over the woman. In further service to Bisclavret, “they set them [the clothes] down in front of his nose, but Bisclavret ignores the clothes...He will never make the least move to get dressed in front of you.” Even in lupine form, Bisclavret is a modest gentleman/wolf. This detail discourages the aforementioned allegorical interpretation.

Finally, the familiar lord is restored to his human form and is recognized and welcomed by the king and the court. Immediately, he is reaccepted into society, despite

his peculiar affliction (or ability). “When [the king] catches his breath, he hands him back all his fiefs and lands, and more presents than I will say” (ibid.). Surprisingly, the King fully accepts the admitted werewolf back into his court and even generously rewards him. Here is a rare if not unique occasion where the werewolf is accepted in human society without any stigma at all. In fact, the court rejects the woman who rejected the werewolf!

In conclusion, *Bisclavret* offers a unique portrait of a man-wolf hybrid that depicts him in strongly positive terms, whether allegorically or literally. The tale makes use of traditional views of wolves as vicious predators capable of inflicting dreadful wounds, but tempers those attitudes by bestowing the wolf with a nobleman’s humanity and dignity. The relationship between man and wolf is brought to the forefront here especially in the initial encounter between King and Bisclavret. Instinctual animosity, however, is curtailed by the protagonist’s capacity for rational reflection and evidence of social grace. Man and wolf can co-exist in this lai, at the level of the individual, Bisclavret, and in the social realm. This tolerant co-existence is a unique situation in French literature. This atypical wolf/man is not immediately rejected by men despite his lupine appearance. Typical wolves, those without obedience to humans, would have been hunted and slain without mercy or remorse.

The ambiguity inherent in this tale stems from the author’s emphasis on love. Those who are faithful, constant and loving (Bisclavret) will have all their faults forgiven, regardless of their bizarreness or extremity. Those who fail to remain faithful (Bisclavret’s wife) will be rejected no matter how they conform to society’s mores in all other regards. Additionally, violence is understood as human if it is motivated by passion (vengeance and honor). Love, then, becomes the yardstick of civilization, more so than

any other trait. But if a wolf is more capable of love than a human (Bisclavret's wife) is, that wolf is more human than the humans.

This rather courtly attitude, it must be said will become obsolete by the 17th century. Before the calamitous 14th century, authors were not yet so anti-wolf. It takes the wolves' widespread necrophagia brought about by war and winter's murderous toll on humanity to pit man against wolf so poignantly in history, and therefore literature. Nonetheless, man and wolf remain at odds in this lai, vying with each other for control of Bisclavret. Indeed, the tale provides invaluable insight into the literary heritage of Franco-lupine relations inherited by La Fontaine, Perrault et al.

II A 3 : Le Roman de Renard

This chapter is dedicated wholly to another text key in establishing French attitudes towards wolves inherited by 17th century authors: *Le Roman de Renard* and in depicting its lupine antagonists: Ysengrin and his wife Hersent. Before delving into the depiction of Ysengrin, it should be noted that the stories that involve him are many, varied and not always congruent in their storylines. This is perhaps because diverse authors are responsible for their creation at different times. That said, it is worthwhile to examine the comments made in the introduction of the translator of a compendium of Renard-related tales, or branches: Patricia Terry. Her particular work includes Branches II, Va, I, and VIII, though other branches exist. Terry's choices, however, are sufficiently thorough in establishing Ysengrin's character.

In her introduction to the text, Terry continues: "Unlike the fables from which the animal characters partly derive, the *Roman de Renard* has no overt moral purpose. No doubt it is intended to be instructive" (3). Some of the intended instruction is related to the depiction of its animal characters. Whether it was intentional or not, *Le Roman de Renard* undoubtedly made a lasting impression on its readers,³ and perhaps in no way more telling than in its characterization of its ostensibly animal characters. Readers were intended to accept that these characters' behaviors were indicative of their respective species. These same readers might well be tempted to over-apply the stereotypes they encounter in the book and assume that all wolves behave as Ysengrin, that all foxes behave like Renard, etc. On a subconscious level, even modern readers might still be said

³ The extent of the *Roman de Renard's* influence can be seen in the linguistic realm as well as the literary. Until this period in history, the Old French word for fox had been goupil, a derivation from the Latin vulpus. Renard changed this.

to be vulnerable to accepting the stereotypes established and/or reinforced by the *Roman de Renard*.

Terry focuses on the lead roles of the text whose “principal characters were a fox and a wolf” (4). Besides Renard himself, the most prevalent and important character in the *Roman de Renard* is Ysengrin the wolf. Even more so than the leonine king, the feline, ursine, canine et al. characters, it is perhaps Ysengrin more so even than Renard who receives the largest share of attention throughout the book. This need not be coincidence. French audiences’ long-standing interest in and fear of wolves only facilitates the pragmatic convenience of incorporating the wolf into this lead role. A less well-known animal would not do in such a dominant role. Reality and literature are indeed inexorable when dealing with animal characterization: literature, even the *merveilleux*, must reflect reality to an extent.

Perhaps one other reason for the celebrity of the *Roman de Renard* is its continuation and extension of traditionally popular themes. There is some reliance on previous medieval romances, and some reliance on universal human interests in the *Roman de Renard*. In the stamp of the love triangle among Arthur, Guinevere and Lancelot, *Le Roman de Renard* is not without its equivalency. Terry notes: “Pierre de Saint-Cloud...was the first to write in French of the famous triangle consisting of Renard the fox, Ysengrin the wolf and Hersent his wife, which forms the nucleus of the major adventures. Pierre did not invent the hostility of fox and wolf, but he did give the wolf a less than virtuous wife” (4). The hostility between wolf and fox might be said to date back at least to Aesop’s fables. Obviously, some license was taken in the characterization

found throughout *Le Roman de Renard*, but simultaneously, a kernel of verisimilitude, at least in the minds of the authors and readers, remained as well.

The results of the tales' popularity are made evident by its widespread, even ubiquitous reproduction. The animal archetypes presented in the *Roman de Renard* are hardly unique to France. According to Terry: "comparable episodes can be found from Sanskrit to Swedish" (6). Such ubiquitous archetypes are recognized by the authors of *Le Roman de Renard*, which unleashed an enthusiastic response throughout Europe. Indeed many works have an intertextual bond with the *Roman de Renard*, including Nivard's Latin poem *Ysengrimus*. Terry claims, however, that: "Resemblances between it and the *Roman de Renard* involve the plot alone" (6). Because I am concerned with the characterization of Ysengrin and Hersent rather than the details of any plot, *Le Roman de Renard* suffices for the purposes of this work.^{4,5}

Now as concerns Ysengrin specifically: on a socio-economic level, he is considered a noble, and so maintains certain privileges as due his station. The *Roman de Renard* has a habit of rendering the nobles as predators and the common folk as prey, in a poignant satire of medieval society. It will be remembered that only nobles could hunt and carry a sword, the weapon that facilitates their capacity to dominate both man and beast. The wolf's uncharitable behavior towards others is presented as a moral failing for

⁴ That said, there is one essential discrepancy that bears mention. Namely, as Terry states: "Pierre de Saint-Cloud's account of this adventure differs from that of Nivard on a point of capital importance that it influences the entire story; in the Old French version the wolf's wife more or less initiates the adultery and certainly welcomes it" (6-7). St. Cloud's version deliberately added a new element to this antagonist of Renard.

⁵ One other distinction to mark the *Roman de Renard* from its predecessors is, as Terry states: "Pierre de Saint-Cloud, however, chose to give Renard an opponent superior to the wolf in *Ysengrimus*. Renard and Ysengrin are both described in the beginning of the poem as 'mighty lords' and essentially equals" (16). Why St. Cloud did this is also open to speculation. Whatever his reason, Pierre's version will become formative, more so than was *Ysengrimus*, to the popular medieval attitude towards wolf which will result in an ambiguous portrait.

which he is usually punished by his relentless defeat at the hands of Renard. Ysengrin provides a prime example of a non-charitable and self-centered noble: “there are some, like the wolf, who have a great position at court and who are always threatening to flout the law if it cannot be adjusted to suit them” (7). Commoners, on the other hand, are not so fortunate and do not receive so much legal leniency. The simile is clear: nobles prey upon commoners like foxes prey on chickens. Lupine Lord Ysengrin is no exception to this rule.

In addition to the cynical observation above, there is additional criticism of the so-called noble characters in the stories: “No one in the *Roman de Renard* is wholly admirable. Every character will use his powers unjustly” (15). The extent of the individual character’s power is what determines the depth of his or her depravity. One’s vice is merely a function of one’s ability to exercise it in proportion to one’s station. By this scale, nobles are able to sink further into depravity than are commoners, an occurrence that is often depicted throughout the text. Yet even as a noble, Ysengrin is relatively more law-abiding and moral compared to Renard in terms of behavior. Renard’s many outrageous exploits need not and cannot be outlined here.

In his many confrontations and defeats resulting from the legendary wiles of Renard, Ysengrin might appear to be quite the fool. But compared to the unmatched wit of Renard, even the clever and resourceful would seem witless and foolish. Terry reminds us that “Ysengrin does not show stupidity as much as he finds himself in a ridiculous position” (16). Given such difficult situations, Ysengrin is both clever and fortunate to come out with any shred of dignity or resources intact, and so credit must be given when it is earned. For example, Terry states:

Renard made a fool out of Ysengrin – getting him trapped in a pit, in a rich man’s larder, in a frozen pond, in a monastery – but the cause of the war between them was more Renard’s malice than Ysengrin’s dull wits, and the fox escapes the wolf’s immediate vengeance by speed rather than by cleverness (16).

The text portrays wolf-kind, via Ysengrin, not so much as dull-witted buffoons, but rather as unfortunate victims of the most notorious criminal mind of the time. Though the victim, the wolf resists victimization, and struggles at all times for justice and revenge. He can hope to attain satisfaction only through physical means, because in strength, he is superior to Renard. This will also be the primary advantage enjoyed by the ogre antagonist studied below: they are easy to trick, but dangerous, strong and violent.

Yet at the same time, readers are not encouraged to sympathize with Renard’s antagonist. Terry states: “Although Ysengrin is endlessly the victim of Renard, he never manages to inspire our sympathy” (16-17). Perhaps it is too much to ask of a medieval audience to pity any wolf due to pre-existing historical or allegorically religious reasons (see parts IIA1 and IIB1 of this work). Whatever the reason, readers may tend to sympathize with Renard over Ysengrin. This may be the most consistent trademark of any antagonist: he bears the author’s and readers’ (and therefore the protagonist’s) antipathy. These characters exist as a foil, and are destined always to fail in any endeavor that is opposed to the protagonists.

Within the storylines found in the branches of Terry’s work, the first direct mention of Ysengrin in action is the following reference: “Lord Ysengrin returns alone. He is happy to be home at last, having run so many miles so fast, tracking down and capturing his prey until he had meat enough to weigh almost too much for his strong back. Little does he care what others lack!” (57). While this might describe any working man, or for that matter hunter or bandit, it alludes to both positive and negative traits.

Ysengrin is industrious, but also selfish and greedy. He cares for his family, as he provides for them to the point of straining his considerable strength, but heedless of the expense of anyone else. Upon his return home, he learns some devastating news:

Ysengrin nearly lost his head on hearing what his children said. He almost fainted, then roared and screamed just like a raging devil he seemed: ‘Hersent, what do you take me for? You vile, stinking lousy whore, I’ve cherished you and held you dear, You’ve not known either want or fear and You let someone else between your legs! (58).

In homage perhaps to the fabliaux also popular about this time, Ysengrin fills the role of the cuckolded husband whose wife cheats on him. His rage here might be understood and forgiven by readers, even though it is phrased in diabolical terms. Again he recalls his industriousness as a provider, whose virtue has been unjustly betrayed by her adultery. And though it could be easy to sympathize with the betrayed husband, his insertion into the role of the cuckolded sot renders him a comedic relief target, beneath readers’ pity.

When he learns who is responsible for his new pair of horns, the enraged husband does what any other might in his place: “Ysengrin says he’ll end the war before it gets started and Renard from now on had best be on his guard. Then Ysengrin set out to seek his foe” (59). Whether this action is intended to protect his wounded pride or to protect the unity of his family is not specified, but safe to say that both are factors, demonstrating his dual concerns. Perhaps his primary motivation is simply to strike at his old adversary Renard however he can, using this latest episode as a pretext for doing so.

When the vengeful wolf approaches the guilty party’s home, “Renard knew his voice, and had no doubt of what Ysengrin was glad about, so he turned tail and ran flat out” (59). By fleeing, Renard here demonstrates that he is physically afraid of Ysengrin. In this, he remains faithful to the natural hierarchy of predators as well. It also suggests

that Ysengrin is of a higher or equal rank than Renard in this fiction, and need not fear breaking oaths of homage in overt revolt. This passage is also quite credible for medieval readers as it taps into their primordial fear of the wolf as a dangerous enemy who is irresistible in direct confrontation and can be overcome only by merit of guile and deceit. Failing that, flight is the best course of action for survival.

When he has a chance to accost Renard, verbally at least, Ysengrin is not so foolish as to accept Renard's glib explanation, and persists in his demand for the truth: "When does anyone push and shove, as I saw you doing to Hersent, when pulling was really his intent?" Ysengrin is not stupid. He suspects that she is cheating and knows that Renard is lying. Yet he would accept Hersent's lie if it furthered his cause of persecuting Renard. His primary motivation remains Renard's downfall, not Hersent's honor.

When both physical assault and verbal prodding fail, the plaintiff is forced to resort to courtly justice to settle the affair of his wife's adultery. But instead of pleading the King for mercy, Ysengrin's approach is to remind the king of his sacred duty to uphold the law, a clever legal tactic that is likely to be more successful than a complaint couched in terms of a personal vendetta. "Ysengrin with a sigh said 'King, your vassals don't comply with the law...Is that how your vassals should obey the laws you make?'" (66-67). Ysengrin here also demonstrates his boldness by goading his king, risky business, that, as the king has the right to castigate him for any perceived insult. Simultaneously, Ysengrin uses and abuses the law to get his way in court. He is at once clever, audacious and unscrupulous.

At court, Ysengrin is not without his share of allies, many of whom have a common enemy in Renard. Bruin the bear speaks up for Ysengrin: "Lord Ysengrin

deserves support. Were he a traitor or a liar, a proven criminal, we'd require more than what his wife could relate for us to believe his story's straight. But Ysengrin is so well known that if he brings his wife along as witness, we should be content" (72). It is unclear whether Ysengrin enjoys a particularly good reputation or is simply better liked than Renard is. Nonetheless, no one attacks Ysengrin's credibility, thereby suggesting a moral impeccability utterly lacking in Renard. Perhaps Ysengrin simply lacks the guile to commit deeds that result in a licentious notoriety. Equally possible is that Ysengrin has lawfully good tendencies and a desire for moral virtue.

Some final remarks from witnesses concerning Ysengrin include the following viewpoints: Brincemar the boar comments that: "The wolf inspires excessive fright" (81). Bruin the bear, an animal renowned for his strength, adds: "You know that Ysengrin is strong" (95). Finally, Ysengrin offers this declaration on his own behalf: "No wall or moat or bolted door will save him – I will strike him dead!" (100). Altogether, a tapestry of many threads presents itself to be of prowess, pride, rage, and boasting, like Roland more so than Oliver or Renard. And yet there is more to his character, including a trait for which the brash Roland was never known: subtlety. When Pinte the hen brings forth her testimony against Renard, Ysengrin immediately seizes upon it to his advantage. He states: "I do not say it because I hate Renard, but in sorrow for her fate" (103). Ysengrin here clearly lies about his concern for the chicken's plight only to get his way in court. Here again he shows himself to be both clever and unscrupulous. If Ysengrin demonstrates on this occasion a lack of moral virtue by lying, it is only because he is in pursuit of Renard's downfall, which is his ultimate motivation. He is willing to suffer a

minor sin in order to bring about the greater good. One might add “relentless” to the litany of characteristics applicable to Ysengrin.

Altogether, Ysengrin provides a surfeit of characteristics, both positive and negative to place the wolf stereotype for future writers. He is loyal to his wife and family, but a dangerous enemy to have. He seeks the greater good, but is quite willing to endure lesser evils in order to achieve it. He often seems to be more humanized than Renard because he is loyal to his wife and family, and he struggles to work within the law. He is willing to abide by the law of courts rather than the law of the jungle, and he allows the King to arbitrate in his dispute against Renard. Like mankind in general, he has difficulty restraining his passionate impulses and is motivated by passion to seek revenge. He seeks the greater good, but is quite willing to cheat or lie in order to achieve it in the end. In the end, there is no way to label Ysengrin as a positive or negative character. In fact, he presents quite an ambiguous portrait that allows for great leeway in future iterations of lupine character representation.

II B 1: Lupine Associations at Witch Trials

In this is the chapter I seek to understand the historical reasons that could elucidate the negative portrayal of lupine antagonists in 17th century literature. On many occasions, unforgettably traumatic historical events created in many Europeans, including the French, a pejorative view of wolves that is ultimately reflected in literature. The indelible impact of these dark times upon the minds of the survivors and their descendants is documented in a variety of sources. Historical sources such as *Le Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris sous Charles IV et Charles VII, de 1405 à 1449* (Roger H. Guerrand) and *Great Historic Animals* (Ernest Thompson Seton) also point out some reasons that explain how historical events played a role in forming a negative stereotype of wolves in the minds of early modern Europeans. Primarily, frequent and large-scale wars, most notably the Hundred Years War, produced a surfeit of human cadavers too tempting to predators to pass up. Having grown accustomed to human game, many wolves (and wolf-dog hybrids) would come to rely on it exclusively. Aghast survivors bore witness to the wolves' devouring of the dead and near-dead relatives, neighbors and countrymen not only in the forest, but even in their very towns and homes. Such horrors birthed a corresponding horrific literature with lupine antagonists.

As a matter of fact, wolves were so prevalent and so deadly that 16th century French law ordained tri-annual hunts in order to reduce their numbers. In a corroborative study of *Witchcraft, Lycanthropy, Drugs and Disease*, author H. Sidky reminds us that: "The increasing preoccupation with, and apprehension concerning lycanthropy is reflected both in the number of people brought to trial and in the fact that between 1591 and 1686 no less than fourteen major treatises were written on the subject" (215). To say

the least, the grim historical realities and demonic fantasies attributed to wolves of sixteenth and seventeenth century France were interpreted into the literary wolf so relevant to 17th century literary.

Wolves will figure as a significant component of what is in fact a long-standing tradition of animal persecution in Europe. As for the 17th century in particular, Philip Lewis states in his book: *Seeing through the Mother Goose Tales*: “No doubt the interpretive context in the seventeenth century was also inflected by authentic human fears of being devoured that stemmed from actual cases of cannibalism provoked by famine, during the Middle Ages and the sixteenth century” (171). Fear of being devoured, by man or by wolf, would be rightly attributed to the horrific wars and winters. To take this lupine animosity one step further, oftentimes criminals were depicted in lupine terms. With that old fear in mind, the following historical trials of the 17th century can be better understood as a reaction to the devouring wolves as much as an attempt to bring justice to the devoured. Within the larger framework of a long-standing tradition of anti-wolf animosity, the 17th century in particular was one marked by obsession with wolves as villains, as reflected both in history and literature.

Again, the animosity between man and wolf was neither exclusive to nor rooted in the 17th century. Rather, it is as old as the species themselves are. Sometimes competitors for mutual prey or territory, and sometimes the prey of each other, man and wolf’s ecological roles naturally pit them against one another. In her work, *Wolfsong*, Catherine Feher-Elston speculates further on the subject of the origin of this animosity. “The transformation of Europe from paganism to Christianity changed the wolf from a tribal figure of nurturer and protector to one of cruel devourer and denizen of the Underworld.

Others maintain that the cause was human society's shift from hunting to herding and farming" (83). Feher-Elston immediately labels these two theories as simplistic, but fails to provide an alternative, if one indeed can be found at all. She does point out, however, that man's horror and hatred of wolves diminishes considerably when the Industrial Revolution bestowed upon man the means to exterminate his competitor and predator, literally leaving him with nothing to fear any longer. Chronologically then, there is a temporal window of extreme animosity between man and wolf in Europe, relegated approximately to the dawning of Christianity and the end of the 18th century. It is a large time-window indeed, and so bears further scrutiny. This scrutiny will yield a paroxysm of animosity in the 16th and 17th centuries, largely exacerbated by religious fanaticism, such as that of the Inquisition in France. Indeed, as Feher-Elston notes, "The French seem to have been particularly plagued by werewolf mania" (86). The following chapter will elucidate this historical reality in part responsible for the literary portrayal of wolves throughout the 17th century.

In her work, "Such an Impure, cruel, and savage beast..." Nicole Jacques-Lefèvre cites several diverse sources concerning 17th century French views on wolves, all of which are negative to varying degrees. She begins with comments on Beauvois de Chauvincourt's *Discours de la lycanthropie ou de la transformation des hommes en loups*: She states: "After having there recalled the evils of the French Wars of Religion, especially in the Anjou countryside, [de Chauvincourt] evokes an additional scourge, 'the bloody incursion of wolves maddened with hunger'" (182). Let us not also forget other equally calamitous aspects of the preceding centuries. Sidky recalls in the work, *Witchcraft, Lycanthropy, Drugs and Disease: An Anthropological Study of the European*

Witch-Hunts, that “The common European wolf (*Canis Lupus*) became particularly troublesome after the massive casualties of the Black Death led to the abandonment of formerly cultivated lands and inhabited villages...reversing the deforestation of the previous centuries and facilitating the resurgence of dwindling wolf populations” (220).

This observation dovetails with the Hundred Years’ War as the catalyst for wolves’ predation on humans, both the living and the dead. In the aftermath of wars and plague, a proliferation of human corpses during the harsh winter drew wolves to this readily available source of meat. It was physically expedient for the predators to take advantage of human prey because hunting them in their weakened state required less energy than was required to hunt healthier, harder to find game. Had these wars never occurred, perhaps the wolves would never have acquired the taste for human flesh. It then follows, that in that event, humans’ fear of wolves would have been similarly reduced both in history and its corollary, literature. Perhaps the wolf would not have been used as a villain in 17th century literature had it not been for these historical factors.

In addition to temporal factors aligning to produce the perfect storm of anthropo-lupine adversity, geography played an equally important role. In contrast to France and Germany, where wolf populations still abounded in the 17th century, England and other regions with minimal or nonexistent wolf populations had no similar outbreak of literary lupine villains. English witch trials focused on witches whereas French hunts yielded many examples of “witches” who were also werewolves. Had wolves been absent from the French countryside, religious authorities may have had to settle for a different scapegoat.

Even before this fear of wolves reached its post-war peak, there was substantial anti-wolf sentiment among the French. Jacques-Lefevre recalls the words of Henri Boguet, one of the chief witch-hunters of Burgundy and author of the notorious *Discours des Sorciers* in the late 16th and early 17th centuries: “it would be a shameful thing for man, to whom all the beasts of the earth are subject, to be clothed in the form of a beast” (187). As with Spanish Inquisitors of preceding centuries, Boguet’s zeal in persecuting (were)wolves was largely inspired by his fanatical ties to the Christian faith. For example, the Book of Genesis teaches that God gave man dominion over all the animals in Eden. To pious Christians such as Bouget then, the uprising of the wolf against his human “master” is not only a physically threat, it is, moreover, spiritually reprehensible because it violates God’s order.

Again, although antiwolf sentiment reaches its peak in the 17th century, the accounting thereof is not reserved to this century. Indeed, animosity towards wolves maintains a long and varied history throughout all levels of French society. To this regard, Jacques-Lefevre also cites Gaston Phoebus, the Count of Foix in the 14th century and author of the *Livre de Chasse*, as ascribing a fundamentally “bad nature” to wolves (188). This self-styled master of the hunt and of animal behavior might have been taken for an authority on the subject in his time and in his home county. It is safe to say that his opinion was shared by many of his contemporaries and descendants throughout the kingdom. “Bad nature” only hints at the depth of the animosity between the two species. By the 17th century, this is a litote. Even those self-proclaimed specialists of wolf behavior, those perceived as the authorities on the subject, had only libel and slander for the wolf.

To further establish the long-held tradition of negative associations with wolves in French literature, Jacques-Lefevre refers to Montaigne's reference to werewolves in the *Apology of Raymond de Sebond* as "half-breed and ambiguous forms between human and brutish nature" (189). It is assumed that (were)wolves necessarily have to be vicious savage marauders, as if they have no free will and their lupine blood demands carnage. This analogy, however, is based on one's association of those bestial traits with the lupine half of the werewolf. These associations were clearly held by a wide sampling of mainstream French population for some time and were not isolated or fringe individuals' beliefs.

Those humans associated with wolves via lycanthropy in any form are never characterized in any manner except the negative. Jacques-Lefevre recalls, to name but one example, how one man was apprehended and accused of being a werewolf: "Jacques Rollet, captured near Nantes described as 'so stinking and revolting that no one in the world can approach him; covered with grease as thick as two fingers' all over his body...having been bastardized and subjected by his master, Satan, to brutality'" (191). In this case, the Christian devil, depicted as a "wolf in sheep's clothing" in Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, is associated with (were)wolves. In both cases, the wolf's hallmark is his brutality. To any self-respecting Christian, which was, ostensibly, every socially accepted person in positions of power, this was an evil impossible to suffer. Like witches in the *Malleus Maleficarum* around published this time, (were)wolves must not be suffered to live.

That said, there is a fundamental commonality between werewolf and wolf that needs to be explicitly clarified at this point in order to justify incorporation of these

Witch Trial sources: both wolves and werewolves are depicted first and foremost as lupine creatures of savage violence, often resulting in the slaughter of either a human or livestock. Concerning the cases to be mentioned below, the characters are consistently dubbed as ‘werewolves’ in that they involve humans who transform themselves into wolves. In all cases below, said “werewolves” are effectively wolves in that they appear and behave as wolves, at least to the minds of the people at the time. As such, they will be considered wolves for this portion of the study.

Among the many recorded accounts of wolf-related attacks, Robin Briggs’ article, “Dangerous Spirits,” which appears in the collection: *Werewolves, Witches and Wandering Spirits*, recounts several characteristic occasions of werewolf activity. By his account,

Full trial records survive for approximately 375 individuals tried as witches in Lorraine between 1580 and 1630...there are around 110 which provide significant material for analysis, some of them under two or three headings. Wolves appear in thirty six of these...The fact that they appear in almost 30 percent of cases, and perhaps 5 percent of meaningful testimonies, does suggest that they were an important component of Lorraine witchcraft beliefs; at the symbolic level they might even be thought to have been an integral one (4).

The trials of Lorraine here will serve as an example of the trials of French territories as a whole. The following are examples of victims of accusations of lupine association.

Perhaps the most famous of werewolf trials in European history is “The Werewolf of Bedburg.” This trial of Peter Stubbe (alternately Stumpf) occurred on the other side of the Lorraine border shortly before the dawn of the 17th century. Suffice to say, Stubbe was accused of acts of wanton carnality so unthinkable⁶ that they sufficed to equate him in the minds of his accusers with a werewolf, rather than to a human being. His

⁶ Propriety prevents me from recounting those crimes and that punishment here.

punishment was equally gruesome. This trial, though by far the most extreme, even in those extreme times, seems to set the tone for similar cases in 17th century France.

To recount the most significant events of but a sampling of cases that occurred in Lorraine itself: Idoult Charpentier of Saint Blaise was accused in 1603 by Noel George who claimed that “two wolves had attacked the animals and he had recognized the head of one of them as that of Idoult” (Briggs 6). This is a bizarre case in one respect only: that the head of a human is recognizable on the body of a wolf. Otherwise, the sole accusation of violence against persons or animals is the standard for this sort of trial, as will be demonstrated below.

Similarly, Claudon Hardier of Hesse was accused in the following way in 1608, according to Briggs: “the herd was sometimes plagued by a wolf, whose attacks did not seem to fit an animal of that kind, insomuch as instead of leaping upon some animal to feed on it, it only twisted and turned around them and scratched them” (7). In this case, the contemporaneous French audience believed devoutly that it was: “not a true wolf...that it was the devil...[because] dogs ran away from the unnatural wolf” (7). Claudon confessed under torture of being responsible for the crime as well as implicating others as witches who could transform themselves into wolves. Here now is a direct link between wolves and witches, in that they may be both one and the same: criminals in these trials. Consequently, this duality or ambiguity in villainy may be reflected in literature of the period, in fulfillment of Stendahl’s famous maxim.⁷

Similarly, Dieudonnée Jalley of Mazelay was accused in 1618 by hired hands of having transformed herself into a wolf. One of the employees accused her of killing some of his animals. His wife accused Dieudonnée of having personally harried her and her

⁷ « Le roman est un miroir qui se promène sur un autoroute » (Le Rouge et le noir)

son. A wolf, it seems, can be a convenient and credible villain for all the woes of the afflicted. It is particularly interesting to note how an employer is depicted in lupine terms by the employed, a conflict between members of different socio-economic classes which will repeat itself in literature.

In 1630, Jennon Grand Didier of La Rochatte was convicted of having turned herself into a wolf and attacking and killing a donkey (Briggs 8). Again, dogs refused to pursue this wolf. One of her neighbors and accusers was cited as attributing to her the following curse: “may the evil wolf strangle and kill them” (ibid. 8). The verb ‘strangle’ is odd as wolves are incapable of doing so; this act necessitates a human’s hands. Nonetheless, Jennon was found guilty, perhaps simply for being contrary and unpleasant, much in the manner Salem witches were accused in this same century and the next across the Atlantic. The French public was disinclined to be lenient in this case and any case involving a wolf.

Mengette Cachette of Flin in 1602 (Briggs 8) was accused by approximately fifty of her neighbors of shape shifting, now a standard clause. A “circumstantial story” (8) placed her as an unseen wolf that had killed a horse fifteen years previously. Claudon Hursieu accused Mengette of making their son ill and of killing another horse. Mengette, possibly under torture, confessed to strangling a horse in the form of a wolf. The process of transformation in this case is attributed to a ‘master,’ Persin, who had “greased her body and pinched her forehead” (8).

Jean Callerey of Pajalle was accused in 1614 (Briggs 9) of strangling a cow while he was in the form of a wolf. Jean did not personally confess, but implicated his “master:” Houbelat. On other occasions, this master had commanded Jean to take the

form of a wolf by applying a grease and, unusual for French cases, a wolf skin. The recurring evidence of applying grease is now becoming a pattern just as much as the wolves' attacks on animals and people. The nature of this grease is remarkable for it may have contained many toxic and/or narcotic ingredients. So it is not surprising that the subject of this ointment was rendered temporarily insane, even believing himself the object of his obsession: the wolf.

Claudatte Dabo of Grattain (formerly Robache) (Briggs 9) was accused in 1613 by an already accused witch of having taken the form of a wolf and helping to devour a human child. Specifically it was stated that she had taken the heart away and ate it with her companions. In her confession, Claudatte admitted also of turning into a wolf in order to attack the sheep at Grattatin. The purpose of eating the child's heart, supposedly, was to obtain protection from the judicial process. Briggs points out how this superstition very poignantly places humans and werewolves at odds.

Mengeon Claude Perrin of Brehimont in 1600 (Briggs 10) is another example of an unpopular character accused of witchcraft/lycanthropy by several sources. Colas Claude accused Mengeon after one such feud of turning himself into a wolf in order to attack his children. Separately, Jennon Perrin, after having observed Mengeon in a theft, accused him of turning into a wolf by putting his hand on the ground. In wolf as well as human form, Mengeon called her a slut and a liar and threatened that "he would have her." Mengeon is also accused of threatening two other girls. Mengeon confessed to turning himself into a wolf with the use of grease given to him by his master in order to attack the children

Claudon Bregat of Sallennes in 1612 (Briggs 19) was accused after a dispute of being responsible for the illness of Jennotte Rodeans, who claims furthermore that he was attacked by a wolf. However, Rodeans did not specify that Claudon was this wolf himself or if he simply managed to get a wolf to attack him. Either case would not be out of place for this time period.

Finally, Jean Colombain of l'Estraye was implicated in 1624 by saying that: "Tantedient, my father, will soon have some of your animals.' A big wolf then appeared and carried off a goat, while Jean's father was working nearby at the time" (Briggs 20). This was enough to condemn the man.

The list of similar accusations and procedures goes on and on. The cases listed above are but a sample of the common and accepted trials that proliferated early modern courts, but provide ample evidence of the association between violent crime and (were)wolves. The similarities between the French and the American Witch Trials of Salem, MA (1690) should be apparent, but there are more significant differences between the two. In American trials, most notably, associations of werewolves were non-existent, but they were prevalent in French trials. I attribute this discrepancy to mainland Europe's more recent historic struggles against wolves. In America, on the other hand, where wolves were also common at that time, there was simply no bloody history of conflict, and so no bias and no basis for werewolf associations with witchcraft.

Other animal antagonists appear as villains in French confessions including cats and to a lesser extent dogs, even pigs. In fact, a bear was on at least one occasion exonerated from potential witchcraft associations in the confession of François Lhermite of Saint Dré in 1630. According to Briggs, Lhermite recounted: "he met a black bear,

which told him he should always be a good man, and that he should never do any harm” (18). A similarly positive portrayal of a dog is recounted in César le Charpentier of la Bourgonce in 1620: “a black dog carried them up their chimney and to a fine room where they are as much meat as they wanted” (20). There are no similarly positive accounts of wolves.

In stark contrast, one animal stands apart from the rest in terms of frequency of culpability as well as the nature of his crime. In all these cases, wolves were blamed for violent actions that often (if not always) resulted in a kill of either livestock or humans. The wolf’s repeated presence is remarkable for at least 2 reasons: 1) a wolf is singled out as the killer as opposed to any other capable predator including bears, lions, dragons or even something completely alien, such as a supernatural manifestation of the “devil.” 2) The wolf was not identified for any other reason except for the attack or the kill and certainly not for any benevolent purpose.

Both reasons directly reflect the 17th century Frenchman’s perceptions of the wolf but thorough knowledge of his history and faith and their corresponding prejudices. The repetitive nature of these lupine associations with violent criminal behavior is indicative of several things. Accusers either supplied or were satisfied with the repetitive use of the wolf as villain in these witchcraft trials. The fact that the victims identified a wolf, and that the wolf was accepted as a scapegoat, proves that the wolf was an acceptable and believable subject of blame in the minds of the general population on both sides of this inquisition. Had these same accusers blamed chickens, sheep or even lions and tigers for the attacks, they would, in all likelihood, not have been believed. The wolf, and only the wolf, is the acceptable, believable villain for 17th century French imaginations, both

historical and literary, precisely because it has been the most historically problematic predator in quotidian French life for several centuries.

The fact that true wolf attacks increased tremendously around this time due to the corpse-producing wars of man only exacerbated the man's paranoia and immediate implication of the predator. This combination of sources, both actual and suspected, provided an environment where readers and listeners were more than ready to accept the wolf as the villain in literature. Perhaps these stories would not have been so popular or successful without the wolf's predation on Frenchmen at that time. Because of these dark ages for man, the wolf would henceforth be maligned as little more than a *bouche dévorante*.

II C 1: La Fontaine

Before discussing the specific fables written or adapted by Jean de la Fontaine, a foreword on the importance of genre is necessary. Fables, such as those of La Fontaine, are a unique literary genre employed to communicate a moral lesson through an amusing and succinct anecdote involving familiar character archetypes. These character archetypes predominantly, but not exclusively, take the form of anthropomorphized animals, rather than lycomorphized humans and tap into readers' common knowledge regarding behavior and innate characteristics. As human authors struggle to portray animal characters in a credible way, no small amount of inevitable anthropomorphism occurs throughout fables. Yet the characterization in fables is not without innovation or verisimilitude. The fables remain faithful to their characters' essential animalistic natures despite the inherent convention of anthropomorphism. In her work *Thinking with Animals...*, Lorraine Daston explains:

In fables, animals are humanized, one might even say hyperhumanized, by caricature...Whereas the same stories told about humans might lose the moral in a clutter of individualizing detail of the sort we are usually keen to know about other people, substituting animals as actors strips the characterizations down to prototypes. Animals simplify the narrative to a point that would be found flat or at least allegorical if the same tales were recounted about humans (9).

The wolf is one of the most prevalent archetypes used in fables, both before and during La Fontaine's time. For example, many of these lupine conventions appear in the works of Aesop (q.v. Widdower) and Phaedrus (q.v. Berrigan). In nine of La Fontaine's fables, the author expresses one aspect of mankind's nature or demeanor through the allegory of the wolf. However, in order to portray the wolf in a believable way, La Fontaine had to present the wolf in a way thought believable by readers of his time so as not to defeat the

premise of his seemingly innocent tale. The power of the fable exists in direct correlation to the familiarity of the reader with its content and context. Those well versed in the character of the animals involved will better understand the tale, as the animals' representation and actions within the fable are supposedly a function of their true nature in the wild. Many of the conventions we have seen ascribed to wolves in medieval sources reappear in the portrayal of the wolves in La Fontaine's fables as well.

And although La Fontaine clearly intended his wolf characters to be metaphors for humans, he would not have used wolves if the wolf was not recognizable and acceptable as such an intended figure because otherwise it conveys no believable allegory. E.g., chipmunks would be ineffective to convey lessons of ferocity and violence because readers have pre-conceived notions about chipmunks and have a limited set of beliefs that can only be pushed so far even when dealing with metaphors. Therefore, a modicum of naturalism is needed (La Fontaine himself was the son of a *maître des eaux et forêts* and so might very well have had this background as well) to properly understand and appreciate La Fontaine's fables, which represent and confirm prejudices that have already been established. They offer relatively little new insight concerning the wolf's portrayal, but serve rather as a validation of the public's general attitude towards wolves. Unless otherwise stated, all citations attributed to La Fontaine are taken from the following bibliographical entry : La Fontaine, Jean de. *Les Fables*. Elizur Wright, trans. Jupiter Books, 1975.

In the fable *Le Loup et le chien*, we see a juxtaposition between these two canine species that emphasizes their primary difference: wildness vs. domesticity. The situation of the wolf in the tale is dire. He is characterized as poverty- and hunger-stricken: "Un

loup n'avoit que les os et la peau" (16). As a result of this desperate plight, he is forced to travel out of his natural woodland habitat and into human society in search of ways to fill his stomach. When no easy prey presents itself in either locale, the desperate wolf considers the dog's invitation to work for mankind in exchange for regular feedings. When pressed for further information, the dog proceeds to list all the benefits of his employ, including plentiful food and man's affection in exchange for a minimum of work. The wolf is impressed with these benefits and might have suffered himself to take the job if he had not noticed, in a fortuitous moment of lucid alertness, the chafing of the collar that binds the dog in place. At first the dog tries to conceal this admitted downside of his condition but at last is forced to concede that enslavement is indeed part and parcel of his job description. By attempting to conceal this binding, the dog reveals that he is ultimately ashamed of his servile condition and does not want it known, and with good reason. Aghast at this lack of freedom, the wolf retorts: "Il importe si bien, que de tous vos repas Je ne veux en aucune sorte, Et ne voudrois pas même à ce prix un trésor" (16). The final word said, the wolf flees the scene of the dog's incarceration and returns to the wild woods of his natural habitat.

This fable offers insight into the wolf's values, his fears, and his priorities. Certainly, hunger is a high-ranking drive in any animal's life, but in this particular case, it is not the most important. Even more compelling for the wolf is the drive to be free, to come and go as he pleases, to have freedom of choice. He can accept dependence on another for food without moral conflict, but the threat of physical containment is an insurmountable drawback. The wolf makes a choice; he chooses freedom and hunger over satiation and bondage.

Le Loup et le chien is an extraordinary fable in that it casts the wolf, perhaps for the first time in literature, in a seemingly positive light. Typically, the wolf's behavior is designed to elicit condemnation, thereby motivating the reader to act in an opposing manner. This wolf, at least in the view of modern readers, appears heroic rather than blameworthy. Perhaps, in the context of seventeenth century salon society, the wolf's attitude is intended to underscore the undesirability of social isolation, a theme prevalent in many of Molière's plays as well. In this, however, we see how La Fontaine is moving the fable beyond its conventional function as a genre intended to teach morality into one dedicated to teaching readers the new values he or she will need to acquire in order to function in a rapidly changing society. In other words, the individual or psychological moral typical of fables is being transformed into a collective or sociological moral. As we will see, this phenomenon of allegorizing social rather than moral behaviors will be increasingly attributed to ogres in later seventeenth century representations.

In the fable *Le Loup et l'agneau*, La Fontaine presents more than just the brutish side of a wolf who confronts weaker prey, though it is this aspect that receives the primary emphasis. Stalking a lamb drinking from a stream, a wolf approaches and accosts the weaker animal out of both hunger and boredom. Naturally, the wolf has but one thing on his mind when presented with such a sight: food. The only question in the wolf's mind is how best to obtain it. Surprisingly, brute force is not the preferred *modus operandi*. Instead, he makes an effort to proceed in a manner that justifies the imminent violence: he feigns indignity at a supposed trespass and angrily demands of the hapless ovine: "qui te rend si hardi de troubler mon breuvage?" (24) When the lamb stutters a meek but perfectly valid justification, the merciless predator retorts with a litany of additional

accusations, doubtlessly fabricated on the spot, in order to justify a death sentence for the innocent lamb and perhaps also to assuage any internal moral conflict associated with this imminent murder. Yet for each accusation, the lamb has a solid alibi. Finally, and as a last resort, the wolf abandons all attempts at cleverness and judicial process, and contents himself with overpowering and devouring his prey “au fond des forêts” (24), the wolf’s natural habitat.

For once, the moral of the fable is found at the beginning of the tale, perhaps simply in order to facilitate the rhyme scheme: “La raison du plus fort est toujours la meilleure, nous l’allons montrer toute à l’heure” (24). Literally, the wolf is the strongest, if not the cleverest of the characters represented in this fable. And in the dog-eat-dog world of fables, strength is sufficient for success. Innocence, cleverness, and moral superiority cannot save the weak. Here is an ending not often seen in popular stories of any kind, including fables: might triumphs over right, brute force triumphs over cleverness, and the villain is victorious without any hint of repercussions or punishment. Apparently, the wolf did not fret about his potential moral conflict too much after all. However, it is necessary to point out that brute force was only the last resort of the wolf. He relied on violence only when multiple ploys at justification failed. Even if these attempts were only an illusion, they illustrate that the wolf does not always choose to engage his superior strength as his primary hunting strategy. Unfortunately for him, however, nothing but this force will succeed in making a kill. The wolf is not a killer by choice, but only by necessity.

On a metaphorical level, an idea introduced in the chapter on medieval bestiaries, the wolf has come to represent the Devil in Christian mythology. He is mentioned

explicitly in Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, where Jesus made mention of himself often as "the lamb of God." The metaphorical triumph of the "Devil" over Jesus in this story may seem shocking to readers of the Christian persuasion. But the point of the fable is that guilt is determined by one's social standing rather than one's deeds. Ultimately, the wolf is construed as the villain/antagonist in this fable rather than the hero/protagonist as in the previous fable. Whether he likes it or not, in *Le Loup et l'agneau*, the wolf is construed as a creature of brute force and lacks any truly cunning strategy. He is victorious by might, not by right. He is victorious by might, not by right. The pedagogical insights the fable offers to readers involve the victim rather than the predator, however. Because the wolf is victorious, it is difficult to read the fable as a cautionary tale advising against the urge to prey on weaker beings. The moral of the tale is that humans should avoid coming into contact with the powerful and the influential because in contemporary society. In La Fontaine's cynical view, David cannot defeat Goliath, no matter how deep his faith.

In the brief fable, *Le Loup plaidant contre le renard par-devant le singe*, La Fontaine offers only a brief glimpse into what it means to be lupine. Before addressing the plot of this fable, however, it should be noted that the entire scenario of a judicial process involving a wolf, a fox and a monkey is too human to be construed in a natural, literal sense. In the other fables, the scenarios were, theoretically, possible in the life of a wolf. In those cases, the use of animals was simultaneously literal and metaphorical. In this fable, however, the use of animal characters must be assumed to be strictly metaphorical. In other words, it must be understood simply as allegory. That said, it is important to note that the author did not simply resort to the use of human characters. He

retains the use of animals as characters and by doing so incurs all connotations of their respective types in his fable.

Moreover, it is interesting to note the return of the old dichotomy between wolf and fox, a French literary tradition that extends back into the Middle Ages with *Le Roman de Renard*. Similar animal characterizations link both sources: the wolf is stronger but easily duped by a weaker, but cleverer fox. The novel element of the monkey is the real innovation of this particularly succinct fable. Essentially, a wolf accuses a fox of theft. The monkey presiding over the hearing finds in favor of neither plaintiff nor litigant but rather finds equally against both, not out of any sense of justice, but simply for his own profit.

The metaphor of wolf extends in this instance to represent a type of man who is outwitted by others in positions of power, such as the *vilain* of medieval fabliaux. It is curious that a notoriously violent wolf would bring any case to court in the first place. The presumed course of action would be to simply attack, kill and devour his adversary in the wilderness, as this is his true strength. Here perhaps is a forewarning that he ought not do so. For whenever a wolf enters a domain not naturally his own, i.e. the court or society, and must rely on traits that are not his finest, he is doomed to ignoble defeat. Thus he cannot hope to prevail in this legal setting. Even the fox, typically renowned for his guile, fails to succeed in this venue. The monkey's cleverness, spite and or greed trumps even the fox's cunning. The monkey address the wolf: "car toi, loup, tu te plains, quoiqu'on ne t'ait rien pris" (38). This accusation, if we can believe the monkey, suggests that the wolf has brought false charges against the fox. This event, however, seems unlikely. For even if a wolf has the cunning to employ such a ruse, he definitely lacks the

finesse to succeed therein. This accusation can be seen as the monkey's clever means to deprive the wolf of his rightful claims. So in yet another mental contest, the wolf loses doubly: not only did he fail to reclaim his stolen property, but he was robbed of justice by a corrupt judge. The moral lesson to lupine types is: never put yourself in a position where those with more power than you can manipulate the outcome, when you are in the right.

Building off of the previous fable, La Fontaine provides another, in this case even stronger, example of a wolf's guile backfiring on him in the fable: *Le Loup devenu berger*. During a particularly lean season, a wolf resorts to using his wits instead of his strength to capture his prey. He decides to masquerade as a shepherd, replete with attire, staff, name and voice. Thus disguised, he sneaks up upon a sleeping flock and their accompanying shepherd and sheep dog. But when he pushes his luck too far by attempting to herd the sheep towards the woods with a call, he is the cause of his own undoing. The call awakens the dog and the shepherd who immediately pounce upon the wolf. Encumbered by his disguise, the wolf can neither flee nor fight, and so is defeated and presumably, beaten to death. La Fontaine explicitly offers the following moral: "Quiconque est loup agisse en loup" (52). This fable offers a portrait of a wolf whose attempt at cunning is not only a failure, but worse, directly responsible for his defeat and, presumably, death. Had the wolf remained the hunter he was born to be, he would have lived another day to try to hunt again. The fact that the wolf did not foresee his own potential defeat and even demise speaks to his foolishness and lack of foresight. A cleverer animal would have prepared for that contingency. The wolf lacks the sufficient mental faculties to pull off such a ploy. His prowess is therefore primarily physical, not

mental. Here La Fontaine characterizes the wolf as foolish to try and be something that he is not. For him, it is better to be and seem a monster than to conceal one's monstrosity beneath an innocent and ineffective mask.

Similarly, La Fontaine's following fable, *Les Loups et les Brébis*, reveals a corollary moral: never trust those who pretend to be something they are not. Essentially, the plot entails a truce reached between the ancestral enemies of wolf and sheep, guaranteed, theoretically, by an exchange of hostages: wolf pups for sheepdogs. Both parties profit from the peace by a mutual reduction in casualties. The truce prevails without incident until the wolf pup hostages grow up. Upon achieving adulthood, the wolf hostages immediately assume the predatory behavior of their forebears as if it were an inescapable heritage. La Fontaine characterizes this development thusly: "Au bout de quelque temps que messieurs les louvats se virent Loups parfaits et friands de tuerie" (61). Despite having grown up under the peaceful guidance of the sheep, these young wolves have and, as La Fontaine suggests, *must* retain their essentially lupine nature regardless of their upbringing. At the earliest given opportunity, wolves will show their true colors and do what is in their nature to do. They will be what wolves cannot help but be: ravenous predators and eternal enemies of sheep. La Fontaine concludes with the realistic, if somewhat cynical moral: "La paix est fort bonne de soi, J'en conviens : mais de quoi sert-elle avec des ennemis sans foi?" (61).

Though the context of a truce here is highly anthropomorphized, the moral remains equally applicable to both animal and human realms: one is born a wolf, both literally and metaphorically. Neither wolf nor humans can change their nature, and it is foolish to believe that they ever will or can. Nature triumphs over nurture every time.

Moreover, the nature of the beast is one inherently violent as well as untrustworthy. Additionally, the wolf is perhaps portrayed in this case as a cunning creature. La Fontaine failed to indicate if betrayal was the intention of the wolf peace-makers all along. This raises the question: Did the wolves, knowing that their pups would inevitably act in such a murderous manner, accept the truce in bad faith, thereby showing themselves competent at subtle manipulation, or were they equally surprised by the reaction of their young and simply took advantage of the opportunity to break the truce when it presented itself? Given that the lupine portrait in La Fontaine's fables is consistently brutal, violent and non-cerebral, the latter case seems the more plausible. The motivation of the wolves upon entering the truce is credible enough: the desire for self-preservation from merciless shepherds and dogs. This scenario suggests that wolves are here more opportunistic than Machiavellian. They are able to adapt quickly to the caprices and vicissitudes of fortune, and know best of all how to seize an opportunity for all it is worth. The text supports this theory as well, as La Fontaine offers no hint of conspiracy throughout the fable, and recounts only that the adult wolves react to a situation initiated by their young. La Fontaine's odious characterization as an "ennemi sans foi" is the only hint that there was some conspiracy the entire time. Suffice it to say that the wolf is a creature notorious for his blood-thirst first and foremost, and must always be considered as a creature of instinct rather than of strategy. Secondarily, and more hesitantly, the wolf can be a creature of subterfuge and / or opportunism, though this claim is somewhat more dubious.

Heretofore, one hesitates to associate any surfeit of intelligence or cunning to the wolf despite a paltry few hints to that effect. The following fable furnishes further evidence of the wolf's extant, but rather limited guile. In *Le Loup, la chèvre et le*

chevreau, a mother goat leaves her child at home while she is gone for the day, locking the gate behind her as well as cautioning her child not to allow anyone entry unless they first speak the very telling password: “Foin du Loup et de sa race!” (89). Assured that her home and child are secure, the mother departs. Conveniently enough for him, a wolf happened to be strolling by at that precise moment and overheard the password. Seeing the mother leave and realizing that a potentially easy meal awaits behind a supposedly easily opened door, the wolf saunters up to the gate and supplies the password, taking care to disguise his voice to resemble that of the mother goat’s. However, the kid rightfully suspects the concealed identity of the visitor and demands a second verification: the showing of a white paw over the gate. The wolf, whose fur is not white, cannot comply and instead slinks away, disappointed, frustrated and hungry. The moral of the story is that two preventative checks are better than one.

In this fable’s literal interpretation, the wolf is portrayed as a strategist, perhaps, but a poor one at best. He is capable of forming a rudimentary plan, but is unable to cope with contingencies of said plan. He underestimates his prey and so is easily stymied by even the young goat. The wolf relies more on luck than wits: “Le Loup, par fortune, passe” (89). Perhaps this is because his prey is already aware of his inexorable nature and does not mince words: “Foin de Loup et de sa race” (89). Given a well-prepared enemy, the wolf fails both as a trickster and as a hunter. The wolf will only ever succeed in a hunt when his enemy is caught defenseless and unawares in the forest, like the lamb in *Le Loup et l’agneau*. Indeed, the wolf does not have a very successful hunting record in fables, making only one kill in nine fables, which occurs in the forest. In society, the wolf is powerless.

Another recurring theme is the wolf's attempt to disguise his voice as a ploy to gain entry. Though it worked for the wolf in *Le Petit Chaperon Rouge*, here the wolf is foiled by the request for additional proof. The prevailing attitude towards wolves is one of mistrust and antipathy, established not only by the protagonists but also by La Fontaine himself with such epithets as "glouton" (89). Readers may well cheer when the wolf is turned away and the kid saved, so effectively is reader empathy manipulated.

The recurring question of the wolf's intelligence surfaces again to occupy a place of prominence in the fable: *Le Renard, le loup et le cheval*. Essentially, a fox spies his first glimpse of a strange creature in the woods. In the spirit of curiosity, he asks his neighbor the wolf what it could be. The wolf logically asks the fox for a description which the fox declines to give on the grounds that he lacks the talent to describe such a fanciful animal. Instead the fox suggests that they go observe the creature in person. They catch the animal grazing in a meadow and approach it. When the fox inquires of the mysterious animal its name, the equine retorts cryptically: "Lisez mon nom, vous le pouvez, messieurs: mon cordonnier l'a mis autour de ma semelle" (218). Whereupon the fox excuses himself once again, citing his illiteracy while vaunting the wolf's erudition. Flattered, the wolf leans in for a closer look at the animal's shod hoof and receives a bone-jarring, tooth-shattering kick for his trouble. As he lies on the ground, dazed and bleeding, the sly fox offers the moral of the story: "Cet animal vous a sur la mâchoire écrit Que de tout inconnu le Sage se méfie" (218).

Clearly, the wolf is presented as the naïf, but vain buffoon who can be manipulated into doing anything, however risky or dangerous, with a little flattery. Here, the fox and the wolf are not enemies, as is often the case in literature, but neighbors. The

wolf suspects no chicanery from the fox and innocently performs all that he asks. The fox, though clever and distrustful enough to suspect the horse's treachery, was not honest enough to warn his neighbor of the risk he foresaw. He exploited the wolf's trusting (and simple) nature just as much if not more so than his own wiles. Here it might be argued that the wolf is not unintelligent, but merely overly trusting. It is curious that the wolf's first question is "est-il plus fort que nous?"(218), rather than "à quoi ressemble-t-il?" (ibid.). His interest in strength might be seen as a sign of caution, or, consistent with his vanity, an attempt to identify a threat to his monopoly of strength. Altogether, we have another negative portrayal of the wolf: naïve as well as vain.

In the next fable, *Le Loup et le chasseur*, La Fontaine prefaces the plot with an explicit appeal to his readers to heed his lessons of virtue and avoid the downfall of the greedy as demonstrated by the characters in the following story. Here, the wolf and the hunter are deliberately paired together as similar types. A hunter succeeds in felling a doe and, lo and behold, her fawn approaches in order to remain with her mother. The hunter quickly shoots her as well. To further heighten his luck, a boar stumbles along and is shot as well. When the hunter sets his sights on a fourth target, a partridge, the dying boar finds the strength to gore and kill the hunter while his guard is down. Thereupon comes a fortunate wolf, or so he believes himself to be. Seeing the array of already-slain prey before him, the wolf rejoices and plans on how best to ration the meat for the following month. He begins slowly by eating the bowstring, which smells of meat. Somehow this releases an arrow through the wolf, who thereupon joins the ranks of the dead. La Fontaine closes with the moral: "Témoin ces deux gloutons punis d'un sort commun: La convoitise perdit l'un; l'autre périt par l'avarice" (171). The author exhorts his readers to

make the most of what they have every day, and to take every opportunity to enjoy life without greed and hoarding.

La Fontaine attempts to portray the wolf as well as a human hunter as parallel misers whose greed is ultimately their own undoing. Had they been content with a more meager catch, they might have been spared and able to enjoy their repasts. Thus is moderation rewarded. That said, the wolf, more so than the hunter, appears not so much greedy as simply lucky. They merely take advantage of a situation that presents itself. The hunter, perhaps, took life unnecessarily. But the wolf, scavenging the kills, not only serves his own hunger drive, but also fulfills an ecological function by cleaning up rotting carrion that would otherwise fester and attract disease-spreading flies, poisonous fungi, etc. Though the hunter might be guilty of greed, the wolf is not. Moreover, why La Fontaine chose this twofold illustration of his moral is questionable. The hunter alone might have sufficed as preventative demonstration and the addition of the wolf seems superfluous. Why the author chose to insert a human character into the fable, a genre normally reserved for anthropomorphized animals, is another baffling question. There is no need for metaphor in this fable, as both man and wolf are seen as similar. The moral, however, is altogether weak when it comes to the animal realm. The bottom line is that the wolf suffers unjustly from being compared to a greedy hunter. He simply cannot be given a positive portrait in fables. Perhaps the wolf's most important function is his role as a despicable character whom readers can easily and guiltlessly condemn. In this, he serves as the fall guy, right or wrong.

Finally, La Fontaine's fable *Le Loup et le Renard* contrasts the two similar canine predators in an original way. The fable recalls the wolf's more traditional characterization

while highlighting a new element of his persona. Desperate from hunger, a fox approaches a wolf and implores him to teach him to live by eating sheep. In his exhortation, the fox brings up some recurring lupine characteristics that bear mention. His observation: “J’approche des maisons; tu te tiens à l’écart” (211) recalls that the wolf lives in the woods and therefore far from human society. When he asks the wolf: “Rends-moi le premier de ma race qui fournisse son croc de quelque mouton gras” (211), he recalls that it is the wolf alone among all predators who monopolizes sheep as a source of prey. Furthermore, when the wolf consents to the fox’s request, he confers his well-known hunting prowess through the wearing of a wolf skin. Once the fox dons this skin, he (eventually) becomes a successful hunter of sheep, at least as much as any wolf ever was. This element recalls the transformation powers associated with wolves, either in voice, such as in *Le Petit Chaperon Rouge* and *Le Loup et les Brebis*, or in physical form, as seen in the Witch Trials of the previous century. In fact, the fox becomes so successful at hunting sheep that he is mistaken for no fewer than fifty wolves by the village people.

Yet at the same time, the fox relates to the wolf much like Patroclus relates to the mighty Achilles in *The Iliad*. However successful or fearsome the fox in wolf’s clothing may be, the wolf remains the more powerful animal. In this case, however, there is no Hector to slay the plucky Patroclus in the guise of a mightier foe. In fact, there are no repercussions whatsoever subsequent to this unusual usurpation of roles. Yet just when he is about to seize upon a hapless sheep, however, the fox overhears the crowing of the village cock. The sound triggers a Pavlovian response in him, revealing his vulpine nature conditioned to avian rather than ovine prey. La Fontaine asserts, this time without punishment, that nature wins out over nurture.

In this fable, the wolf plays a relatively small role, acting as teacher to a fox. This is a unique opportunity for the wolf. Normally, he has no skills that the fox regards as worthy of learning. Also, the fox has no subtle plot designed to humiliate the wolf. In this case, the wolf is generous in the extreme. Teaching the fox to hunt his prey voluntarily induces competition and reduces supply relative to his voracious demand. The wolf stands to gain nothing; in fact, he stands to lose precious ovine prey. Yet he willingly imparts not only his time and knowledge, but also the skin of his brother to an adversary. In this fable at least, it could be said that the wolf is finally portrayed in at least a neutral tone, if not a positive one.

In summary, La Fontaine characterizes the wolf as a multi-dimensional figure, even sometimes in a positive way. Besides the above fables, the only other mention of a wolf is in “Les animaux morts de la peste” in which the wolf, as a “clerc” (translated by Bishop as “scholar,” (184) comes up with the idea of sacrificing the poor donkey as penance for their collective sins and in the hopes of appeasing God into abating the plague He sent unto His loyal subjects. According to La Fontaine, the wolf’s most prominent traits are his independence, his brute force, his attempted and failure to outwit his opponents, his opportunism, his naïveté, his (supposed) greed, and finally, his generosity. Altogether, we have quite a complex figure. In terms of allegory, it would be difficult to identify one type of man with him, but rather many sorts of men, each of whom is predominantly characterized by one (or more, but probably not all) of the above traits. The wolf could be seen as a composite figure, a catch-all for many sorts of men. Allegory aside, the wolf retains a function as predator of sheep, enemy of shepherds and dogs, and inhabitant of the forest. In such a role, he stands alone. No other animal, not

bear, not lion, not fox, could be so believable and accepted in these roles. Indeed, the wolf has a permanent position in the human psyche and therefore in its literary reflection as well. This literary predominance is also a reflection of historical involvement of the French with wolves.

The wolf's ambiguity in La Fontaine's tales extends not only to his multiple traits and roles, however. In many, perhaps most cases, the wolf retains the conventional function as a moral counter-example. The fable illustrates his bad behavior in order to encourage readers to avoid imitating him. However, at times, the "moral" message is linked not to the wolf's behavior (behavior that readers are presumably encouraged to avoid) but to the consequences of his behavior. In *Le Loup et l'agneau*, for example, the message communicated is to avoid the predator, not predatory behavior. In *Le Loup plaidant contre le renard*, the moral is to avoid bringing one's cause to corrupted courts. While there are of course a number of fables where it is the wolf's moral behavior that is implicitly condemned, his fate is often not the fault of his own failings, but those of the society in which he operates. As we move from fable to fairy tale, we will note that the wolf's bad behavior threatens not only the moral order on an individual level, but the collective social order as well.

II C 2: Le Petit Chaperon Rouge

The next tale that I will examine is *Le Petit chaperon rouge*. Every reader should already be familiar with the general plot line, but the Perrault version might very well be different from the popular conceptions of our current time and culture. The original version being lost in oral tradition, however, this Perrault telling (1697) will serve as the basis of a literary tradition that may never recover from later, less provocative reinterpretations. It is worth retelling the plot as Perrault wrote it in order to divest it of later non-French influences and most importantly so that Perrault's distinctions pertaining to the Wolf's characterization become apparent.

Perhaps this tale's complexity, despite its brevity, explains why it receives a considerable amount of attention from scholars, even when concerned only with the Wolf's characterization such as I am. For example, in her work *From the Beast to the Blonde*, Marina Warner characterizes the antagonist thusly: "the wolf is kin to the forest-dwelling witch, or crone; he offers us a male counterpart...a werewolf who swallows up grandmother and then granddaughter" (181). Warner underlines a point that will become clear again and again throughout this work: villains, whether wolf, witch or what have you, overlap in function. This wolf is first and foremost a villain. Moreover, he shares with witches a certain humanity.

To better convey this antagonist's character, it is necessary to describe our protagonist: Le Petit Chaperon Rouge (LPCR). She is described as the prettiest girl we have ever seen, dutifully and obediently sent by her mother to bring food to an ailing grandmother. It is impossible for readers not to immediately and constantly sympathize with this sweet little girl. Young and innocent, she is a veritable lamb led to the slaughter.

To hinder her, much less assault her in any way, would be an unthinkable act, save only in the darkest, most twisted of minds. And such is the all-encompassing desire of the antagonist: the Big Bad Wolf. Again there can be seen the conflict between wolf and lamb, linking this tale with La Fontaine's fable.

It should be noted that LPCR does not seem perturbed one iota about conversing with a Wolf. This could be for multiple reasons: perhaps the innocent LPCR does not recognize the danger in speaking to wolves, or perhaps wolves commonly speak in her world, or perhaps 'wolf' is intended purely as metaphor applied to a human antagonist. In the second case, this tale can be interpreted as an example of the *merveil*, on the nature of which Todorov comments in his work, *Introduction à la littérature fantastique*:

Dans le cas du merveilleux, les éléments surnaturels ne provoquent aucune réaction particulière ni chez les personnages, ni chez le lecteur implicite...on lie généralement le genre du merveilleux à celui du conte de fées ; en fait, le conte de fées n'est qu'une des variétés du merveilleux et les événements surnaturels n'y provoquent aucune surprise : ni le sommeil de cent ans, ni le loup qui parle (59).

The moral of the tale makes it clear that this Wolf is a metaphor for certain kinds of rapacious men. Furthermore, the wolf's ability to speak strengthens the metaphor of the 'wolf' as being a metaphor for a human predator. Nonetheless, what is important here is that it is a wolf, rather than say, a lion, a bear, a fox, or any other ferocious, wily predator, that is used as the credible vehicle of conveying this moral. The choice to use the wolf as this vehicle is based off of long-standing and widely-held associations of wolves that do not apply to other predators. It is also significant to note that a fictitious creature, such as an ogre or fairy would not suffice as the vehicle either. It takes a very real, very feared animal to serve as a convincing antagonist in this tale.

That said, however, Jonathan Krell draws a comparison between the ogre and the wolf: “the ogre is represented by his double the wolf-like the one in ‘Little Red Riding Hood’- hungry for young bodies” (20). “Hunger” of course can be interpreted in multiple ways, the main distinction of which is that the literal hunger is represented by the ogre, whereas the sexual hunger is represented by the wolf. Krell pursues this idea of the wolf as a double for the ogre when it comes to sexuality by stating: “The ravenous wolf – metaphorically the brazen seducer in legends like Don Juan and Blue Beard- is a double of the ogre, who can be as hungry for sex as he is for meat” (49). However, I find this assertion to be weak in light of the overwhelming evidence of both the ogre and the wolf, including Blue Beard, as primarily a bouche dévorante rather than any sexual predator. Although associated with sexuality in medieval bestiaries and perhaps in *Bisclavret*, only in this one instance, *Le Petit Chaperon Rouge*, does the wolf serve as a metaphor for a sexual predator. If the wolf and the ogre are doubles, it is for their appetites for (hu)man flesh, not for the flesh of girls.

Perhaps an ogre was not reviled enough in the minds of the tellers of this tale to suffice as the antagonist. The wolf, however, is certainly construed as a contemptible character, worthy of the readers’ immediate and constant antipathy. Yet the similarity between this lupine archetype and a typical ogre is evident from the very beginning of the wolf’s introduction: « elle rencontra compère le Loup qui eut bien envie de la manger ; mais il n’osa à cause de quelques Bûcherons qui étaient dans la forêt. Il lui demanda où elle allait...elle ne savait pas qu’il est dangereux de s’arrêter à écouter un Loup...Demeure-t-elle bien loin ? » (20). As with both villains, one of the most prominent, initial and therefore most defining characteristic is his rapacious, even

hyperbolic hunger. One might argue that Hunger is therefore the true villain, forcing wolves and ogres alike to perform atrocious deeds, but such interpretation is not immediately evident, or supported by the text. Readers are much more likely to immediately condemn the wolf for being the animal that he is, due to a long-held French tradition of antilupinism.

Perhaps where the Wolf most differs from the ogre is the ability to reason. What is additionally apparent is the Wolf's prudence. Though hungry, he possesses enough intelligence to refrain from immediately indulging this drive in obeisance to an even stronger drive: fear of Man, which in turn is a means to the ultimately fundamental instinct of all life; self-preservation. This wolf has apparently learned that Man is an enemy to be feared and that victory through force against him is impossible. In this regard, he is quite unlike the ogre, who is constantly duped but never daunted by his human opponents. The wolf, however, realizes that guile is the only means available to achieve victory over his desired prey. Moreover, he has sufficient wits to succeed in doing so. This wolf is not the mindless impulsive eater that the ogre is. Though they suffer from the same merciless compulsion, to prey upon children rather than other animals, the wolf is perhaps more humanized, in Cartesian terms, for he employs reason to temper his burning instinct.

Perrault narrates explicitly here that it is dangerous to listen to a Wolf, though again, the metaphor of wolf as a sexually rapacious man is clear. It is interesting, though, to counterpoint his argument with the fact that he refers to the Wolf, which he also capitalizes along with all proper names, thus defining the character exclusively in terms of his archetype without consideration for any individual discrepancies or values.

Perrault's use of the term "compère" suggests a shared paternity between the Wolf and the girl, or at the very least, a modicum of respect. The term 'compère' adds to the problematic of villainizing the wolf. According to Lewis (183), the term can be understood either as "comrade" or as "godfather." Either way, his humanity comes across at least as much as his merely nominal lupinity. This character can be viewed as between or both human and animal and therefore resists any definitive classification. There exists a paradoxical analysis of this character: on the one hand, he is a ravenous brute, but on the other hand, he is wily and must be shown respect as well as caution.

Respect for the Wolf is due in part to his proven cunning. While deceiving a naïve young girl may only seem like child's play, the Wolf's talents at manipulation do not end there. When he races ahead to Grandmother's house, he manages to fool her by disguising his voice and thereby gaining ingress to the house: « 'C'est votre fille le petit chaperon rouge' dit le Loup en contrefaisant sa voix (21). Here, the Wolf manages a similar form of 'magic' by transforming his voice to resemble that of Le Petit Chaperon Rouge. This voice transformation is a recurring trait that was also seen in La Fontaine's fable, "Le Loup, le chevre et le chevreau," and will be seen again.

When his ruse gains him entry, he wastes no time in proceeding with his surprisingly complex plot to achieve what could have been the relatively simple goal (for a Wolf) of devouring a young girl. This plot is comprised of no fewer than six steps, each of which requires the utmost delicacy and guile. Step one (interrogation) was to acquire reconnaissance by determining the prey's course of action through dialogue. Step two (manipulation) was to entice LPCR to take her time, so that he might beat her to their mutual destination while simultaneously avoiding human involvement and assuring the

necessary privacy in which to enact the requisite violence of devouring. Step three (infiltration) was to gain access to the place of action by duping the Grandmother. Step four (preparation) was achieved by removal of any human interference in his plan by the most natural of means to a wolf: “Il se jeta sur la bonne femme et la dévora en moins de rien ; car il y avait plus de trois jours qu’il n’avait mangé” (21). Devouring the entire grandmother, perhaps some, 120-140 pounds of flesh, might satisfy any appetite and render his consumption of LPCR moot. However, the Wolf’s huge appetite can be understood as hyperbolic. Equally, if one is to assume sexual metaphors in place of actual devouring, his sexual appetite is equally enormous as well as diverse, involving no prejudice towards age or any other discernible factors.⁸ Step five (transformation) is the luring of the prey into the place of death, a feat he accomplishes again through vocal chicanery. He duplicates Grandmother’s voice as well as he reproduced LPCR’s: « ‘Qui est là ?’ ... le Loup lui cria en adoucissant un peu sa voix : ‘Tire la chevillette le bobinette cherra’ » (21). He also managed to remember the entire complex process for entering the locked door, a remarkable feat for a notoriously simple Wolf. But his transformation does not end with the vocal. He is also able to transform his appearance, at least initially, “en se cachant dans le lit sous la couverture...[il lui dit] ‘viens te coucher avec moi’ » (21). Hidden mostly beneath the covers, he manages to cut a credible figure as an elderly woman despite his distinctive facial features which LPCR eventually points out. Bettelheim phrases the transformation in an unusual albeit significant way: “To the child, Grandma is no longer the same person she was just a moment before; she has become an ogre” (66). His use of ‘ogre’ here is clearly

⁸ In his renowned work, *The Uses of Enchantment*, Bruno Bettelheim points out that the wolf’s devouring of the innocent Grandmother is out of place for fairy tales wherein usually only the guilty or flawed are punished. This is indeed a unique character.

metaphoric, but such metaphorical use only further blurs the line between the two supposedly separate species of antagonists. Suffice it to say, whether wolf or ogre, the character is unquestionably villainous. Step six is the fruition of the wolf's plot: « ce méchant Loup se jeta sur le petit et la mangea » (115). At last, the villain wins, which is an unusual trait for wolf. It is no coincidence that this Wolf, who is a more intelligent hunter, is also more successful than his predecessors in *La Fontaine*, for example.

In summation, Perrault elaborated upon the characterization of the Wolf in the moral of the story where he is cast as a sexual predator rather than a literal predator: “tous les loups ne sont pas de la mesme sorte” (22). This metaphorical depiction only strengthens the link between humanity and lupinity. His lupine, rather than humanoid, behavior is just a detail. Being essentially a human with lupine traits, the Big Bad Wolf is clearly an example of lycomorphism rather than anthropomorphism.

II D: Analysis of Wolf Antagonists

A note on characteristics: some of the listed traits may seem unnecessary due to their absence, but in order to maintain a consistent comparison with the ogres' evaluation to be found later, I maintained all the ogre characteristics here as well, regardless of frequency found among wolves. Further conclusions are drawn and comparisons are made upon analysis of corresponding ogre characteristics at the end of this work.

	& Chien	& Agneau	Plaidant	& Brebis	& Chevre	Renard &
Male	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ugly						
Huge						
Castle						
Riches						
Tricked			x		x	x
Magic						
MagicItem						
Man Eater						
Appetite						
Unnamed	x	x	x	x	x	x
Kidnaps						
Animal			x		x	x
Employs						
Violent		x		x		
Diabolical						
Is killed						
Metaphor						
Tricks				x		
Married						
Integrated						
Woods	x	x		x		x
Sexual						
Totals:	3	4	4	5	4	5

	& Chasseur	& Renard	Petit Chap.	Bisclavret	& Berger	Ysengrin
Male	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ugly						
Huge						
Castle				x		
Riches				x		
Tricked				x		x
Magic			x	x	x	
MagicItem				x		
Man Eater			x			
Appetite			x			
Unnamed	x	x	x		x	
Kidnaps						
Animal						x
Employs						
Violent			x	x		x
Diabolical						
Is killed	x					
Metaphor			x			
Tricks			x		x	
Married				x		x
Integrated				x		x
Woods	x		x			x
Sexual			x			
Totals:	4	2	10	9	4	7

	Hersent	Bestiaries	Totals /15
Male		x	14 93%
Ugly			0 0%
Huge			1 7%
Castle			1 7%
Riches			1 7%
Tricked			6 40%
Magic		x	5 33%
MagicItem			1 7%
Man Eater		x	3 20%
Appetite			1 7%
Unnamed		x	11 73%
Kidnaps			0 0%
Animal	x		5 33%
Employs			0 0%
Violent		x	7 47%
Diabolical		x	2 13%
Is killed			2 13%
Metaphor			1 7%
Tricks	x	x	6 40%
Married	x		4 27%
Integrated	x		3 20%
Woods	x	x	10 67%
Sexual	x		3 20%
Totals:	6	8	

III A 1: Origins and Evolutions of the Ogre

The fact that ogres are represented in a remarkably similar though not quite identical manner throughout the world, even in such vastly different cultures as France, Japan and Iceland, suggests that ogres are a ubiquitous archetype, indigenous to the human psyche much as vampires and werewolves are. Readers of ogre tales encounter similar motifs the world over, from the Far West to the Far East: The ogre is almost always cast, among other things, as a blood-thirsty but stupid, man-eater. He is perpetually at odds with humanity, and so lives far from civilization, usually in a forest or mountains. Though local languages and customs may tweak the ogre archetype to conform to the quotidian realities of a given cultural heritage, the fundamental characteristics remain constant. What are called ogres in southern Europe can be called Trolls in the north, or giants elsewhere in the world. Both fulfill the same role in literature and legend as supernatural man-eating creatures of the wild, the antithesis of humanity and its hallmark: civilization.

In addition to their literal denotation as man-eaters, ogres may serve additionally as symbolic figures, representing the part of man that is violent and barbarous, the part that must be stamped out if civilization is to flourish. This symbolic interpretation lends itself not exclusively to ogres but equally to the entire family of monstrous or Giant-kin, not unlike the schism in R.L. Stevenson's *Jekyll and Hyde* between the character(s) of the same name(s) or in *Beowulf's* depiction of the struggle between the heroic and the bestial. And whatever the ogres' names or guises, they are doomed to obscurity, vanquished by man's supreme effort and indomitable will.

The family of supernatural monsters which includes ogres is one with many members whose relationships to each other are not always entirely clear for many reasons. Though my focus here is on one member in particular, ogres, a word need be said at this point of another closely-related member of the monster family, Giants. The relationship between these two creatures has been obfuscated over centuries of nominal distinction and seemingly unrelated and altogether embellished tales, but multiple sources corroborate the closeness of the relationship between the two. For example, Marina Warner states in her work *No Go the Bogeyman*, that “Giants are not identical with ogres, but they share characteristics, stories and meaning,” (95) and in the same book goes on to elaborate that “In early modern fairy tales, ogres are giants, all brawn and no brain” (312). The link between giants and ogres is worth further investigation. There *is* a definite link between giants and ogres, and their relationship is one of descent, both in terms of chronology as well as status and powers: giants can be seen as the progenitors of ogres. With the aid of several examples from across the globe, including Greece, Iceland, and France, this link between giant and ogre becomes clear.

Giants have been construed as progenitors not only to ogres, but also to gods and men. Even the diverse Greek and Norse mythoi independently attributed great status and vast powers, namely, the formation of the universe, the Gods and mankind, to Giant-kin. In his work, *The Ogre's Progress*, Jonathan Krell recalls that: “In order to understand the place of the ogre in the literary imagination, it is useful to return to the roots of Western literature: early Greek philosophy and tragedy. Long before the gods took their place on Olympus...the Titans and Giants ruled” (18). He uses even stronger language in his article: “L’ogre réécrit, l’ogre réhabilité” when referring to one figure in particular:

“Kronos...symbole du temps destructeur, prototype de tous les ogres du folklore européen” (16). In the Greek tradition, the Titan parents, Uranus (the heavens) and Gaia (the earth), gave birth to Kronos and Rhea, from whom issued Zeus and the other Olympian Gods. And when authority has been established, as it was by Kronos and the Giant-kin, it is soon challenged, in this case, by the ‘gods,’ who themselves are the children of these giants and therefore giants themselves.

It is Kronos who will serve as the first example of ogreishness, the template from which others are formed and the yardstick by which they are measured. Krell seeks to split hairs in associating Kronos exclusively with male ogres but not with female ogresses: “If Kronos is the mythological prototype of the ogre, the ogress has different roots. She descends not from the titanic symbol of time, but rather from his half-sister Aphrodite” (107). Krell goes on to detail the varied aspects of Aphrodite including a side shared by Kali, that of destructive forces, but I am forced to disagree with his gender distinction. Ogresses have little in common with the primary denotation of the Goddess of love and beauty and share more with their ogre husbands’ connotations, and hence, derivation from Kronos. This primordial titan is first introduced in literature in Hesiod’s *Theogony* in the following terms: “crooked-schemer Kronos, most fearsome of children, who loathed his lusty father” (7). To usurp his father, Uranus, he castrated him, but this usurpation did not satisfy Kronos. Threatened by the powers of his godly children, Kronos cannibalized them, as seen in the famous Goya painting *Saturn Devouring His Son*. Hesiod recounts: “The others great Kronos swallowed, as each of them reached their mother’s knees from her holy womb. His purpose was that none but he of the lordly Celestials should have the royal station among the immortals” (16-17). By this single

monstrous act, he established a lamentable legacy that persisted more strongly than perhaps any other attribute of Giant-kin: man (and/or child) eating.

Krell sees this act in a metaphorical sense, interpreting *Kronos* in his etymological denotation: time: “For time...is the greatest ogre, eating up the seconds of our lives as we march toward death” (20). In that sense, no one is safe from time, not man, not even gods. The act of eating is such a potent symbol that it is worthy of incorporation into the *Dictionary of Literary Themes and Motifs* edited by Jean-Charles Seigneuret, who added that “Literature has found that, far from being merely a biological action, eating may offer insights into moral, psychological, sociological, and metaphysical truths” (432). Perhaps ogres eat humans for a less than obvious reason: not out of simple hunger, but rather to satiate a psychological insecurity by eliminating what they perceive to be a threat to their very survival and supremacy in the world, as was the case with Kronos eating his sons/heirs. Eating is a particularly significant means of destroying a threat because it has traditionally symbolized absorbing the powers of the meal/enemy. The eating of a god, theophagia, or their nearest equivalent, man, anthropophagia, can equally be seen as a reach for power.

The gods themselves are descended from the Titans: Zeus, et al from Kronos. By fooling Kronos, Zeus is able to liberate his siblings and wage war against their father. After an epic battle, the vanquished Titans, including the Cyclopes, were imprisoned underground and thus became chthonic deities removed from overt mortal acclimation, though still acknowledged for their formative role in forging the cosmos. Greek Titans, for example, “ruled the planets that governed the days of the week” (Hesiod 9). The Cyclopes, whom Hesiod introduces as “the proud-hearted Cyclopes, Thunderer, Lightner,

and Whitebolt stern of spirit...In other respects they were like the gods” (7) forged the Thunderbolts for Zeus. In her volume of mythology, Edith Hamilton concurs:

The Greeks did not believe that the gods created the universe. It was the other way about: the universe created the gods. Before there were gods, heaven and earth had been formed. They were the first parents. The Titans were their children, and the gods were their grandchildren. The Titans, often called the Elder Gods, were for untold ages supreme in the universe. They were of enormous size and incredible strength” (24).

With their usurpation by the Olympian Gods, the Titans were either murdered or otherwise effectively deposed. The well-known fates of Atlas and Prometheus at the hands of Zeus were particularly harsh. Yet for those who survived, the Titans’ potency remained gargantuan but latent.

It is worth mentioning, as Krell points out, that Kronos can, like other Giantkin will be, viewed in more positive ways. “Kronos ruled the idyllic Golden Age, when the world approached perfection...By contrast, the other ages – all governed by Kronos’ son Zeus- are characterized by war, suffering, crime and other miseries” (125-6). Of course it must be remembered that Zeus himself is the son of a Titan and therefore a Titan himself, and not immune to the failings of his kind. Naturally, there are exceptions to every rule. Prometheus, a Titan, was the savior of mankind by rebelling against Zeus and offering fire to the suffering species. Zeus himself sent Pandora’s Box to someone without the will to resist, knowing what would result. Then again, no character is entirely good or evil, including Giant kin and even ogres. Krell states: “Yet as evil as he is, the ogre, like all great mythological figures, is ambivalent-even duplicitous, as he can represent evil or good, the other of the self. Primarily a personification of evil, the ogre can nonetheless be...a positive force” (125). Ogres are not inherently good or evil; they simply are, much as natural forces and catastrophes

In the Greek mythos, there is a tradition of sons usurping fathers from Uranus to Kronos, and again from Kronos to Zeus. Perhaps some day Zeus too will fall to one of his many sons. Warner claims that lest stagnation set in, a healthy society is one in which the old gives way to the new, often through the actions of a hero who goes so far as to slay a giant, an ogre or a dragon: “The new generation must be allowed to survive: forces which attempt to engulf it, to halt age and time, appear as brutal, stupid, and ultimately powerless. In this sense, fairy tales do offer allegories of time and resignation: the future belongs to the young giant-killer...” (77). In this regard, the ogre plays a necessary part in the transfer of progress from old to new. The deposing of the elder Giant-kin by the younger generation is far from unique to the Greek tradition. This struggle between Giant-kin and up-and-coming rivals, i.e., gods and man, is so common that it has come to be included in the *Dictionary of Literary Themes and Motifs* as well. Seigneuret adds: “A monstrous race of creatures, usually giants, is frequently the chief obstacle to the primary divinity. Zeus battles the Titans before establishing Olympia; Odin, in Norse mythology, contends with the giants of Jotunheim...Often the less anthropomorphic the creature, the greater its animosity toward the ruling deity or the human race” (871).

Similarly, in the Norse tradition, the world itself is formed not by the will of the gods, who are in fact mortal and fated to die in Ragnarok, but rather from the corpse of the frost Giant Ymir: his bones are mountains, his flesh is earth and his blood is the seas. The origin of Ymir is somewhat more nebulous, as Hamilton explains: “Drops of water fell from the mist and out of them there were formed the frost maidens and Ymir, the first Giant. His son was Odin’s father” (312). Even the Gods, the Aesir, are ultimately descended from Giant-kin, and it is the Gods, specifically Odin, who formed man- and

woman-kind from the wood of ash and elm trees. Though Ymir and his ilk are accorded no glory, in fact they are the enemies of the Aesir and man, it is ultimately through them and their contributions that the universe and its inhabitants are given existence. Claude Lecouteux illustrates the prominent aspects of the Scandinavian giants in his work *Les Monstres dans la pensée médiévale européenne*:

Les [géants] se divisent en trois familles: les Trolls, assimilés à des démons...les Jötuns, 'géants primitifs constitutifs du monde physique', qui tirent leur nom du verbe 'manger' (eta), - les Thurses enfin, aussi appelés Géants du Givre (Hrimthursar) 'puissances originelles contre lesquelles les dieux ne cessent de se battre...Les géants se disposent de pouvoirs merveilleux, certains peuvent se métamorphoser. Ils connaissent la magie et ont le don de prophétie (94).

In this one succinct description we find a great many of the traits ascribed to giants in scattered sources: (1) demonic, i.e. underworld connotations, e.g. Orcus, (2) constitution of the world itself, e.g. Ymir, (3) association with eating, e.g. Kronos, (4) opponent of the gods, e.g. Kronos again, or Surtr, et al., (5) magical powers, especially transformation, i.e. Loki. Already the giants are well-defined.

In both Greek and Nordic mythic traditions, the Giants are overthrown and punished. Despite their contributions to the formation of the world, they are cursed and scorned by mankind and the 'gods' who usurped the Giant's as masters of the world. It is perhaps in this spirit of scorn that the descent of the Giants first began.⁹ But even besides these two traditions, the motif of Giants responsible for the World's creation is not singular or uncommon. These world-forgers include Norse Aesir, Greek Titans, Celtic

⁹ These two diverse traditions, Greek and Norse, are not irrelevant to a study of French literature, as the French, at least by the 17th century, are ultimately the children of Roman and Frankish conquerors. The Romans had plundered Greece for all its treasures both literal and literary, and the Franks being a Germanic tribe with a shared heritage among Nordic tribes. In some part, the French collective consciousness is formed, among other sources, by Romano-Hellenic and Germanic parentage.

Giants et al. In all these cases, a similar *Riesedämmerung* (Twilight of the Giants) is in effect.

Not yet bereft of their mental faculties, the Giants themselves acknowledged this twilight at the hands of gods and men, and their recognition was evident to man.

Here the Giants' melancholy reaction is perhaps the most telling aspect of their dire situation. It is typical to see Giants and humans coming into conflict with each other, humans winning this conflict, and the Giants retreating or simply dying in droves at the hands of their conquerors. The decline of Giants and their kin is a twofold development.

The first aspect of the decline of Giant-kin, as might be expected, is simply in the dwindling of their numbers. Here it is implied that Fate is to blame for the decline of Giants and *not* human antagonists. There was simply nothing even the Giants could do to fight fate's decree, which occurred through no fault of their own. Fate is simply an irresistible force. This holds equally true with ancient myths where the Fates, the Norns, controlled all and no one, no matter how mighty, was exempt. In Snorri Sturluson's *Gylfaginning*, a veritable textbook on Norse mythology, he establishes the following relevant parallel between the Norns, the Fates, and the Fée: "There are additional norns, who come to each child, when it is born, to shape the life...Good norns of good family give a good life, but those people whose destiny is not good, bad norns cause that" as reprinted in John Lindow's *Norse Mythology*. Thomas Keightley likewise emphasizes the link between fairies and fates in his work *Faery Mythology*: "These Nornir bear a remarkable resemblance to...the fairies of romance. They are all alike represented as assisting at the birth of eminent personages, as bestowing gifts either good or evil, and as foretelling the future fortune of the being that has just entered on existence" (65).

The second aspect of the Giants' decline is in terms of their individual status and powers. Instead of consistently producing the colossal contributions of creating and shaping entire worlds, the Giants were gradually becoming something entirely, uniformly different and inferior; they were becoming ogres. Here it is suggested that ogres are directly linked to Giant ancestors through generations though irreversibly declining from cosmic titans to colossal giants to monstrous ogres.

The history of the conflict between humanity and Giant-kin is as old as humanity itself, as pious humans allied themselves with the Gods who opposed the Old Order of Giant-kin. Consequently, myths and legends reflect the pious sentiment the world over. Though they remain present in myths and legends, Giants would be an affront to the Gods, and so humans are caught in the middle of a titanic conflict. Time, though, seems to have vindicated the ancient humans' choice.

The decline of Giants into ogres does not, however, leave the descendants entirely bereft of supernatural powers, and ogres will remain something for humans to respect and fear. If any attributes fail to persist over time, it is intelligence and beauty. There will of course be exceptions, and varying degrees of decline present in each ogre: some remain still quite giant-like while others become more brutish and bestial. This is one reason that may account for the diversity of traits we encounter when reading about ogres in the 17th century sources. Other reasons may include: authors' ethnocentrism or individual authorial or narrative necessities contrived simply to forward the plot.

Next, I will examine specific examples of this decline, beginning with the ancient Greek oral tradition. This Greek tradition is particularly worthy of study as it played an inexorable role in shaping all future neo-classical endeavors, including 17th century

“anciens” and “modernes” quarrelers. And within the Greek tradition the best example of Giant-kin falling from proverbial grace is the Cyclops, both as an representative archetypal figure as well as an individual demonstrated by Polyphemus from *The Odyssey*.

Here we have a case study of the general theory of giants’ devolution. Among the mighty works of their former days of exquisite craftsmanship were Zeus’ thunderbolts. No human smith ever forged such impressive works, and no Giant-kin has ever done so again since their decline began. The most puzzling question of all, how and why the decline began, unfortunately, is not explained, though that does not mean that there is no explanation. As we have seen, Fate has been attributed as the cause of this decline.

In *The Odyssey*, Homer’s recounting of the lowly situation of the Cyclopes reinforces the *Riesedämmerung* theory. Far from Olympus, the Cyclopes inhabited an island in the Aegean where they subsisted as hunter-gatherers, forging no weapons, building no ships and dwelling only in caves. They led a primitive existence and lived in relative obscurity compared to their powerful Achaean neighbors. In his translation of *The Odyssey*, Mack recalls: “In the next land we found the Kyklopês, giants, louts, without a law to bless them. In ignorance leaving the fruitage of the earth in mystery to the immortal gods...” (252). Yet this decline does not necessarily mean that the Cyclopes are inferior to humans on all levels. Polyphemus was easily able to catch two of Odysseus’ sailors “like squirming puppies to beat their brains out, spattering the floor. The he dismembered them and made his meal, gaping and crunching like a mountain lion-everything: innards, flesh, and marrow bones” (ibid. 256-7). The animal imagery is

helpful here and will recur throughout literature, comparing the man-eaters to predators, such as wolves.

But although the giant-kin are stronger and tend to be more war-like than man, the latter has the aid of the Gods or similarly divine forces, such as gods-given intellect and wit as well as the more direct protection of Zeus and Athena in Odysseus' case, for only together can they defeat the Giants. Unlike Odysseus, Polyphemus has no regard for the gods, even mighty Zeus, and says as much: "We Kyklopês care not a whistle for your thundering Zeus or all the gods in bliss; we have more force by far" (ibid. 256). Such hubris is often the stuff of divine intervention, and doom often follows. This is no exception.

Indeed, human wit and intelligence will prove mankind's most powerful resource in overcoming dim-witted gigantic adversaries. Seigneuret comments on the literary theme of "stupidity" that "Odysseus' valor is not enough to defeat such enemies as the one-eyed monster Polyphemus, but his cleverness is more than adequate match for Polyphemus' stupidity" (1235). Odysseus could not overpower Polyphemus, but he could outsmart him. Getting him drunk on wine enfeebled the Cyclops' wits and body enough to lull him into a state of vulnerability, whereupon the Achaeans were able to blind him and escape by clinging to the monster's sheep. Odysseus even had the presence of mind to give the name of "Nohbdy" (258) to avoid being pursued by neighboring Cyclopes. Odysseus' exceptional wit is beyond the reach of any giant, Cyclops or ogre.

As an interesting turn of translation, Mack chose the very word 'ogre' to describe Polyphemus: "I tied [the sheep] silently together, twining cords of willow from the ogre's bed" (260). Rightly so; Polyphemus shares the most prevalent characteristics of ogres as

well as giants, and as such he makes an ideal cornerstone in the bridge linking the two antagonists: he is large, violent, dwells far from civilization, a man eater, compared to a predator and easily fooled by man.

Had it not been for the humans of the time, perhaps the giants would never have begun their decline. In addition to the decree of Fate, the giants' decline can also be seen as a function of human domination, thus suggesting a teeter-totter of power between the two warring camps. When one prospers or evolves, the other must decline or degenerate. Neither it seems, is content with equality in the middle.

Humans, as it might be expected, reveled in their burgeoning Golden Age and delighted in the demise of their foes. Such is the case often in the British Isles, where Celtic tales of Giants abound. The following passage helps to date the Golden Age of Giants and the beginning of their downfall by human hands in this region. Many were the Giants mentioned and then slain in such Celtic-originated French tales such as Tristan and many of the Arthurian cycle's tales.

Many of the same tropes that characterize Giants in other traditions reappear here in the Frankish, merely adapted to their particular literary style: to slander Giants. Giants are relegated to the domain of the *antagonist du jour*, with many if not all of the accompanying negative traits: terrifying notoriety, possession of a castle and wealth, and access to magic. A study of the *Song of Roland* reveals similar descriptions of the human Saracens. Villainization is villainization; and Giants remain constant in their function as villains. The most significant changes they incur are what individual cultures do to tweak them to make them conform to their propagandist's needs at the time. One might see them in the "Huns" depicted in World War I propaganda portraying savage, blood-thirsty

Germans. As Rudwin does very well to point out in his book: *The Devil in Legend and Literature*, “Each nation has a special and distinct devil related to its own temperament” (274). The ogre can and has served as this “Devil” on many occasions. “Satan,” of course, means only ‘adversary,’ a synonym of antagonist, and so ogres can be seen as satanic, which serves as yet another link to the underworld.

In the end, like all great myths of antiquity, the characters involved left their indelible mark upon the world. Just as Zeus’ thunderbolts served to explain the phenomenon of atmospheric electrical accumulation, so too do the graves and rotting corpses of giants and ogres serve to explain the formation of terrestrial geography. Despite this, giants and ogres then, have a reputation as antagonists since their inception in mythology. Originally, they were fundamental in the formation of the earth that humans came to usurp. Then they underwent a decline into disability and extinction. In any event, giants and ogres have had a hard lot and Fate has not been kind to them.

To summarize all the evolutions and permutations of the giant-kin throughout the ages and throughout the world, one thing has remained relatively constant: mankind finds himself almost always in opposition to giantkind. Often this conflict is overtly physical and deadly, with man slowly gaining the upper hand. As we shall see, cooperation between the two species is a rare trait indeed for giants and ogres. As Walter Stephens observed in his work *Giants in Those Days*, “Since the human scale defines itself as miniature in relation to the gigantic, the prevalent relation between Giants and humans is one of antagonism, expressed as the opposition between culture and Nature, mentality and physicality” (35). Far more common traits include a litany of paradoxes, including a giant’s or an ogre’s propensity for violence but lack of victory, his superior size but

inferior intellect, his similarity with predators, particularly the wolf, yet animosity and vulnerability to man, his access to supernatural magic and magical items, yet rejection from the other supernatural or divine entities of his cosmology, and excessive riches yet separation from all human societies who value it. The giant and ogre figure is indeed one of contrasts and paradoxes. Perhaps that is why he has remained such an intriguing character archetype for so many peoples for so many centuries.

III A 3: Basile's Ogres

To understand French ogre tales, one must understand Perrault. To understand Perrault, one must understand his Neapolitan predecessor, Giambattista Basile, whom Perrault credited as a source of some of his tales. This next section studies Basile's conceptions of the ogre as represented in his principal work, *Il Pentamerone*. This chapter is dedicated to examining the Basile tales in particular because his oeuvre represents the ogre tales in the Italian tradition that immediately predates the French tradition. Most importantly, he is responsible for influencing Perrault and other French writers, including L'Héritier and d'Aulnoy, et al. Indeed, as Marina Warner states, "The word 'ogre' was imported into French from Italian, from *Il Pentameonre* or *Lo Cunto de li Cunti* by the Neapolitan courtier, historian and bellelettrist Giambattista Basile, whose cycle of fifty stories can lay claim to being the foundation stone of the modern literary fairy tale" (304). Regarding Basile citations in this dissertation: unless otherwise specified, all quotations come from the tales represented on the following online fairy tale index: <http://www.surlalunefairytales.com/pentamerone/index.html>.

Concerning the origin of the ogre in Italian literature, Suzanne Magnanini recounts in her work, *Fairy Tale Science*, that "Criticisms of *favole* telling of ogres, fairies and witches ... appeared in Italy as early as the fourteenth century in Giovanni Boccaccio's *Genealogica deorum gentilium*, a handbook of mythology" (38). Magnini does well to point out that ogres do not come into Boccaccio's more renowned works such as *The Decameron*, or for that matter, most other forms of Italian literature. The ogre remains a relatively obscure figure until Basile chose to portray them in his tales in the 17th century. Magnini continues: "While occasionally Boccaccio's characters

encounter the marvelous in the form of ghosts or necromancers, they move through landscapes bereft of the sorts of monsters and marvels found in fairy tales. Dragons do not cross their paths; ogres do not threaten their lives” (29). One notable exception to this ogressless Italian canon is Basile’s *Pentamerone*, wherein ogres are commonly occurring characters.

One of the most focused studies of Basile’s ogres comes from Nancy L. Canepa: “Ogres and Fools: On the Cultural Margins of the Seicento.” In this work, Canepa succinctly yet thoroughly summarizes the representation of Basile’s ogres by placing them within the historical context of the 17th century and characterizing them relative to other characters of the period. She attributes the origin of ogres to the same root as stated above: “Ogres have their most distant origins in the classical underworld deity Orcus...as savage monsters that devour humans-in particular, children” (223). This definition and its connotations will survive to be adopted by both Basile and Perrault.

Concerning the function of the ogre per se in Basile’s tales, Canepa reaffirms a widely-held observation that the ogre acts as a foil to the hero, or in her words: “These epic ogres seem to embody everything that civilization is not, or does not wish to be, or fears that it could become, and as such are typical ‘oppositional’ figures” (223). She points out some specific examples of how these ogres’ nonconformity indirectly illustrates the norms of 17th century Italy (or France for that matter) in that ogres live in geographically isolated areas, such as forests or mountains. They often devour human flesh, they are physically repulsive, they often wield magical powers or items, and they disrupt the neo-feudalistic societies ubiquitously established in the fairy tale genre (223-4). One could add to that list the commonly found trope that ogres are averse to sunlight.

Since most heroes of these tales are humans, it follows that their foils would be inhuman: hence, ogres. By labeling non-conforming characters ogres, such tales inculcate behavioral conformity in their respective societies.

Concerning the origin of Basile's influences, we must remember that many of these ogre tales, like most other forms of literature, were established in oral tradition long before they were first written. It would be impossible to precisely attribute their origin to any specific date or source. All that we can and do specify in terms of originality is their documentation. In this domain, the Italians, or more specifically, the Neapolitans, are credited with the original written sources of many ogre tales. In his introduction to the fundamental collection of Neapolitan ogre tales, Sir Richard Burton reaffirms this conjecture: "Very few of the fifty tales of this book derive from literary sources, the great mass of them came straight from the still vigorous oral tradition" (6). Unfortunately, it is no longer possible to engage these traditional oral stories today, and so what might have been true originals are forever lost. We must instead rely on documents in literature as we must with history.

And among the Neapolitans, it was Giambattista Basile who deserves the credit for transplanting ogres from oral tradition to the national literary canon. Though the moralizing tale format is predated in Italy by Straparola and the *Facetious Nights*, Basile can be said to be the father of the ogre tale in the Neapolitan, Italian and even European tradition. In all of Straparola's tales of intrigue, mystery and innuendo, he relied exclusively on a *human* medium to convey his morals: typically clichés involving romantic misunderstandings that seemed to plague rich and/or noble couples of his time. Basile, on the other hand, made sufficiently frequent use of ogres and ogresses in his

stories to merit an entire study in its own right. Numerically speaking, ogre characters appear *per se* in no fewer than fourteen of his tales. To give a sense of scale, there were only eight ogre tales in the entirety of the French canon, including the works of Perrault, d'Aulnoy, de Mailly, de la Force et al. Basile's use of ogres is comparatively quite extensive and surprisingly well-developed.

Due to the numerical frequency as well as the chronological originality, it should be safe to say that Basile played a significant, even predominant role in shaping the original conception of the ogre in the minds of European readers. Sir Richard Burton states: "The miracle is that this whimsical author respected his material so much and distorted it so little that, two hundred years later, the brothers Grimm could recognise [sic] the same details in tales current among German peasants" (6). Basile's characterization of ogres in his *Pentamerone* is fundamental, formative and inescapable.

As specifically concerns Basile's ogres' characteristics, Sir Richard points out a certain ambivalence, that is, a human side juxtaposed with an inhuman side, that reveal a fundamental ambiguity in Basile's ogres:

This horror-world is personified by ogres and ogresses more dreadful than ever under their name of Ghuls and Ghulas. Although so frightful, they have their domestic side, keep house, cook dinners and follow the usual activities of Neapolitan humanity. They can be mollified by willing service and sometimes controlled by quickly giving the right answer to a riddle. Their occasional amiability towards their protégés is very considerably outbalanced, however, by their unrestrainable fondness for human flesh (8).

While Basile's ogres sometimes possess some relatively humane traits, these are often overshadowed by characteristics that mark them as inhuman. The most frequently occurring characteristics of Basile's ogres are exactly the ones that designate them as more inhuman than human. They are also the traits that separate Basile's ogres from the

ogres of the French tradition, which will be studied below. Principally, the Italian ogres are physically hideous; they dwell far from mankind in isolated woods or caves; they employ magic and or magical items; and they have an aversion for sunlight. Here are listed but a few examples of these predominant characteristics in Basile's ogre tales. For a more complete accounting, consult the Basile Ogre Characteristic Frequency Tables below.

Six out of Basile's fourteen ogres share the first characteristic: ugliness. *The Story of the Ghul* offers perhaps the most detailed example of the extent to which Basile's ogres are physically repulsive:

O mother mine how hideous was he! His head was larger than an Indian vegetable-marrow, his forehead full of bumps, his eyebrows united, his eyes crooked, his nose flat, with nostrils like a forge, his mouth like an oven, from which protruded two tusks like unto a boar's; a hairy breast had he, and arms like eels; and bandy-legged was he, and flat-footed like a goose; briefly he was an hideous monster, frightful to behold, who would have made Roland smile, and would have frightened a Scannarebecco" (24).

Similarly, an ogre is described in *The Golden Root* as "a hideous pest, a compound of ugliness, a harpy, an evil shade, a horror, a monster, a large tub, who with a hundred flowers and boughs about her looked like a newly opened inn." The character of *Peruonto*, albeit a human metaphorically labeled an ogre, is described in the equally inhuman terms: "an ugly lout, the very sight of whom he could not endure, with a shaggy head, owl's eyes, a parrot's nose, a deer's mouth, and legs bare and bandy." In *The Flea*, another ogre is described as "the most ugly being in the world, the very sight of whom would make the boldest man tremble and quake with fear." In most of these cases, the exact ugliness of the ogre is couched in bestial or inhuman terms. Two of them, for example, are described as having tusks (*The Three Sisters*; *The Seven Doves*).

Fully fifty percent of Basile's ogres inhabit the woods rather than any human settlement, and five out of fourteen inhabit sunless, lightless woodland lairs. For example, the story of *The Flea* contains a description of the following rustic lair:

The ogre, who dragged her off without any attendants to the wood where the trees made a palace for the meadow to prevent its being discovered by the sun...and went safely through the thicket whither no man ever came unless he had lost his way. Upon this spot, which was as black as an unswept chimney, stood the ogre's house ornamented all around with the bones of the men whom he had devoured.

This particular abode is also proof against the sun, the third characteristic that suggests a link between the ogre and the denizens of the underworld's lightless gloom as well as vampires. The sun and its accompanying light, furthermore, have long been metaphors for knowledge, goodness, and life, and so the fact that these metaphoric associations are not welcome in the ogre's home is very telling. In the story of *Corvetto*, we read about an ogre who lived:

Ten miles distant from Scotland, where the seat of this King was, there dwelt an ogre, the most inhuman and savage that had ever been in ogreland, who, being persecuted by the King, had fortified himself in a lonesome wood on the top of a mountain, where no bird ever flew, and was so thick and tangled that one could never see the sun there.

Here we read of the first and only specific allusion to "ogreland" which seems to be a geographical neighbor of Scotland, though it is removed from any human cartography. When in human lands, however, the ogre is sure to dwell in the sunless wilderness far from human habitations. Another example of ogres' predilection for inhuman habitation comes from *The Story of the Ghul*: "[At] the foot of a mountain so high that its head touched the clouds, where, in an avenue of poplar-trees, at the entrance of a grotto built of pumice-stone, was sitting a Ghul" (24). By choosing to dwell in such rustic places, the ogres physically distance themselves from their human counterparts, who tend to prefer

communities of their own kind. Similarly, the ogres in *The Enchanted Doe* and in *The Seven Doves* live in the woods. In *The Three Citrons*, the ogresses are confined to an island.

Fourth and finally, Basile's ogres are also gifted with magic powers. Perhaps in no other tale does the magical aspect of Basile's ogres come across so well as in *The Story of the Ghul*. This particular ogre, "who could see into his innermost thoughts by a look at his nose and a move of his back parts," was also explicitly labeled a sorcerer. Through his own sorcery, perhaps, the Ghul comes into possession of three magical items, which he proffers to his human charge Antony: a magical donkey, a magical napkin and a magical mace. The nature of these magical items is not based in transformation, as are many French ogre spells, but rather in the creation of wealth. Concerning the donkey for example, "when the beast began to ease itself...pearls came out of it, and rubies, and emeralds, and sapphires, and diamonds, each of the size of a walnut" (25). When the Ghul presented Antony with a fine napkin, Antony has but to command: "'Open and shut thou napkin,' whereupon in opening the napkin displayed many precious things which were marvelous to behold" (27). Finally, "[The Ghul] presented him with a finely chiseled mace, and said to him, 'take this mace and keep it in remembrance of me, but be careful not to say, 'Lift thyself mace,' or 'Lie down, mace'" (28). By reciting these words, a thieving innkeeper incurred a merciless beating from the magical weapon and then immediately returned Antony's wealth to him. These examples of magic occur in nine of Basile's fourteen tales and serve to distinguish the ogre sorcerers from more mundane human characters.

The end result from these four trademark characteristics is a de-humanization of the ogre characters. By being essentially inhuman, these ogres cannot be lycomorphized, by definition that lycomorphization is the application of animal traits onto human beings. This phenomenon will be reserved for the French ogres, which I will examine next.

III B 1: Perrault's Ogres

The main objective of this portion of the dissertation is to establish a thorough and comprehensive description of ogres as depicted by various French fairy tale authors of the late 17th century. First I will examine the stories of Charles Perrault, as he was very easily the most reproduced and most easily recognizable fairy tale writer of the century. Although Vicki Mistacco sees the fairy tale as the domain of women writers and discounts Perrault's eminence, I posit that his works represent the mainstream of the genre, and have even come to serve as the yardstick by which other tales were measured and judged by posterity. Of his most commonly reprinted eight fairy tales, only three offer ogres per se: *La Belle au bois dormant*, *Le Chat botté* and *Le Petit Poucet*. Despite their relative rarity, these ogre tales were fundamental in establishing the character of the French ogre, as they made use of some existing (Italian) ogre traits while establishing additional ones of their own.

According to the *Petit Robert*, the word 'ogre' first appears in 1697, the very same year that Perrault's *Contes de la mere Oie* was published:

OGRE, OGRESSE n. (v. 1300; fem., 1697; altér. prob. de *orc, lat. *Orcus*, nom d'une divinité infernale. Géant des contes de fées, à l'aspect effrayant, se nourrissant de chair humaine. *L'ogre et le Petit Poucet*. – Par métaph. *Manger comme un ogre*. « *Elle se jeta dessus avec un appétit d'ogresse* » (Flaub.) – *L'ogre de Corse*, surnom donné par les royalistes à Napoléon (dont les guerres « dévoraient » la jeunesse française).

Doubtless, the date of 1697 mentioned in *Le Petit Robert* is a reference to Perrault's work, which introduces the ogre to French written literature, if not oral tradition. The *Petit Robert* offers the Latin origin of "Orcus," god of the underworld. Its etymological evolution may well have occurred along these lines: Orcus > Orgus > Orge > ogre. This Latin etymological origin makes sense because in Italian, there are a number of tales

featuring ogres as well. Italian works, especially those of Basile, could very well serve as the intermediary vehicle by which the Latin Orcus may have become the French ogre.

Upon further study below, it will become clearer how this god of the underworld set the standard for an ogre's appearance, powers and behavior.

In both Italian and French traditions, the ogre is essentially the same stereotype, that is, a man-eater, though with some significant differences. While the Italian ogre did sometimes maintain some human characteristics, their four predominant traits: hideousness, isolation from humans, magic use and aversion to sunlight, separate them from the French ogres, whose predominant characteristics are gullibility, marriage (often with humans), possession of castles and riches, kidnapping of human women and a large, even hyperbolic appetite. The end result of these characteristics is that the Italian ogre effectively lacks sufficient humanization to undergo lycomorphism whereas the French ogre undergoes sufficient human characterization to be lycomorphized.

Before discussing these tales individually, it is imperative to examine Perrault's own conception of ogres, as revealed in the appendix of his *Peau d'Ane* and reprinted in Gilbert Rouger's compilation of Perrault's *Contes*:

« ogre : **homme** sauvage qui **mangeait** les petits **enfants** » (note de Perrault)
Le mot ogre ne figure dans aucun dictionnaire du XVIIe siècle et n'a été admis par l'Académie qu'en 1740. cf. *Parallèle des anciens et des modernes en ce qui regarde la poésie*, p. 120 : « Ceux qui ont fait des contes de *Peau d'Ane* » y « introduisent de certains hommes cruels qu'on appelle des ogres, qui sentent la **chair fraîche** et qui mangent les petits enfants ; ils leur donnent ordinairement des **bottes de sept lieues** pour courir après ceux qui s'enfuient... Les enfants conçoivent ces bottes de sept lieues comme de grandes échasses avec lesquelles ces ogres sont en moins de rien partout où ils veulent » (293). (emphasis added by myself)

It is of prime importance that Perrault defined his ogres as essentially “men.” Though monstrous, their fundamental human nature is what separates them from Italian predecessors and simultaneously facilitates the application of lycomorphy.

In his own work, Barchilon contends that Perrault’s conception of ogres was inspired by a wide variety of commonly held perceptions in the public domain of anonymous oral sources: « It is assumed that all of Perrault’s tales came from folklore or popular tradition, and that all he had to do was to transcribe them from some peasant woman...and publish them » (91). We note, however that Barchilon has linked elements from *Peau d’Ane* through Basile’s *L’orza* in the *Pentamerone*: namely, the flight of the princess and taking shelter under an animal skin (92). A similar link can be found between Perrault’s *La Belle au bois dormant* and Basile’s *Sun Moon and Talia*: the sleep of the princess is caused by an evil ogress in both tales. Barchilon concludes by saying “the last five stories of the collection all seem to owe something to earlier literary models” (94), most often an Italian source, namely, Basile. And though this influence remains evident, equally evident are the innovations Perrault added to his particular brand of ogre.

Michèle Simonsen concurs when she recalls that “L’influence de Basile est considérée souvent comme probable, bien que certains commentateurs la récusent” (16). Even if Perrault could not read the Neapolitan versions in the original, it does not prove that the stories did not get transmitted to him in other ways. If he heard them in French directly, or if they were indirectly passed on across the border from neighbor to neighbor until they reached Perrault’s ear, he was nevertheless quite familiar with Basile’s work. After all, to cite a precedent, his *Griseldis* reproduces elements of Boccaccio’s

Decameron. It would be difficult, therefore, to imagine that Perrault would be completely ignorant of ogre associations in both oral and written traditions from neighboring Italian authors.

In his edition of Perrault's Popular Tales, Andrew Lang introduces ogres in Perrault's works with a curt dismissal:

As to the ogres in Perrault, a very few words may suffice. They are simply the survival, in civilised Folklore, of the cannibals, *Rakshasas*, *Weendigoes*, and man-eating monsters who are the dread of savage life in Africa, India and America. Concerning them, their ferocity and their stupidity, enough will be said in the study of Le Petit Poucet. As to the name of ogre, Walkenaer derives it from Oigour, a term for the Hungarian invaders of the ninth century, a Tartar tribe. Hence he concludes that the ogre-stories are later than the others, though, even if 'ogre' meant 'Tartar' only the name is recent, and the Cannibal tales are of extreme antiquity. Littré, on the other hand, derives ogre, from Orcus, *cum Orco rationem habere* meaning to risk one's life. Hop o' my Thumb certainly risked his, when he had to do 'cum Orco' if Orcus be ogre (xli).

Naturally, I disagree with the diminished importance Lang assigns to the role of the ogre, and I am not alone in this disagreement. For example, Philip Lewis, in his discussion of "The ogre's Genesis" in his work, *Seeing Through the Mother Goose Tales*, considers the ogre as "a cruel, abnormal but still human being" (177). Lewis also takes the view that Perrault's ogre has a deeper relationship with antagonists of the 17th century. He states: "The tradition that seems to originate largely with Perrault takes wolves and monsters to be surrogates of the ogre. The wolfishness of ogres is made explicit in *La Belle au bois dormant*" (173), a tale I shall examine in order to determine precisely how the villain embodies ogreishness and wolfishness. This will simultaneously demonstrate the extent to which the ogre plays a significant role in the oeuvre of Perrault and how these ogres differ from their predecessors of the Italian tradition.

In the complex tale that is *La Belle au bois dormant*, the reader is first introduced to the idea of an ogre as the Prince's own mother and the Princess's stepmother: « car elle estoit de race ogresse & le Roi ne l'avoit épousée qu'à cause de ses grands biens ; on disoit même tout bas à la Cour qu'elle avoit les inclinations des ogres, et qu'en voyant passer de petits enfants elle avoit toutes les peines du monde à se retirer de se jeter sur eux » (Rouger 15). This ogress is quite a different creature than the typical Italian ogre. In possession of wealth enough to tempt a king into marriage, she is a full member of human society, going so far as to breed with them. Also, this ogress lacks any associations with magic. Like most other ogres, naturally, she devours human flesh with great alacrity. However, it is worthwhile to note the mien in which the ogresse Queen speaks: « elle le dit d'un ton d'ogresse qui a envie de manger de la chair fraîche & je la veux manger la Sausse-robot » (16). Furthermore, this particular phrase "chair fraîche" will be repeated in other ogre tales and so bears mention. Her demand to devour her own grandchild à la Sausse-robot is particularly interesting because it juxtaposes her ogreish tendencies with the refined culinary sophistication of a more human and civilized Queen. It is clear that she is a human being first, but with monstrous qualities that earn her the sobriquet of ogress. In such, we have a prime example of lycomorphism: a human being depicted in terms so bestial, so lupine, that conventional language becomes problematic and the sobriquet of ogress becomes necessary.

Upon reception of this inhuman order, the ogress Queen's steward hesitates to comply but realizes that disobeying such a draconian mistress could be dangerous to his own hide: "Ce pauvre homme voyant bien qu'il ne fallait pas se jouer à une ogresse" (16). Fortunately, however, he has the human decency to not butcher a child, and dares to

trick the tyrant by serving a lamb in her place. This introduces another predominant French ogre characteristic: gullibility, which alludes to the French literary tradition of Ysengrin and the fables of La Fontaine.

Without any moral qualms concerning this monstrous act of cannibalism, the ogress Queen merely prepares an excuse as to why her human victims were missing. But not just any excuse would be credible under these extraordinary circumstances. It would take an outrageous claim that must seem realistic in its savagery and cruelty. Perrault states: « Elle estoit bien contente de sa cruauté et elle se préparoit à dire au Roi, à son retour que les loups enragés avoient mangé la Reine sa femme et ses deux enfants » (106). The fact that she is content with her cruelty implies at the very least that her monstrous wishes are the norm for ogres, or that she is particularly cruel. The specific comparison of her behavior with that of rabid wolves does much to detail the extent of her lycomorphism. Not only wolves, but *rabid* wolves are the only creatures ferocious enough to which this ogress-Queen can be compared.

When, in the end, the ogress discovers that she was tricked, she prepares a suitably horrible fate for her tricksters as well as the victims who escaped. She has a pit filled with vipers and adders and commands that her prisoners be hurled into its depths. In a suitable twist, upon the arrival of the King, it is the ogress who succumbs to this fate: « L'ogresse, enragée de voir ce qu'elle voyait, se jeta même la tête en première dans la cave et fut dévorée en un instant par les vilaines bêtes qu'elle y avait fait mettre. Le Roi ne se laissa pas d'en être fâché » (18). Here it is important to note that the ogress is thwarted by the arrival of the King and her own rage, throwing herself into the pit, where

she is devoured by animals. This last detail will become another common characteristic among French ogres.

The nature of this ogress as human with non-human tendencies is perhaps difficult to reconcile, and though it may be impossible to ascertain her binomial nomenclature, it is safe to say that her actions designate her as somewhere in between man and beast. This ambiguity is addressed explicitly by Michèle Simonsen in her study of *Perrault: Contes*: “Enfin, jouant sur les deux aspects, humain et monstrueux, de la belle-mère ogresse, il juxtapose deux modalités apparemment inconciliables de la prise de nourriture: le goût animal pour la chair humaine fraîche (crue?) et la délectation devant les apprêts culinaires » (56). An animal, such as a wolf, would simply devour its prey without the sauce Robert. A human, on the other hand, would never consent so readily to cannibalism. It takes an ogre, and only an ogre, to combine the two desires.

To more succinctly summarize the relationship between man, wolf and ogre in this tale, it could be said that the ogress’ intent to infiltrate human society and exploit it to the satisfaction of her own lupine appetite is just cause for the humans to deceive and overthrow her. Perrault establishes in this tale several ogre traits that will become staples of other ogre tales: ogres’ desire to eat human flesh, their ability to interbreed with humans even though they are referred to distinctly as a “race ogresse,” their gullibility, their defeat via animals, their castle and riches, and their comparison to wolves. The essence of the French ogre(ss) remains that of humanity but with a lupine twist, hence, lycomorphism.

The next of Perrault’s tales to specifically address an ogre character is *Le Chat Botté*. In this tale, the ogre plays a relatively minor role. His purpose seems frivolous and

altogether unnecessary except as a token obstacle for the hero to easily overcome. Why Perrault opted for an ogre as an antagonist, however, will become clear upon examination. Initially, the ogre is introduced via a somewhat random encounter: « Le Maître Chat arriva enfin dans un beau château dont le maître estoit un ogre le plus riche qu'on ait jamais veu car toutes les terres par où le Roy avoit passé estoient de la dépendance de ce château » (33). The fabulous wealth of the ogre is even more extreme in this case. This ogre possesses lands enough to make catch the jealous eye of a King. Furthermore, this same ogre is explicitly referred to in the superlative as the richest ever seen, and who therefore naturally is in possession of a beautiful castle. These possessions serve to render the ogre an essentially human figure and a full member of human society.

The cat, “qui eut soin de s’informer qui estoit cet ogre” (34) learned that this ogre was also a master of magic, and so used this to his advantage, manipulating the ogre: « On m’a assuré, dit le Chat, que vous aviez le don de vous changer en toute sorte d’animaux ...je vous avoue que je tiens cela tout a fait impossible... Impossible reprit l’ogre, vous allez voir et en même temps ils se changea en une souris...Le Chat ne l’eut pas plus tôt aperçue qu’il se jeta dessus et la mangea » (34). The ogre was only too happy to show off his powers and first transforms himself into a lion, and then, upon the insistence of the clever cat, into a mouse. Upon this second transmogrification, the cat reverts back to his feline roots and pounces upon the tiny rodent, devouring it whole. In this brief exchange, other traits of the ogre are exposed: the affinity for shape shifting magic, as opposed to divination or enchantment magic more often associated with fairies or witches. Two of this ogre’s traits link him with lupine antagonists of the French tradition. His transformation magic recalls the lupine Bisclavret of Marie de France,

linking the wolf with the ogre. The ogre is also pitifully easy to manipulate, as was Ysengrin at the mercy of Renard. Blinded by pride in his magical ability, the ogre ignores the natural order of the food chain and assumes the form of the favorite prey of his guest. Finally, the ogre is defeated by an animal, as was the ogress Queen in *La Belle au bois dormant*. And like in the previous tale, the ogre's predominant characteristics serve to make him basically human but with some lupine associations.

One additional item of note concerning this ogre is his relationship to the King of the land. Upon assuming control of the ogre's castle and lands, the cat and his master make a significant discovery: « ils trouvèrent une magnifique collation que l'ogre avait fait préparé pour ses amis...mais qui n'avaient pas osé entrer, sachant que le Roi y était » (35). This passage suggests that the ogre feared the King, though for undisclosed reasons. The exact nature of this ogre's role in society is nebulous, but he functions like a typical seigneur. He does also at least provide a foil to the cat, and a means to enable his master to acquire wealth without strings attached. Ogres will often be seen as socially acceptable targets for robbery and murder, a convenient means of obtaining quick cash, which in turn facilitates the traditional happy ending in human society. In this case, the cat's master assumes the ogre's riches and thus becomes eligible as a suitor to the princess.

The ogre's reception of the cat in his castle is also a curious detail: "L'ogre le recut aussi civilement que le peut un ogre" (34). Typically, man and beast alike would be devoured or abused in some way on sight, were they to trespass in an ogre's domain. The fact that this ogre exercises not only restraint but good manners towards his guest singularizes this character as noble. Despite his accommodating manner, the fact remains, however, that little to no sympathy is aroused for this antagonist. His imminent death is

little mourned. His particular mode of death, being devoured by his adversary, is ironic indeed for an ogre and poses the question of what manner of monster could devour an ogre, and isn't the world better off with the ogre instead of such a deceitful monster? In fact, this so-called villain never harmed any one in the story. He did not devour any "char fraiche." He is only scorned because he is nothing more than an ogre, a member of that terrible tribe, for whom death and robbery are seemingly appropriate. Otherwise, we would feel remorse at wrongful assassination. It is always assumed that ogres are inherently evil creatures who must be eliminated. Had he been introduced as a human, his murder would have been considered ruthless and unwarranted. Merely mention the word "ogre," and any manner of atrocity now becomes not only acceptable, but justly rendered. That said, the ogre's characterization remains consistent with that of other French ogres. He maintains a castle and riches, he employs transformation magic; he is tricked and defeated by an animal. Perrault also introduces an element of civility in this ogre and some sort of relationship (perhaps adversarial) between the ogre and the king. Altogether, we have the portrait of an essentially human figure, whose hubris (a typically human failing) caused his downfall.

The antagonist of Perrault's final ogre tale, *Le Petit Poucet* is introduced simultaneously and perhaps superfluously as an ogre who eats little children: "c'est ici la maison d'un ogre qui mange les petits enfants" (65). This predilection for the flesh of children also links the ogre to the wolf in that wolves are often represented as preying on lambs, similarly young and defenseless prey. It is also relevant to note that this particular ogre maintains no castle per se as many other ogres do, but rather lives in a house with his wife and children, thereby appearing even more humanized. When lost, le Petit

Poucet and his brothers seek shelter in this house to evade “les hurlements de Loups qui venoient à eux pour les manger” (64). To avoid such a grisly fate from such terrifying animals, Tom pleads to the ogre’s wife: « Il est bien sur que les Loups de la forêt ne manqueront pas de nous manger cette nuit » (65). Perhaps the boys do not realize that this is the house of an ogre, or, when faced with the choice of who will devour them, it seems that the boys prefer to be an ogre’s victims rather than the wolves’. Perhaps they hope that the ogre will be less brutal in his method of dispatching them. Either way, this suggests two important points: that the ogre is relatively human in nature, but aligned with the wolf in their mutual propensity of bloodshed.

At this point it is worthwhile to examine the role of the ogre’s wife, an interesting character unto herself. She is not mentioned as an ogress and she is presumed to be human. She is characterized by her mercy and charity: “La femme de l’ogre qui crût qu’elle pourrait les cacher à son mari” (65). One wonders why such a kind-hearted woman would marry an ogre and even bear him seven children. The fact that ogres and humans are biologically compatible implies that they are of the same species or at least genus, in taxonomic terms, as diverse species are incapable of reproducing viable offspring. Humans and ogres, then, are closely related. Michèle Simonsen, however, suggests another interesting alternative. She theorizes that this character is indeed a true ogress, and is merely masking her true intentions. “Elle cherche d’abord à sauver le petit Poucet, mais sa ruse est inefficace; par ailleurs, en tant que femme de l’ogre, elle est objectivement l’adversaire du héros, comme d’ailleurs les petites ogresses” (107). Although such speculation seems logical, Perrault unfortunately offers no clarification regarding the true identity of this character. The ambiguity remains unresolved.

In general, the ogre is often depicted in terms of his appetite, and this one is no exception. When the ogre returns home, he finds “le Mouton estoit encore tout sanglant, mais il ne luy en sembla que meilleur” (66), thus demonstrating a bloodthirsty edge to his hunger that cooked animal meat fails to entirely satisfy. He then demands every ogre’s favorite dish. “Il fleuroit droite & à gauche, disant qu’il sentoit la chair fraiche,” (66) that famous epithet for human beings and so craved by the ravenous ogre. Like an animal, he follows his nose to his prey without need for his eyes. When the wife fails to distract her husband from discovering the hidden children, she is calmed when she is ordered to feed them lest they become too skinny: “la bonne femme fut ravie de joie et leur porta bien à souper » (66). Perrault deliberately portrays her as a good wife, nurturing and protective, and thus becomes more or less a sympathetic character. All blame is relegated to the ogre himself, and not to those who aid and abet him. She offers him a copious repast indeed: « voilà un Veau, deux Moutons & la moitié d’un Cochon » (66). In addition to this gigantic meal, the gluttonous ogre « but une douzaine de coups plus qu’à l’ordinaire » (67), demonstrating a hyperbolic appetite that exceeds all rational satiety, another marvelous characteristic of this ogre that alludes to the French tradition.

This ogre in particular shares another hallmark trait notorious among his kind: foolishness. In a plot device often repeated in other stories, this ogre demarcates his children by adorning them with golden crowns. Tom cleverly switches the ogre’s children’s crowns with his and his brothers’ sleeping caps. When in the dark, the ogre drunkenly and blindly stumbles to the beds, he feels only for the presence of the crowns. Finding none on the heads of his children, he proceeds in error: “il coupa sans balancer la gorge à ses sept filles” (68). According to Krell and Tournier, this confusion is a

characteristic function of an ogre's sensory strength and weakness. He is thus equated him with animals. Tournier states:

The ogre's sense of smell is extraordinary: he lives by his nose. On the other hand, his vision is very poor. The most famous ogre in French literature is in Charles Perrault's tale, "Little Tom Thumb." He is a giant who lives in the forest... The ogre arrives and declares to his wife 'I smell fresh flesh.' During the night he tries to slit the throats of Tom and his brothers, but instead he kills his daughters, because of his poor eyesight. That's typical of the ogre, and you see the same thing with Homer's ogre, Polyphemus. He only has one eye, which Ulysses pokes out, so then he only has his sense of smell to guide him (134).

Again there is a link between the Cyclopes and ogres, and for that matter, animals and ogres. Tournier goes on to compare the ogre and the dog both of whom have corresponding sensory strength and weakness. The wolf, however is nearer the mark due to the bloodshed involved.

When violence is coupled with the devouring of one's own children, a crime of mythical proportions occurs, as Loeffler-Delachaux points out in his work *Le Symbolisme des Contes de Fées*: "Un personnage accessoire du Petit Poucet mérite un instant d'attention. C'est l'ogre. Ses origines remontent au mythe de Saturne [Cronus] qui dévorait ses propres enfants à mesure que Cybèle (la Terre) les mettait au monde » (165). This link between the mighty gods and titans of antiquity and the humble status of ogres in the 17th century has been established earlier, and the link here is quite clear and quite monstrous.

The ogre's daughters are interesting enough to merit some discussion here as well : « L'ogre avait sept filles... Ces petites ogresses mangeaient de la chair fraîche comme leur père ; mais elle avaient de petits yeux gris... Elles mordaient les enfants pour en sucer le sang » (Rouger 67). Though perhaps a hybrid form, it seems that the seven ogresses take predominantly if not exclusively after their ogre father in both manner and

appearance. Both ugly (though in a human way) and cruelly murderous of human children, they can be considered full ogres for the purposes of the story. Had they been human, their deaths would have been problematic, but ogres are always expendable in the domain of Fairy Tales.

When the ogre realizes his error, his rage is boundless and he wastes no time in pursuing the fleeing human children. Though the children had at first an insurmountable lead on their predator, the ogre quickly evens the odds with another hallmark trait of ogre-kind: his magical « Bottes de sept lieues...qui allait de montage en montagne...comme elles étaient Fées » (69). In no time, the ogre catches up to the children, but, “car les bottes de sept lieues fatiguent leur homme” (Rouger 69), he fell into an exhausted sleep just on the verge of discovering his prey. The speed imparted by these seven league boots could be seen as an allusion to the portrayal of wolves in the medieval bestiaries that mentioned the wolves’ powerful limbs.

Instead of dispatching the ogre, le Petit Poucet satisfies himself with merely robbing the ogre of all he is worth, beginning with the marvelous boots. He returns to his home and convinces his wife to accord him the ogre’s wealth under the pretext that he was being held for ransom. The wealth of the ogre, in addition to his magical boots, is considerable: “car cet ogre ne laissoit pas d’estre fort bon mari, quoy qu’il mangeast les petits enfans. Le Petit Poucet estant donc chargé de toutes les richesses de l’ogre s’en revint au logis de son père” (Rouger 70). It is interesting to note that the ogre is not killed in this story and nothing more is said of him as he lies slumbering in the woods, now barefoot and penniless.

Suffice to say that the relationship between man and ogres remains one of conflict, though in this case, it is a predator-prey relationship rather than hostile warring camps. The ogre predares upon man as he does upon other animals. That aside, however, this ogre is representative of many recurring characteristics: hyperbolic appetite, gullibility, possession of Seven League boots, and compared to wolves in both sense of smell and as a predation threat to the human characters, children in particular. This ogre has a wife and has produced ogrelets, thus suggesting the wife is also an ogress, though readers can not be certain. Altogether, this is perhaps the most stereotypical portrait of a French ogre: human figure with lupine traits superimposed.

In these three stories alone: *La Belle au bois dormant*, *Le Chat botté*, and *Le Petit Poucet*, Perrault reiterates some of the ogre character traits that Basile had previously established but innovates many of his own. Like Basile's ogres, Perrault's are man-eating, have magical abilities, and display a wide variety of features. That is to say, no two ogres are exactly identical. That said, Perrault's ogres appear more domesticated, have more interactions with humans, reveal some refined culinary tastes, live in well-appointed castles and their magical abilities appear limited to self-transformation, in the manner of werewolves (the seven-league boots were magical in and of themselves and did not depend on the ogre to release their speed). Perrault's ogres are not depicted as being particularly ugly in appearance, and their life-styles appear quite similar to those of humans. Though they appear more outwardly human than Basile's ogres, their instincts are quite lupine. They are rapacious and gluttonous, they have a fondness for children, and they are quite easy to dupe, all traits that serve to lycophorize Perrault's ogres.

Although Perrault's ogre tales, in contradistinction to *Le Petit chaperon rouge*,

offer no ostensible moral, the fact that they are always defeated does demonstrate the triumph of “good” over “evil”. Additionally, however, they also facilitate the wealth of others, allowing financial gain to move from evildoers to those deemed somehow more “meritorious”. It is difficult to avoid drawing parallels between the rising bourgeois class who were profiting from their exploitation of a less industrious aristocracy, an interpretation that establishes the fairy tale genre as a vehicle for social commentary rather than moral instruction. It is a distinction that Perrault’s followers will exploit with masterful success.

III B 2: Aulnoy's Ogres

Although it is Perrault who is the most highly recognized name in the 17th century French fairy tale genre, Madame d'Aulnoy is another primary contributor to ogre tales, both in terms of in-depth characterization as well as innovation. In only three of her many tales, she manages to reiterate many ogre traits established by her predecessors and also forays into the relatively unexplored regions of ogre ecology, geography, and culture by introducing many new details. In Aulnoy's tales, as in Perrault's, we are provided with some evidence that links the ogre to man's celebrated animal foe, the wolf. That said, it should also be noted that Aulnoy's ogres tend to be the exception rather than the rule among French ogres in that Aulnoy portrays somewhat less humanized examples of ogres. For these reasons she receives her own chapter in this dissertation. The three principal stories of interest are *Finette Cendron*, *La Princess Carpillon* and most especially, *L'Orangier et l'Abeille*. All citations from these texts come from volumes 1 and 2 of Aulnoy's *Contes nouveaux ou les Fées à la Mode édition du tricentenaire*.

Before focusing on the antagonist in the story of *Finette Cendron*, a word needs to be said about the resemblance of many fairy tale elements to those found in previous tales. The protagonist, in this case a princess, is depicted in very familiar terms. When going to visit her fairy godmother, the heroine recalls *Le Petit Chaperon Rouge* by bearing gifts of food: « Voila du beurre, du lait, de la farine & des œufs que je vous apporte pour vous faire un bon gâteau à la mode de notre pays » (Aulnoy 365) Instead of an ailing grandmother, it is a fairy godmother, but the effect is the same: the protagonist is painted in indisputably wholesome terms and so immediately earns the readers' sympathy. Another parallel image in that *Finette* is mistreated by her cruel sisters

much in the same way that *Cendrillon* is. In a larger sense, this similar characterization, if a not direct allusion to earlier works, suggests an intertextuality that authors can rely on in order to construct the necessary tale for conveyance of a morality. It is arguable to what extent Aulnoy, Perrault and Basile et al borrowed from one another and from common oral tradition, but these common protagonist traits are often used to the same end: both are functions of a shared literary heritage reflective of contemporaneous Western values.

These similarities, however, are particularly useful when there is a distinct departure from precedents. As noted above, *Finette*, like *le Petit Chaperon Rouge*, is presented to the readers as a wholesome character that is bringing food to another party. What is most interesting however is that in Aulnoy's tale, the foe is transformed from a wolf into an ogre. This transformation moves Aulnoy's tale into the realm of an increasingly human dimension. As we saw with Perrault, ogre and human are increasingly similar in French tales. It will become clear how an ogre's presence can impact even an already established tale archetype that might appear even under the same heading on the Aarne-Thompson scale. Namely, differences in antagonists will necessitate minor differences in plot.

Seeking shelter in a castle, *Finette* and her sisters are greeted by an ogresse whose introductory image is somewhat exceptional among the French tradition of basically human-appearing ogres: « Aussitôt une vieille femme épouvantable leur vint ouvrir. Elle n'avait qu'un œil au milieu du front, mais il était plus grand que cinq ou six autres, le nez plat, le teint noir & la bouche si horrible qu'elle faisait peur. Elle avait quinze pieds de haut & trente pieds de tour » (374). Not only is this ogresse ugly and huge, but

hyperbolically so, as Hubble established as typical of medieval romance monsters in her article “Hideous a mesure.” Her single eyes recalls the Cyclops of Greek myth and provides another example of the link between ogre-kind and Cyclops-kind. For these two reasons, the link between Aulnoy in the 17th century and the past, both medieval and antiquity, is intriguing and perhaps more than coincidental.

Though the ogresse appears hideous, this superficial inhuman semblance belies her less monstrous nature, which she reveals through her cordial greeting of Finette and her sisters: « O malheureuses ! Qui vous amène ici ? leur dit-elle. Ignorez-vous que c’est le château de l’ogre & qu’à peine pouvez-vous suffire pour son déjeuner ? Mais je suis meilleure que mon mari : entrez, je ne vous mangerai pas tout d’un coup, vous aurez la consolation de vivre deux ou trois jours davantage » (374). Like the good wife of the ogre in *Le Petit Poucet*, this ogresse is not quite as bestial as her husband, revealing a tendency for male ogres to be construed as more villainous than their female counterparts. In this case, her speech also reveals that the ogre, like his predecessors, is a man-eater and a castle proprietor. Despite her good manners, she remains an ogresse, and susceptible to the dietary tendencies of her kind: « char fraîche » (375) in another instance of this repetitive terminology.

Upon hearing of their imminent danger, the humans understandably attempt to flee, but as is also often the case, the ogresse gives chase and overcomes her shorter-legged prey:

Quand elles entendirent l’ogresse parler ainsi, elles s’enfuirent, croyant se pouvoir sauver. Mais une seule de ses jambes en valait cinquante des leurs : elle courut après & les reprit, les unes par les cheveux, les autres par la peau du cou & les mettant sous son bras, elle les jeta toutes trois dans la cave, qui était pleine de crapauds & de couleuvres & l’on ne marchait que sur les os de ceux qu’ils avaient mangés (374).

Such speed and strength are attributes of the ogresse's cyclopean size rather than to any supernatural ability. Furthermore, it also definitively establishes that a kidnapping occurs. And out of deference, the ogresse detains the prey for the arrival of her husband. The presence of toads and adders in the ogre lair also recalls the ogresse-Queen's tendency in *La Belle au Bois Dormant*. The human bones that abound recall the ogre's lair in Basile's *The Flea*. Many familiar traits are already emerging amid the Aulnoy innovations.

When her husband finally returns home, he is introduced in even more forceful terms of monstrosity:

L'ogre était six fois plus haut que sa femme. Quand il parlait, la maison tremblait & quand il toussait, il semblait d'éclats de tonnerre. Il n'avait qu'un grand vilain œil, ses cheveux étaient tout hérissés, il s'appuyait sur une bûche dont avait fait une canne. Il avait un panier couvert dans sa main, il en tira quinze petits enfants qu'il avait volés par les chemins & qu'il avala comme quinze œufs frais (374-375).

Not only is he more huge and repulsive than his cyclopean wife, he is also introduced as loud, and manifestly as a man-eater without so much as sharing his captives with his wife. Devouring fifteen children, moreover, is a demonstration of hyperbolic appetite reminiscent of the wolf of medieval bestiaries and of Gargantua and Pantagruel, but far crueller.

And despite this monstrous appetite, the ogre hungers for more. Children are often depicted as the ogre's favorite prey, but in this case, it seems that human princesses are held in even greater culinary regard, so much so that the ogre is quite willing to murder his wife for withholding the dainty treat: « Si je trouve, répliqua l'ogre, & que tu me le caches, je te couperai la tête pour en faire une boule » (375). The ogre's threat suggests a total lack of regard for even his own kind, even his own wife, much less for humanity in

general. Here also is a glimpse into the married life of ogres and their potential spousal abuse as often found also in human relationships. But as food is the subject of their quarrel, as opposed to say, money, the ogres' instinct for human flesh motivates the quarrell in this tale.

Out of obedience and perhaps fear of her husband's threat, the ogresse immediately relents and reveals their presence in soothing terms that reveal an ogre pet-name reminiscent of Basile's *Three Sisters*: « Ne te fâche point, mon petit ogrelet, je vais te déclarer la vérité. Il est venu aujourd'hui trois jeunes filles que j'ai prises, mais ce serait dommage de les manger, car elles savent tout faire. Comme je suis vieille...Elles seront nos servantes » (375). On the surface, her plea for domestic help seems pitiable, but also recalls the ogrish tendency to maintain human slaves. But inwardly, the ogresse plans to trick her husband and eat the princesses herself: « Elle pensa en elle-même : 'Quand il ira a la chasse, je les mangerai & je lui dirai qu'elles se sont sauvées » (375). Her suggestion is accepted and so her plan is working smoothly for the moment, « l'ogre était friand » (376), reinforcing the stereotype that ogres are fools who are easily duped, even by ogresses, who can in turn be tricked by humans

To tide them over for the future prized human meal, the Ogrish couple indulges their appetite in a fittingly copious feast: « L'ogre & l'ogresse mangeaient plus de pain que deux armées....l'ogre, qui était présent, attendait le pain tendre, mangea cent agneaux & cent petits cochons de lait. » (376). Yet if this vast repast did not satiate their gastronomic rapacity, three dainty human princesses surely could not. Their culinary value then must reside in the flavor, not in the filling.

Put to work as slaves rather than immediately consumed, the clever Finette deduces a way to trick the ogre as she prepares a giant, burning-hot oven wherein she cast no less than a thousand pounds of butter: « Il faut y tâter avec la langue, mais je suis trop petite. – Je suis assez grand, dit l’ogre, et se baissant il s’enfonça si avant qu’il ne pouvait plus se retirer, de sorte qu’il brûla jusqu’aux os » (376). Just as the witch will be roasted in her own oven in *Hansel and Gretel*, the captor cooks his own goose. And as with Bruin the Bear in *Le Roman de Renard*, it is one’s well-known appetite that often gets on in trouble. In this case, the human is to the fox as the ogre is to the bear, or the wolf, as Ysengrin was often the target for Renard’s mischief.

Aulnoy’s ogres, like Perrault’s, are rather dim-witted. The ogresse, though cleverer or at least more cunning than her late husband, is no mental match for her human captives. But she is easily beguiled by a weakness that is based in vanity, another uniquely human failing:

Si vous vouliez quitter ces horribles peaux d’ours dont vous êtes habillée & vous mettre à la mode, nous vous coifferons a merveille, vous serez comme un astre. – Voyons, dit-elle, comme tu l’entends. Mais assure-toi que, s’il y a quelques dames plus jolies que moi, je te hacherai menue comme chair à pâté. Là-dessus, les trois princesses lui ôtèrent son bonnet & se mirent a la peigner & a la friser, en l’amusant de leur caquet. Finette prit une hache & lui donna par derrière un si grand coup qu’elle sépara son corps d’avec sa tête (377).

Instead of hunger as a fatal flaw, it is the ogresse’s vanity, as well as gullibility, that provide her enemies with the opportunity to exploit her weaknesses. Either way, both ogres and ogresses have their weaknesses. The ogre has a more conventional flaw; the ogress exhibits a more human frailty. Once discerned, a clever human can exploit both of these weaknesses and defeat the bestial brutes in confirmation of the classic axiom “brain over brawn.”

And as endings typically go, the deaths of the ogres permit the human heroines to reap the windfall of their demises by assuming the collected wealth of the ogres: « Il ne fut jamais une telle allégresse. Elles montrèrent sur le toit de la maison pour se divertir a sonner les cloches d'or, elles furent dans toutes les chambres, qui étaient de perles & de diamants & les meubles si riches qu'elles mouraient de plaisir...Nous voila plus riches que n'était notre père quand il avait son royaume » (377). The twist on Aulnoy's tale, however, is that the princess saves herself without the rescue of a young prince. Additionally, Aulnoy's ogre and ogresse in *Finette Cendron* are somewhat different than their French counterparts in other tales in certain key regards, and even similar to Italian, medieval and antiquated giants in other regards.

In summary, the ogres mentioned in this tale are similar enough to be discussed together: they are both ugly, huge, loud, violent, gullible, rich and hyperbolically hungry. Though they live apart from human society in their cave, the woman's interest in fashion humanizes her to an extent. It will also be noted that the ogres likes to cook prey with ample amounts of butter, a culinary refinement that links the two species together. Behaviorally, however, the ogres have more in common with wolves: the hyperbolic nature of their appetites, their fondness for smaller, more delicate prey, and in particular, for females, establishing the sexual undercurrent so often linked to wolves in the French mindset

Another of Aulnoy's tales corroborates the usual concordance of ogre characteristics: *La Princesse Carpillon*. Perhaps due to their relatively brief cameo in this tale, the ogres are characterized in a concise summary just sufficient to prove their ogreness to the readers. That said, there are still new innovations regarding ogres even in

this succinct summary. For instance, Aulnoy makes mention that « Cette contrée avait longtemps servi de retraite aux ogres » (8). The ambiguous term « contrée » can imply one of two things: (1) a region of geography known to humans but heavily populated by ogres, or (2) an uncharted but unified nation of ogres banded together in organized societies much as human beings are. Either way, it implies that ogres stick together with their own kind, perhaps for war parties on mankind and fairykind, hunting forays on the former, or simply mutual protection from their myriad enemies. Either way, their socialization is an additional humanizing element.

The second scenario seems to be what Aulnoy is suggesting as she portrays the “contrée” in the following terms: « Ces ogres terribles, courroucés de la haine qu’ on leur témoignait, redoublèrent leurs cruautés & mangeaient sans exception tous ceux qui tombaient entre leurs mains » (8). Here at last there seems to be a little consideration for ogres as the victims of the (albeit justifiable) hatred of other groups. Their substrata status in turn has given rise to a ferocity necessary to protect their borders and ensure the isolation that is perhaps key to their survival. Of course, being ogres, they will also eat their vanquished foes and trespassers.

These foes, in turn, organize themselves into an opposing faction, every bit as united along the lines of their species: human beings, specifically, shepherds: « Enfin un jour les bergers s’ étaient rassemblés pour délibérer sur ce qu’ ils pouvaient faire contre les ogres » (8). It is difficult to determine who is the aggressor in this conflict and so Aulnoy succeeds here in the attempt to portray ogres not merely as pure evil foes to be eradicated, but as a distinct group equally worthy of anthropological and ecological study.

But as is almost invariably the case, the ogres are destined to fall. This fall, in turn, is brought about in this case by an interesting hybrid of humanity and animals: the centaurs: « Bergers, je suis le Centaure bleu. Si vous me voulez donner un enfant tous les trois ans, je vous promets d'amener ici cent de mes frères, qui feront si rude guerre aux ogres, que nous les chasserons, malgré qu'ils en aient » (8). Here it might be said that animals (in this case, half-animals) have once again vanquished the ogre threat. These centaurs are bestial for two reasons: due to the hybrid nature of man and horse combined, and also due to their demand for children. Here, it takes a monster to defeat a monster. Man is incapable of defending himself, and so chooses the lesser of two evils. But the very superiority of the centaurs implies that ogres are more human than animal. They are presented as an intimidating species between animals (centaurs) and humans. They are militarily less powerful than the animals (centaurs) but less intellectual than humans.

The shepherds rationalize their accord with the Blue Centaur by reducing the evils they are forced to endure by sacrificing merely one child every three years as opposed to the ogres' constant deprivations. « Eh quoi ! mes compagnons, nous est-il plus utile que les ogres mangent tous les jours nos pères, nos enfants & nos femmes ? » (8). If this spokesman is not exaggerating about the exact quantities of humans consumed, it supports the stereotypical hyperbolic appetite of ogres redolent of other tales.

When confronted by the promised hundred centaurs, the “contrée” of ogres is quickly conquered: « Les ogres n'étaient pas moins braves que cruels : ils se livrèrent plusieurs combats, où les Centaures furent toujours victorieux. Enfin ils les forcèrent de fuir. » (8-9). Either a « contrée » is not a sizable territory or ogres are inferior fighters to Centaurs. Either way, and as usual, the ogres are defeated, which results in increased

quality of life for human beings. Yet now the shepherds have a new foe to contend with: the centaurs. When they chafe under this new yoke, perhaps the humans will make a deal with another party. Admittedly, the centaurs did not declare what they intend to do with the children they acquire. Perhaps they do not eat them after all; but instead raise and educate them as Chiron educated Jason, Achilles and Asclepius. The conflict between ogres and centaurs is a unique juxtaposition of antiquated and contemporaneous antagonists that reflects the querelle des anciens et des modernes expressly, whether Aulnoy intended it or not. In this case, the anciens win the querelle. If this analogy is accurate, the ogre can be understood as a modern concept, although as we have seen, he is not without his ancient counterpart in Cyclopes, Titans and Giants.

In summation, the ogres presented in this tale are representative of an ogre-inhabited land in a state of open hostility and even frequent skirmishes with humankind. They seem to have the upper hand over their human enemies until the centaurs enter the fray and ally with the shepherds, tilting the odds in favor of the humans. Other common tropes include the ogres' violence and desire to devour human flesh. It is difficult to ascertain their essential nature, whether human or bestial, due quite simply to the lack of characterization.

I have saved the best for last in the Aulnoy oeuvre. For in *L'Orangier et l'Abeille*, the author outdoes herself and indeed other writers of ogre tales in terms of depth of characterization as well as character innovation, providing a wealth of ogre information. To be fair, many ogre-related conventions are repeated, and indeed must be in order to maintain a recognizable ogre tale. But within the well-established framework of that familiar narrative structure upon which Vladimir Propp was so famously written in his

Morphology of the Folk Tale, Aulnoy paints some radical new images that stray from traditional ogre depiction in the French (and Italian) canons. To begin with, the protagonist, who is yet another princess, floats like Moses into a foreign land: « la petite princesse, qui dormait dans son berceau, demeura flottant sur l'eau & enfin la mer la jeta dans un pays assez agréable, mais qui n'était presque plus habité, depuis que l'ogre Ravagio & sa femme Tourmentine y étaient venus demeurer » (244). Here the ravages of the ogres, already formidable and rightly feared by human populations, reach a crescendo of intensity. Having either conquered and most likely devoured or driven off most of the human inhabitants, one couple of named and married ogres maintain the equivalent of their own fiefdom. This indicates either that humans cannot militarily overcome these two ogres on their own (as is often the case), or that they simply refuse to co-exist alongside these terrible neighbors.

The ogres, in turn, are introduced as representative of their kind, with all accordingly notorious characterization, namely, a hyperbolic appetite: “ils mangeaient tout le monde. Les ogres sont de terribles gens : quand une fois ils ont croqué de la char frache¹⁰ (c'est ainsi qu'ils appellent les hommes), ils ne sauraient presque plus manger autre chose & Tourmentine trouvait toujours le secret d'en faire venir quelqu'un, car elle était demi-fée » (244). Again, an ogre's (be it French or Italian) primary hallmark is his or her tendency to eat humans, which they regard not as human beings but as “char frache,” much as man might consider lambs to be lamb, or cows to be beef. French ogres often seem to be more gluttonous, however.

¹⁰ **Chair fraîche.** L'hésitation phonétique est concevable pour le premier terme, non pour le second: s'agit-il d'un procédé burlesque ou enfantin de cacophonie? [author's note]

But what is of primary interest is the genealogy of Tourmentine. We have previously seen ogres and humans married and producing viable offspring in *Le Petit Poucet*, but this is the first and indeed only instance in all fairy tales/ogre tales of the breeding between a fairy and an ogre. Her fairy blood will prove to offer Tourmentine certain advantages over her purely ogrish husband. As the female partner, then, Tourmentine, is less ogrish than Ravagio due to her lineage. The counterbalance of ogre (less than human) plus fairy (superhuman) ought to logically yield descendants with properties similar to those of humans.

Despite being half fairy, Tourmentine, whose name, as often is the case in fairy tales, is quite telling, acts and looks more like an ogre than a fairy, cursed with all the traits inherent in that breed. But being an ogre is not all bad. There is at least one advantage to these exaggerated features: heightened perception. Here is another piece of evidence linking ogres to wolves. Like a wolf, Tourmentine uses her large and flat nose to smell her prey:

Elle sentit d'une lieue la pauvre petite princesse, elle accourut sur le rivage pour la chercher avant que Ravagio l'eut trouvée : ils étaient aussi goulus l'un que l'autre, & jamais il n'y eut de plus hideuses figures, avec leur œil louche placé au milieu du front, leur bouche grande comme un four, l'eut nez large & plat, leurs longues oreilles d'âne, leurs cheveux hérissés & leur bosse devant & derrière (244).

Though many ogres can be assumed to be physically repulsive, Aulnoy goes to great lengths to describe their grotesque appearance, alluding more to the Cyclops or the Italian than the French tradition.

In addition to looking like an ogre, Tourmentine also behaves as one. Her primary concern is satisfying her hunger. And like the wolf in many representations, she is more than willing to slake her hunger on the easiest of prey available: a helpless human infant:

« Elle la prit entre ses bras, elle lia le berceau sur son dos & en cet équipage elle revint dans sa caverne » (245). Any suggestion of maternal instinct might be discarded in light of the following revelation: « ce vilain monstre qui venait pour la dévorer » (245). But surprisingly, such is not to be the case after all. Instead, predator and prey retire to the lair. There is no castle for the ogres to inhabit in this case, but a cavern, as any large predator of fen and field would inhabit.

Instead of wanting to immediately devour the child, Tourmentine has other plans in store for her, again revealing a departure from the animalistic. Perhaps due to her own diverse gene pool, she is more interested in the eugenics of her children than in the rumblings of her stomach. But knowing that her husband does not share her concern for non-selfish, non-hunger related goals, she realizes that Ravagio, also aptly named, will require strict warning not to heed his instincts and devour the tasty morsel: « Tiens, Ravagio, dit-elle a son mari, voici de la char frache bien grassette, bien douillette, mais par mon chef tu n'en croqueras que d'une dent : c'est une belle petite fille, je veux la nourrir, nous la marierons avec notre ogrelet, ils feront des ogrichons d'une figure extraordinaire, cela nous réjouira dans notre vieillesse » (245). Interbreeding of fairies, ogres and humans may be perceived as a conscious attempt to redeem a monstrous lineage. Or perhaps like changelings, Tourmentine wants human blood mingled with her own in order to gain a human soul for her descendants. But the desire for intermingling moves the ogres to overcome even their notorious hunger for human flesh.

Apparently, Tourmentine is the more dominant partner, as Ravagio consents to her demand. Typically, it is the ogre who runs the family, as was the case in *Finette Cendron*, *Le Petit Poucet*, etc., but in this tale, the opposite is so. Her elevated status may

be linked to her more humanized characteristics. The result of this matriarchy is a unique arrangement for an ogre family unit : “Voilà donc Ravagio, Tourmentine & l’ogrelet à caresser Aimée d’une manière si humaine que c’était une espèce de miracle » (245).

Typically, ogres keep humans only as slave labor or just long enough to fatten them up to make a decent meal. In this case, Tourmentine is willing to adopt this human, unaware even that she is a princess. In this way, the familiar archetype of the ogresse mother-in-law can be construed, as was seen in *La Belle au Bois Dormant*.

Tourmentine’s fairy blood has additional benefits, which help to explain her allusion to “par mon chef” above: « Elle était demi-fée, comme je l’ai déjà dit ; son savoir consistait à tenir sa baguette d’ivoire & à souhaiter quelque chose. Elle prit donc sa baguette & dit : ‘Je souhaite au nom de la royale fée Trufio... » (245). Though ogres often have magical items, only a fairy has ever been in possession of a magic wand per se. But though fairies usually use those wands for the benefit of their godchildren, Tourmentine’s ogre blood inspires her to use it for selfish means. Thus we observe a Fee/ogre overlap in role and function. We can only assume that Trufio is this chief by whom she swears.

As for princess, her humanity is put into contrast with the ogres who surround her: « La cruauté qu’elle voyait à ces monstres la rendait plus douce » (247). Despite their exposure to princess Aimée, the ogres remain renowned for their cruelty, with the exception of the young ogrelet: « ce petit monstre avait pris un caractère de douceur en voyant & en aimant la belle princesse » (247). The fact that human qualities can and do rub off on the ogrelet suggest a further humanizing element, at least of the ogrelet.

Aulnoy's ogres can learn to be civil if they want to. Therefore, they only choose to be man-eaters. Nurture seems to triumph over nature here.

In her depiction, Aulnoy even offers insight into the language of the ogres: « ce langage dur & barbare qui sonne si mal » (251). The language of the ogres is certainly not French, hinting at a certain level of ethnocentrism in this tale. A contrast and even competition of clashing cultures arises next. Even though Aimée was raised by ogres, her royal human nature instinctually guides her sense of morality. She finds some ogre customs repugnant and consents to them only as a last resort to save the fair prince who wandered into the story at this convenient juncture to share her captivity much like in *Patientine* by Auneuil (below) « Elle se jeta a genoux devant lui & le conjura de garder cette char frache pour le jour de ses noces avec l'ogrelet & qu'elle lui promettait d'en manger. A ces mots Ravagio fut si content de penser que la princesse voulait prendre ses coutumes qu'il lâcha le prince & l'enferma dans le trou ou tous les ogrichons couchaient » (257). The princess' promise is enough to satisfy even an enraged and hungry ogre. He wants to extend his customs to others, yet also is eager to integrate foreign blood into his family. It seems as if he is seeking a true harmony between the two groups, a blend that further muddles the nature of the ogre in Aulnoy's tale.

In addition to adding new aspects, Aulnoy falls back on some traditional ogre customs as well, such as the golden crown custom first discovered in *Le Petit Poucet*: « Or c'est la coutume en Ogrichonnie que tous les soirs l'ogre, l'ogresse & les ogrichons mettent sur leur tête une belle couronne d'or avec laquelle ils dorment: voila leur seules magnificence, mais ils aimeraient mieux être pendus & étranglés que d'y avoir manqué » (258). Here the tale presents an element of exoticism. Ogres represent an entirely new

people with their own corresponding culture, centered perhaps in Ogrichonnie – which begs the question of the ogre’s role in ecology, society, nature. This tale is perhaps as close as readers will ever come to ascertaining final details. The rest is up to the individual’s imagination.

As in *Le Petit Poucet*, the human protagonist has the wits to use the ogre’s notorious weakness for “char frache” against him by tricking him in a fittingly brutal way. Aimée notices that Ravagio has no self-control when it comes to food, like the animals of *Le Roman de Renard*. Exploiting his weakness, the princess gets him to devour his own children in a familiar way: « elle prit la couronne du premier qu’elle trouva & la posa sur la tête du prince » (258). It cannot be coincidence that the exact same unusual trick occurs in *Le Petit Poucet*, thus suggesting a known intertextuality or at least an awareness of common fairy tale elements that can be used to situate new fairy tales within an established, familiar fairy tale tradition.

And also like in *Le Petit Poucet*, Ravagio is duped into the horrible act of cannibalizing his own children: « La princesse, prit doucement la couronne d’une ogrelet & la mit sur la tête de son amant » (260). Aimée will appropriate this trick with great success because Ravagio never learns caution. He is unable to use his senses to overcome his instincts: « Comme il ne voyait point clair, crainte de s’y méprendre, il tata avec la main & se jeta sur celui qui n’avait pas de couronne : il le croqua comme un poulet. La pauvre princesse, qui entendait le bruit des os du melheureux qu’il mangeait, pâma, mourait de peur... » (258). The exact phrasing “se jeta” is significant because it again recalls *Le Chat botté*, *La Belle au bois dormant*, and *Le Petit Chaperon Rouge* when the wolf threw himself upon his prey, drawing another parallel between ogre and wolf. Full

of regret, “Ravagio comprit assez le beau coup qu’il avait fait, mais le mal était sans remède” (259). Apparently, cannibalism is also taboo among ogres. At least, no ogre parent would dream of willingly devouring his children, demonstrating an important change since the days of Cronus. The fact that ogres have no such moral qualms about eating humans, therefore, seems to distinguish the species, in contrast to their ability to interbreed. Most likely, no author ever seriously considered the question. Ravagio clearly loved his children as any human (or animal) does. This parallel makes this act all the more horrific, for Ravagio’s reaction forces us to see all the more how ogres resemble mankind in terms of family interaction

But Ravagio is not alone in his hasty miscalculation. Even his half-fairy wife Tourmentine falls victim to the same cruel duplicity:

La barbare Tourmentine se réveilla en sursaut & rêvant au prince ...se glissa sans dire mot dans le roue des ogrichons, elle toucha doucement ceux qui avait des couronnes (le prince était de ce nombre) & une des ogrelettes passa le pas en trois bouchées...Des qu’il fut jour & que Tourmentine eut trouve les os de son ogrelette, elle remplit l’air de hurlements épouvantables (260).

Tourmentine is tricked by same switch as well. Though she may be half fairy, she remains as gullible as a full-blooded ogre. In Greek mythology, the Titan Cronos swallows his own children as well. The link between the Titans of antiquity and the ogres of the 17th century share this child-devouring link directly, whether it is their own children they devour, or others’ children, knowingly or not.

Intelligence may be humanity’s first, last and only defense against a physically superior foe such as the ogres. If Ravagio and Tourmentine could single-handedly conquer the fief of their choice, the following bold boast of the prince would surely be in vain: « Le prince ne priait pas avec moins d’ardeur & quelque fois il avait envie

d'attaquer ces deux monstres & de les combattre. Mais quel moyen d'espérer quelque avantage sur eux ? Ils étaient hauts comme des géants & leur peau était à l'épreuve du pistolet » (260). In a fair, toe to toe fight, the ogre will beat the human every time.

Therefore, brains must beat brawn (and magic). The reference to pistols also places the tale in its contemporary time and an ogre's invulnerability to bullets could only have been established after the invention of firearms, a purely modern development that the heroes of antiquity lacked in their conflicts against the large but gullible man-eaters that plagued their societies. In either time, force will not suffice, and only trickery can save mankind.

But ogres are not entirely dependant on their brawn to serve them. Tourmentine in particular can rely on « L'art de féerie » (263) to prevail when size and strength fail. She has but to recite the incantation: « Je souhaite au nom de la royale fée Trufio » and she may have whatever she requests. Fortunately, the powers of magic are limited by the wit of the spellcaster, and so nothing truly catastrophic is thaumaturgically summoned. The magic wand cliché associated with this wishing is perhaps all that emphasizes Tourmentine's fairy blood. Being half ogre and half Fairy, this unique creature is in a position to be among the most potent of magic-wielders. Perhaps her ogre blood dilutes the potency of fairy magic, rather than augmenting it with additional powers. Or perhaps the only source of Tourmentine's magic is the wand itself. In addition to her seemingly infinite number of wishes, the magic wand, now in the hands of Aimée, also demonstrates an independent power to enchant the fève to speak and lie to Tourmentine to allow the humans' get away (263). Aimée's use of the wand implies that the magic resides not in the caster but in the artifact itself, thereby suggesting that ogres are no more

magical than humans. It is interesting to note, however, that the magic is reserved for an ogre who is descended from fairies, a species known for their supernatural abilities.

When the prey is threatened, the ogre truly reveals his bestial nature, as expressed through Aulnoy's particular choice of words: "Ravagio ouvre son oeil, sauté au milieu de la caverne comme un lion. Il rugit, il beugle, il hurle, il écume : « Allons, allons, dit-il, mes bottes de sept lieux, que je poursuis nos fuyards » (263). Through this bestial expression, Ravagio shows himself to conform to two more traits typical of ogrekind: (1) he is exceedingly loud, and (2) he possesses a pair of Seven League Boots. Only equipped with his Seven League Boots is he capable of pursuing the fugitives armed with the potent magic wand.

But not even the magical boots can help an ogre so easily fooled by clever humans. When Aimée spots Ravagio approaching, she summons the power of the magic wand to save her and the prince by reciting the formula she learned from observing Tourmentine: « je souhaite au nom de la royale fée Trufio, que notre chameau devienne un étang, que le prince soit un bateau & moi une vieille batelière qui le conduirait » (264). This first transformation with the wand, which completely fools Ravagio, who then proceeds to believe everything that this strange boatwoman tells him: « Elle lui fit signe qu'elle les avait vus & qu'ils étaient passés dans la prairie. L'ogre la crut » (264). With magic, it is even easier to trick a gullible ogre.

When Ravagio must return home to tell his wife of his failure, he states: « J'ai couru comme un loup » (265). This particular comparison is most interesting because it again links ogres to wolves. Of all swift and tireless animals, he chooses the wolf comparison instead of a horse or rabbit. Perhaps it is due to the fact that the ogre

feels a natural kinship to the wolf, a predator, and disdains to compare himself to an herbivore. Or perhaps Aulnoy deliberately chose to make this association in order to play on her readers' lupine connotations. It remains, nonetheless, a valid comparison.

A second time, he pursues Aimée and the prince using his boots, only to be fooled by a second magical ruse of the princess: « Je souhaite au nom de la royale fée Trufio, que le prince soit métamorphose en portrait, le chameau en pilier & moi en nain » (266). Note the verb choice of metamorphosis, a common variety of magic in French fairy tales associated with fairies and ogres as opposed to evocation, for example. Aimée might have wished for a bolt of lightning to smite her enemies, but either she has not the heart to harm any living creature, or the wand does not have jurisdiction over the other schools of magic, e.g. invocation, divination, necromancy, etc. It does emphasize the fact that humans never overcome ogres by force; only by trickery.

For a third, final and significantly numbered occasion, Aimée succeeds in deceiving the ogre. In another disguise, she ironically states: « Ma bouche n'est mie mensongère, homme vivant ne me peut trouver en fraude. Mais allez vite, si qu'érez les occire avant soleil couche. L'ogre s'éloigna » (267).¹¹ Here she tricks the ogre a third time with outright lies. The third repetition is a hallmark number in fairy tales perhaps representing the Holy Trinity in an otherwise heathen text full of non-Christian creatures and pre-Christian motifs, suggested by this odd use of an old fashioned French dialect. Once Ravagio is defeated a third time, we hear no more of him.

Instead, it is now Tourmentine's turn to track her quarry. Though she will fare no better than her dimmer-witted husband, she lacks any empathy for his failures, and considers herself to be more capable than he: "Par mon chef, continua-t-elle, ce les était!

¹¹ In modern French :...si vous voulez les acquérir avant que le soleil ne se couche.

Je suis bien folle de te confier le soin de ma vengeance comme si j'étais trop petite pour la prendre moi-même ! çà, çà, j'y vas/ Je veux me botter a mon tour& je n'irai pas avec moins de diligence que toi. Elle mit les bottes de sept lieues & partit » (268). She is smarter than he is, being half fairy, or, in an Aulnoy story, being female. The role of ogre gender is a significant factor, whose statistical analysis will be considered below.

The final trump occurs when Aimée invokes the wand's magic, yet again shifting her shape and the prince's shape to the namesakes of the tale: "Je souhaite, au nom de la royale fée Trufio, que le chameau soit une caisse que mon cher prince devienne un bel orangier & que métamorphosée en abeille, je vole autour de lui" (268). The particular choice of each individual form is worth inquiry but I can only speculate as to why an orange tree as opposed to cherry tree, whose blossoms are just as sweet, or the bee companion as opposed to transforming Tourmentine into a bee. Perhaps there are rules to the magic that are assumed in each tale that need not be repeated for 17th century audiences though they are lost in time for the sake of modern readers. Perhaps they are indelible, inside connotations that are unique only to Aulnoy herself.

Due to this transformation into the bee, it is an animal form used to harass and punish Tourmentine, and in an unconventional way, best her. It is not through animal violence, as typical in ogre tales, but through another common trope: human chicanery. « [Tourmentine] s'assit sous l'orangier. La princesse abeille se donna le plaisir de la piquer en mille endroits...Enfin Tourmentine toute en sang s'éloigna. » Again, Tourmentine is tricked by the humans, despite her fairy blood. If anything, magical fairy blood might render one safe from any human attempt at trickery, but such is not the case. As it concerns both ogres and half-ogres/half-fairies, humans remain triumphant. This

idea is consistent with Descartes' theory that it is precisely the god-given faculty of reason that makes a human being a human being: "le bon sens est la chose du monde la mieux partagée...ce qu'on nomme le bon sens ou la raison, est naturellement égale en tous les hommes," (Bishop 12) Lacking this sense of reason common to all mankind, a creature ceases to be human and becomes something less, such as an animal. Ogres, clearly excluded from this human sharing of reason, would not be considered human beings by Cartesian logic. Indeed, as animals commonly defeat them, ogres may be considered as something completely inferior on the hierarchy of creation. Finally, the old trope of animal domination of ogres resurfaces.

To conclude this chapter, it suffices to recall three key relationships: (1) Due to her fairy blood, the ogress is intellectually more on par with humans than with either of her parentages. (2) In contrast to his human-like wife, Ravagio is more on par with animals, particularly wolves, due to his predatory nature and quick speed. Clearly he is less intelligent and dominant than Tourmentine. Finally, (3) Altogether, the continuum between animals and fairies includes ogres and humans in the following ascending intellectual and puissance hierarchy: animals, ogres, humans, fairies. Combinations of species (literal or metaphorical) will result in corresponding movements along the continuum, as demonstrated by Tourmentine's mixed blood and Ravagio's lupine associations. Altogether, the ogre-human relationship remains one of hostility in two ways. First, the ogres conquered human lands and carved themselves a demesne, then when the opportunity fortuitously arose, these same ogres enslaved a human child. The ogres themselves are characterized by their violence, eagerness for *char frache*, wolfishness, ugliness, names, magic items, transformational magic, tricked by hat

switching and defeat by an animal, the bee. And though typically in the French canon, the ogres tend to resemble and behave more or less in human ways, Aulnoy presents new discrepancies to this general tendency as well as retains some traditional characteristics.

The happy ending of Aulnoy's tales involves, as it did for Perrault, an accumulation of wealth. In this case, however, it is women who reap the financial rewards. Additionally, she offers increased protection for children in *La Princesse Carpillon*, and the happy marriage between the Princesse Aimée and a suitable husband in Tourmentine. These issues are significant for women of the time, reinforcing the link between the fairy tale and social commentary.

III B 3: Auneuil's Ogres

Madame d'Auneuil's sole ogre tale, *Histoire de la Princesse Patientine dans la Forêt d'Erimente*, affirms some of what other tales have to say about ogres and rebuffs others, simultaneously offering new insights. It opens with the lines: « Il y a avoit un ogre nommé Infacio qui faisoit sa demeure ordinaire dans un Antre obscur & où jamais les rayons du Soleil n'avoient peut penetrer » (282). This introduction accords an ogre a place of prominence lacking in other tales notorious for under-developing their antagonists. This ogre is also special in that he is named, an attribute quite rare in any ogre tale. Furthermore, the reader learns of Infacio's aversion to sunlight, a characteristic normally attributed to vampires, but can be understood in the context of the heir of Orcus, of the sunless Underworld, reaffirming the original, etymological denotation of the word ogre. One could equally understand this trait as an allusion to Basile's frequent use of this characteristic in his tales.

Auneuil retains more classical ogre associations when depicting Infacio in the following negative fashion: « Cet ogre étoit fier, cruel & sans justice & les Furies de l'Enfer qui avoient présidé à sa naissance, ayant répandu de l'écume de Cerbère sur sa langue, elle en fut pour toujours tellement penetrée, que dés qu'il touchoit une personne de sa langue venimeuse, elle en perdoit la vie, sans qu'aucun remède pût le sauver » (282-3). Here the ogre's etymological link to the Underworld is strengthened by no fewer than two direct mythological allusions: The Furies and Cerberus, both members of the Greek Underworld mythos, which the Roman tradition adapted and of which Orcus was a part. In keeping with traditional depictions, this current manifestation of the Underworld antagonist possesses typically negative attributes: pride, cruelty, injustice and a poisonous

tongue, either figuratively or literally. Additionally, Infacio suffers from an extreme state of greed: « Posséder toutes les richesses de la terre, étoit la seule passion qui occupoit son cœur » (283). Altogether, Madame d'Auneuil takes greater care in her antagonists' characterization than do many other authors of ogre tales, ascribing to Infacio more character development and back story than even protagonists are normally allotted in similarly succinct stories.

In addition to his singularly developed character, Auneuil continues to detail the ogre's family life by mentioning his two sisters: « Il avoit deux sœurs qui approchoient beaucoup de son humeur. Elles demeuroient avec lui. L'aînée se nommoit Aigre-douce ; elle avoit la beauté & quelque douceur dans l'esprit » (283). Defying convention for the first time and establishing a precedent yet again, here is the portrait of an attractive, even beautiful ogress, in stark contrast to many other ogres in the fairy tale tradition. Her name Bittersweet alludes to a semi-sweet nature to match her appearance, a dual blessing normally reserved for the hero or heroine of the story. Her dual beauty and sweet nature do more to humanize her than perhaps any other ogress or ogre in any tale.

The younger sister, however, does not benefit quite so much from the generosity of the author's innovation. « La cadette qui se nommoit Bizarrine étoit d'une humeur si capricieuse, si impérieuse & si chagrine que l'on ne pouvoit inventer des tourmens plus insupportables qu'obliger quelqu'un de vivre avec elle » (284). Yet even this ogress is not so much evil as she is just annoying. Even so, she is a far cry from the typically one-dimensional stock villain typically depicted in ogre tales. As such, one could say that she also is more or less humanized, especially compared to Infacio.

Names themselves play a role in depicting the characters in this tale. For example, there is Patientine the patient princess, Courageux the brave prince, Aigre-douce, the ambiguous ogress and Bizarrine, who is bizarre but for no specified reason. The name Infacio, however, defies immediate characterization. Perhaps ‘facio’ comes from the Latin *facere*, to do or to make. In that case, the English idiom “to do [someone] in” makes sense, though it lacks a corresponding French equivalent. It is dubious at best to hazard a guess. But there is another way to ascribe meaning to names. By evaluating a character’s behavior, his name can become synonymous with his predominant characteristic. Pyrrhus, de Sade, Corneille, M. Jourdain, Emma Bovary et al are all examples of characters whose names have come to embody their predominant trait. So can it be said that Infacio is a champion of avarice, as constantly enforced throughout the story. « L’ogre alloit souvent prendre des leçons de la Déesse de l’Avarice » (284). Clearly, Infacio embodies greed as his principal characteristic. His greatest aspiration in heeding the Goddess of Greed was simple: « Il seroit le plus riche de tous les ogres de son temps » (284). This is indeed an audacious aspiration, given that ogres typically possess considerable wealth to begin with. One might say that he would become a regular Croesus or Scrooge. To become the richest ogre in the land, he was told that he would have to marry Patientine, whose relegation to a means to an end makes her a secondary character overshadowed by the prominence of the ogre and his quest. I do not use the word “quest” lightly. In his work *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Joseph Campbell wrote on the nature of the hero and how a quest is inexorable to his title. By assigning Infacio a proper quest, he can be seen as heroic in this Campbellian sense. Such heroism

lends Infacio a more human nature. Despite some monstrous associations with the Underworld, then, Infacio also reveals some distinctly human traits in his wealth.

The seduction of the princess was achieved only through another typical trait of ogres: shape-shifting magic. « Il quitta sa forme naturelle de peur d'épouvanter Patientine...& scût si bien se contrefaire » (285). To complete his transformation, the doppelganger here must do more than disguise his repugnant appearance (« chevelure herissée, » [285]) as well as his cruel nature. This requires some acting talent, some patience and some luck. With adequate amounts of each of these attributes, Infacio succeeds in winning the princess' hand. Both of these traits also allude to previously established lupine traits: transformation recalls the lou-garou and kidnapping the princess suggests sexual rapacity. Furthermore, marriage to a human woman suggests a humanizing element to Infacio as well.

Apparently the deed was done none too soon: « l'ogre impatient de retourner dans son antre avec sa proie & de sortir d'une Cour dont la magnificence blessait si fort son humeur » (286). Use of the word "proie" above suggests, very appropriately, predatory behavior albeit in a metaphorical sense instead of a literal sense. « Après quelques jours de marche, la Princesse arriva dans la Forêt d'Erimente » (286). In typical ogre fashion, he wastes no time in absconding with his prized princess, stealing her away from her family and home and back to his sunless lair far from the lands of humans and the epicenter of human civilization: the court. In contrast, Infacio's lair is described as: « un lieu si affreux » (287). In his isolation, Infacio displays a de-humanizing element more typical of Italian ogres.

While in the ogre's clutches, Patientine is forced to work in slave labor gathering herbs in the field. « Il faisoit lever cette malheureuse Princesse devant le jour & la forçoit d'aller dans la forêt chercher des herbes. Ensuite il les lui faisoit porter dans ses étables pour les donner à des Monstres qu'il y retenoit. Les Bêtes étant engraisées du suc de ces Herbes, étoient d'un prix infini » (288). Kidnapping and enslavement are the most immediate interpretation of this passage but we might consider another allegorical interpretation of this often portrayed dynamic. A monstrous employer abuses his worker in a Keynesian sweatshop ethic that offers a more modern economic appraisal, quite precocious (and far-fetched) for the 17th century author.

To assuage her misery, Aigre Douce offers the princess this advice: « si par complaisance, elle pouvoit gagner son cœur, rien ne manqueroit à son bon-heur...à gagner l'amitié de l'ogre » (287-8). Perhaps well-meaning, or perhaps intended to keep the poor princess servile and obsequious, the advice is ultimately meaningless, since « rien ne touchoit ce cœur insensible à la pitié » (288). And despite Patientine's efforts, « L'ogre... ne trouvoit jamais qu'elle eût assez travaillé & la grondoit incessamment de n'en pas faire davantage » (289). Again there is reference to a worker-employee relationship. The social allegorical interpretation seems unlikely to be intended by the author, however, as Madame d'Auneuil was a countess and thus unlikely to denounce her advantageous socio-economic position.

More likely, Auneuil intended this relationship between Infacio and Patientine to allegorize unhappy marriages between abusive husbands and abused wives. It is the male-female dynamic in which monstrously brutish husbands, such as Infacio, imprison wives, such as Patientine, without a means of escape. Such men who cruelly abuse their

delicate and unfortunate wives who were misled into a forced marriage in the first place are represented here in ogre form. This allegorical interpretation is also evocative of humanizing Infacio because the allegory would simply be ineffective were he inhuman and incapable of marriage to a woman.

The contrast between male and female ogres becomes particularly apparent with the juxtaposition of Infacio and Aigre-douce. On the one hand, there is kindness and pity from the ogress: « Du moins, disoit Aigre-douce, je lui donnerois une nourriture qui pût la soutenir dans de si penibles emplois » (290). On the other hand, there is only abuse and scorn from the male equivalent: « L'ogre en fureur, vomit contre cette Princesse, toutes les injures les plus horribles, & jura de lui ôster la seule consolation qu'elle avoit » (291). The theme of female victimization at the hands of the male is clear in this relationship. It also recalls the French tradition in which ogresses tend to be more human than ogres. It also aligns this relationship with those found in other French tales wherein the ogress is typically portrayed as more humane than ogres.

When a wandering prince aptly named Courageux happens by just in time to defend Patientine from a marauding lion and is subsequently mauled, he is rehabilitated by « Infacio...touché de pitié pour la première fois de sa vie » (294). Though the ogre will pay for his lapse in characteristic greed and cruelty, his facilitation of the royal human relationship was all but inevitable in typical fairy tale tradition, as was his conveniently timely departure, allowing the couple time to develop an amorous relationship: « Dans ce temps-là l'ogre fut obligé de s'absenter avec ses soeurs pour quelques jours » (295) The pressing business of ogres often forces them away, though the business is never described. Suffice to say, it is simply a necessary, if contrived, plot

device common to ogre tales. As the antagonists' departure remains unaccounted for in Propp's morphology tables, it might remain unique to the French tradition. This plot strategy is often found, for examples, in the fabliaux where the husband's departure on business facilitates the wife's love affair. As we will see, Infacio's jealousy re-inforces this French intra-literary link.

Similarly, the sudden departure is matched by an equally sudden return: « Infacio revint plutôt que l'on ne l'attendoit & trouvant la femme auprès du malade, il entra en fureur & l'accable de reproches outrageans...& son avarice se joignant à sa jalousie, lui fit défendre Patientine de plus fournir les choses nécessaires à la vie du Prince » With this passage, Infacio reveals another negative facet to his personality: that of a jealous husband. Additionally, these are clues to suggest that their marriage is unconsummated. Apparently, Patientine and Infacio sleep in separate quarters: « Sa caverne étoit si près de celle de l'ogre » (296). Seventeenth century propriety would decree it so, as no prince could desire a princess sullied by a lowly ogre, even an ambiguously human one such as Infacio. It thus becomes Courageux's goal to « tirer la Princesse d'un si dur esclavage » (296). Literally, this makes sense, as Patientine is reduced to slave labor, but this line may equally serve as a metaphor for marriage. Here the author's perceptions may be more applicable as she might have condemned loveless marriages as Aulnoy was wont to do in her fairy tales (v.i.). Perhaps it is no coincidence that both female French authors make use of this allegory whereas their male counterparts (Perrault and Mailly) do not accentuate it as much.

To preserve his claim as a husband (and overseer), Infacio magically summons a cloud of fog to obfuscate his wife from those who would rescue her: Courageux, and also

a fairy conscripted to the cause. Infacio's magical ability, like his reclusive nature, aligns him more closely to Basile's ogres than Perrault's. The shape-shifting magic, however, recalls the transformational magic found in other French ogre tales that aligns them with the loup-garou in medieval French literature. The effect of Infacio's magic is marvelous: « son antre de nuages si épais, qu'il la rendoit invisible aux yeux du monde ; & changeant les deux Sœurs en Monstres ; ils les mis à la porte de la caverne » (300). Willing to sacrifice seemingly anything in order to maintain his wealth, Infacio does not hesitate to polymorph his sisters, perhaps secure in the knowledge that he can change them back at need.

But despite his magical prowess, no ogre is a match for a fairy, who saves the proverbial day yet again: « Il ne faut pas une moindre puissance que la mienne, pour tirer Patientine des fers d'Infacio. Il a employé tout l'art des Enfers à former un enchantement qui le rend invisible à nos yeux, l'Avarice lui a donné ce conseil ; mais je rendrai son pouvoir inutile » (304). Here is the classic good vs. evil schism wherein, of course, good wins, thereby relegating Infacio to the role of 'evil.' This is far beyond some squabble between neighbors. It is a duel to the death between bitter enemies, representative of their respective kinds. It is also one of the few occasions where readers witness a magical duel between fairy and ogre. Note also the ogre's use of "Enfers" as the source of his powers, reaffirming his link to the underworld of myth. In opposition the fairy, this would therefore represent the divine, implying a link between the fantastic and the celestial in that both are intended represent goodness and justice.

Perhaps it is not a fair contest, as the fairy also makes use of animals to serve her in deposing the ogre, including tigers, deer and eagles (305). The service of these exotic

animals may hinge upon their love for fairy or equally upon their hatred of ogres, as was often is the case in other tales.

And again, in typical fashion, the ogre is duped by the hero. This time, however, Infacio is not scorned as a complete fool, as he was capable of tricking Patientine and the entire court. It is only through the semi-divine intervention of the fairy that Infacio falls, by preying upon his lust for wealth in the form of gold: « elle laissa tomber la chaudière dont l'eau & les herbes qu'elle contenoit, n'eurent pas plutôt touché la terre que l'on vit la caverne pleine d'or brillant...mais à mesure qu'il le touchoit, il redevenoit ce qu'il avoit été » (307). Such gullibility in regards to the fairy recalls Ysengrin's ill-fated intellectual relationship to Renard.

In the end, of course, good triumphs over evil, but what is particularly interesting is the allusion not to Christian divine justice, but rather to « la justice des dieux » (308) rendered by the Fée, who condemns the ogre : « tu employeras tes jours infortunés à amasser des richesses qui disparaîtront dès que tu les auras touchées ». In this story the fairy is judge jury and executioner, who has the power to alter the ogre's intrinsic state and magical power: « tu n'auras plus ce pouvoir dangereux ; ce venin ne pourra se repandre que sur ceux qui te ressemblent » (308). Here it is the fairy and not the Lord who giveth and taketh away. Though Infacio does not receive the death sentence often conferred to ogres, he is effectively removed, allowing Patientine and Courageux their happy ending. But what is most striking is that the happy ending for this female fairy tale writer, like the other one, involves a happy marriage. As for the unrepentant ogre, « il passe ses jours infortunés dans une rage continuelle. Tel est dans les Enfers le

malheureux Tantale » (310), a final reference to the Underworld and its lupine associations

To summarize the innovations Auneuil offers in this remarkable tale, the following points are noteworthy. There is an explicit, direct link between the ogre and the underworld without the intermediary link of the giant or titan, a link which simultaneously validates the etymological origin of the word 'ogre' and reaffirms his originally infernal nature, much as it also evokes the medieval bestiaries' portrayal of the wolf as a metaphor for the devil. Perhaps it is due to such antiquated depiction that the second innovation becomes necessary. There is extended and multi-faceted characterization of the ogre, perhaps as explanation for the infernal side. Indeed, Infacio enjoys more development than perhaps any other ogre in 17th century French literature, even among more verbose tales. The coming together of chthonic association and elaboration of character may simply be a coincidence, but even if it is, it is a satisfying one for lovers of myth (and ogres). Part of this multi-dimensionality is the addition of another negative dimension: that of a tyrannical, abusive husband, further linking the ogre with mankind, though in a brutal sort of way. Auneuil further calumnies this ogre in juxtaposition with his ogress sisters who are relatively benevolent, making a distinction between the genders within the ogre species itself. The author also relies on names to distinguish her characters. She reserves positive monikers, e.g. Patientine and Courageux for the humans, ambiguous names for the ogresses Aigre-douce and Bizarrine, and a vaguely negative epithet for the ogre Infacio. Finally, Auneuil makes use of some more traditional ogre traits. Infacio uses transformation magic to kidnap and enslave a human princess in his sunless abode until he is overcome by a fairy. His downfall is the windfall

for all other characters and catalyses their happy ending. The essence of the ogre–human relationship in this tale remains one of conflict and ogre aggression against humans. In this case however, it is the ogre’s attempt to enslave a human that justifies his overthrow at the hands of the human fairy alliance. Altogether, the portrait of Infacio contains many humanizing and de-humanizing, i.e. lupine traits, making him a prime illustration of lycomorphism.

III B 4: Mailly

Of all the characteristics that serve to sever the ogre from readers' sympathy and thereby render him an antagonist, perhaps none is more damning than the author's lack of character development. With only a minimum of detail penned, the author can offer readers little to no clue about the ogre's background, motivation and mentality. Perhaps this interest is a more modern invention, though the fact remains, oftentimes authors failed to provide as much background for their antagonists as they do for their protagonists. Such is the case in the next French fairy tale of the 17th century, Le Chevalier (Jean) de Mailly's *La Princesse Couronnée par les Fées*. In this tale, we observe an undifferentiated group of anonymous ogres rather than a distinct individual. Not only is detailed individual characterization absent from this tale, but additionally, this group receives only the barest of peripheral development or even consideration. This consideration, moreover, is predominantly negative, although a modicum of ambiguity is present. Clearly, Mailly is relying heavily on readers' pre-existing negative conceptions regarding ogres to suffice as their background while simultaneously supplying ample justification to desire their downfall, thus implying that there is sufficient ogre prejudice already in his contemporaneous society.

First and foremost, Mailly presents a single ogre instigating antagonism to the neighboring fairies and humans who were heretofore coexisting quite harmoniously:

Un ogre effroyable habitué dans les mêmes bois, faisoit, il y avoit long-tems, la guerre à ses voisins, & ne se repaissant que de carnage, avoit dévoré une ou deux personnes qui appartenoient aux fées ses voisines, ce qui étoit contre le droit des gens ; car il y avoit toujours eu quelque traité d'alliance entre les fées et les ogres, à peu près comme nous en avons avec les mahométans, pour la nécessité du commerce » (143).

Now in addition to the traditionally ascribed characteristics of devouring human flesh, inhabitation of the forest and general animosity between ogre-kind and mankind typically found in Italian sources but not entirely absent in French sources, Mailyly introduces an additional level of antagonism concerning this ogre: treachery. Having violated a treaty of peace among the various denizens of the wood, the ogre disrupts commerce, betrays trust, and provokes a war of aggression that will devolve into a war of annihilation. The effect that this description has on the ogre's characterization is primarily one of humanization.

By explicit reference to "Mahométans," Mailyly distinctly forges a link between Muslims and ogres in this tale, yet another hint of the ogres' intrinsic human nature. The intended effect can have only one result in the recipient Catholic French audience: corresponding animosity in a tradition that dates back to the *Song of Roland*. Indeed, many (but not all) of the antagonists in the *Song of Roland* are characterized in terms similar to those used to describe ogres, as sorcerers, hideous, loud and barbarous brutes lacking any refinement or culture, even, as appears in this tale, as "wretched traitors" (Burgess 59) such as Ganelon. To complete the allegory, if ogres are analogous to Muslims, the human and fairy alliance would have to represent the Frankish-Celestial alliance. In both cases, humans and their superhuman allies work together in what they believe to be a just cause in defeating their mutual adversary. If this allegory is the extent of Mailyly's characterization of ogres, then it is no wonder that 17th century French audiences were so ready to view ogres in a negative light.

Despite the ogres' propensity for violence and aggression, they are no match for the human-fairy alliance and quickly and definitively succumb to their combined attack.

« Les fées irritées contre cette détestable nation, avoient résolu de l’exterminer, & les ogres après quelques rencontres où ils avoient toujours eu du désavantage, se trouvant inférieurs en puissance & en enchantemens aux fées leurs ennemis, étoient venus demander retraite dans le château de la princesse » (143). The ogres here resemble the Moors of the *Song of Roland* as well as the ogres of other Fairy Tales as much for their animosity as for their defeat. Ogres never seem to win any battle in any tale in which they find themselves. Furthermore, the vanquished party has to humble itself and beg succor from the victors whom they had originally antagonized. The ogre here has been reduced to a living joke, a mere trifle not to be taken seriously. They are not to be feared in this case, but rather pitied and sheltered. They are no longer seen as ravenous monsters but as meek and cowed beasts, tamed and domesticated.

And though these vanquished remnants are in fact accorded mercy, unchecked prejudice still afflicts popular sentiment. They are referred to as: « la mauvaise race...qui n’étoient capables d’aucune humanité » (144). According to the narrator, it appears that ogres are of a singular variety without exception, and that this variety is a barbarous one bereft of any positive attribute. Judging from this passage, it seems that ogres are a “race” apart lacking in humanity, even as an entirely different species.

Yet this predominantly negative portrait is checked by a single ambiguous reference, as « des hommes qui lui avoient paru malheureux » (144). The use of the word ‘hommes’ is particularly interesting because it again forces us to reconsider the nature of ogres as human or not. Their true nature is not specified in this tale. Indeed, the tale only offers further ambiguity on the matter, simultaneously suggesting that the ogres are poor refugees, hunted to extinction by fairies, as well as monsters justly sentenced to death for

their violent incompatibility with humanity. This is the last the text speaks of them, thus leaving the reader with unanswered questions. However, the prevailing atmosphere instilled by the author leaves a distinctly negative impression of the ogres heightened all the more by allusion to “Mahométans.” Maily’s most telling characterization of ogre-kind may well be his lack of narrating their full fate or character. The ogres here are minor characters, comparatively insignificant compared to the fairies and the humans themselves and unworthy of fuller character development. They fulfill their role simply by being defeated. They are merely an obstacle, and a means to an end. According to Maily, they are straw men who offer an easy victory to their adversaries. Like mosquitoes or other pests, ogres are scarcely worthy of human attention in this tale, except for when it comes time to “exterminate” them.

To summarize the ogres’ characterization more succinctly, it suffices to recall the following: Maily relies on pre-existing anti-ogre prejudice of his readers to supply the ogres’ characterization which is otherwise lacking in the tale. What characterization he does supply is mostly negative, but not without hints of humanity. Ogres, through their treachery to man’s peace treaty, resemble Ganelon and the Saracens of the *Song of Roland*. And also like the Saracens, the ogres are unable to achieve victory through force of arms against the alliance between man and the supernatural. Finally, ogres are considered an “evil race” perhaps distinct from *homo sapiens*. The relationship between man and ogre, according to Maily, then, is one of uneasy but temporary truce inevitably betrayed by a treacherous assault that leads to a war that is inevitably disastrous for the ogres. Geographic separation between the two species is pronounced and goes without saying. The essence of the relationship between ogre and man remains one of conflict and

ogre aggression against humans. In this case, it is the ogres' unjust treachery that justifies their overthrow in war by human-fairy allies. The state of war is one of the more unfortunate human characteristics, as no animals except ants are known to engage in warfare, especially brought on by any concept so complicated as treachery. Thus essentially human in nature, the ogres of this tale display their lycomorphism via their violence and non-Christian associations, though Muslim in this case, rather than diabolical. At the heart of this tale is yet another social issue: a very real concern for peace in a war-ravaged time.

III C 1: La Barbe Bleue et Le Prince Guerini

Thus far I have studied ogres in the French Fairy Tale canon in a coordinated collection that might now be dubbed instead Ogre Tales. For in his *Morphology of the Folk Tale*, Vladimir Propp points out how the term ‘fairy tale’ is limiting, since it suggests only stories about fairies to the exclusion of other non-human characters. He instead uses the much broader term ‘folk tale’ in his analysis: “Quite a large number of legends, individual tales about animals, and isolated novellas display the same structure. The term ‘fairy,’ therefore, ought to be replaced by another” (99-100). As a matter of clarity and contrast, I have deliberately reserved select antagonists from the larger scope of Fairy Tales for a new chapter. These are villains that, while not ogres per se, resemble ogres to such an extent that comparison and contrast is not only useful, but necessary to this study. However, simply labeling an antagonist with different nomenclature, even though he might retain many prominent ogrish characteristics does not necessarily create a separate villain on any but a nominal and superficial level. The following villains come from the same authors as the other ogre tales, so ignorance of ogre traits cannot account for the difference in labeling. These authors, namely Charles Perrault and le Chevalier de Mably, deliberately chose that their villains *not* be ogres for unknown reasons. But behind this veneer of labeling, in form and in behavior these antagonists remain fundamentally ogres. If they are not every bit as ogrish as their more specifically named counterparts, then they are strikingly similar, hence the sobriquet: ‘quasi-ogres.’

The most famous story of Perrault that involves a quasi-ogre is *La Barbe bleue*. This tale appears in Perrault’s *Contes*, reprinted by Gilbert Rouger, from which all citations come, unless otherwise noted. The namesake of this tale is supposedly a human

being. While not an ogre per se, he is not entirely satisfactorily human either, as he is somehow capable of growing a blue beard without the use of hair dyes. Perhaps he has a drop or two of Fairy blood in his gene pool somewhere, but Perrault offers only “misfortune” as explanation. « Par malheur cet homme avait la barbe bleue : cela le rendait si laid et si terrible qu’il n’était ni femme ni fille qui ne s’enfuit de devant lui » (123). According to Verena Kast in the work *Witches, Ogres and the Devil’s Daughter*, this bizarre beard can be better understood through the fashion of the time. She states: “In the sixteenth century a man whose black beard shone with bluish highlights was called a ‘barbe bleue.’ Such men were regarded as womanizers” (92). Perhaps Perrault simply latched onto a popular trend of the recent past and there is nothing supernatural about the beard at all. The womanizing element adds to the ogre’s hunger drive in a lustful sense, much like the wolf in *Le Petit Chaperon Rouge* or in the medieval bestiaries. Though mentioned specifically as a man by nature, his perhaps inhuman beard is a not so subtle foreshadowing of his inhuman behavior. Not to say that humans cannot be brutal in their own right, but Bluebeard’s brutality far exceeds all but the most vicious of humans such as Dracula, Bathory, de Sade, de Rais, et al. and hence necessitates lupine analogy.

This beard ultimately serves as a deformity device, rendering him not only untouchable in human company but also unworthy of a proper name. Once again, we have an antagonist who is known only as a function of his monstrosity, a commonly used slur useful for propagandizing his inhumanity. This facilitates the reader’s propensity to regard him with antipathy and to consider his death as a potential windfall for mankind. Such was almost always the case with ogres as well. Philip Lewis, in his work, *Seeing*

Through the Mother Goose Tales: Visual Turns in the Writings of Charles Perrault,

furthermore, offers the following comparison between Barbe bleue and ogre-kind:

[Barbe bleue] has often been perceived as a variant on the ogre figure because his capacity to persist in unacceptable behavior seems to depend on resources that the ogres of the “Le Petit Poucet” and “Le Chat botté” also enjoy: he has great wealth and, through his magic key, a strange relationship to supernatural powers (173).

Some of the key traits Lewis mentions will reappear frequently, not only as concerns Barbe bleue, but all ogres and ogre-figures. This is not coincidence, for these are among the principal hallmarks of this villainous archetype.

This unfortunate beard is also used by Winfried Menninghaus to draw a connection between the human and the bestial in his work *In Praise of Nonsense: Kant and Bluebeard*: “The beard may be viewed as a sign of virility and (animal) strength as well as of wisdom and dignity...no magician worth the name can get by without a beard” (53). The significance of this beard may not reside entirely in its color but in its very existence, as it carries with it certain indelible connotations of animals’ fur coats and magicians’ extra-human potential. Both are viable explanations for Bluebeard’s not-quite-human persona and his inhumane acts. However one wishes to interpret the beard’s nature or function, it is evocative of characteristics commonly attributed to ogres.

Bluebeard is equally noteworthy for his vast wealth, rendering him a palatable husband only to the boldest (or greediest) of women willing to endure this odious man in order to share his wealth: “il estoit une fois une home qui avoit de belles maisons à la Ville & à la Campagne, de la vaisselle d’or & d’argent, des meubles en broderie, & des carosses tout dorez” (Rouger 23). Oddly, these are the first words used to introduce him. He is primarily known as a rich but repulsive man, yet not an eater of man as are true

ogres. His possession of wealth, particularly gold and mansions, however, puts him on par with typically wealthy and landed ogres, such as the ogres from *Le Chat botté* and *La Belle au bois dormant*.

And as is also often the case with ogres, e.g. *Histoire de la Princesse Patientine*, Bluebeard must leave on unspecified business, a convenient opportunity exploited by his not quite kidnapped but then again not quite eager (let us say *coerced*) bride to further the plot. In his absence, the new bride discovers a grisly secret chamber of many deaths: « Le plancher estoit tout couvert de sang caillé & que dans ce sang se miroient les corps de plusieurs femmes mortes & attachées le long des murs (c'étoit toutes les femmes que la Barbe bleuë avoit épousées & qu'il avoit égorgées l'une après l'autre » (ibid. 25). Here, unlike typical ogres, Blue Beard has no interest in devouring his ill-gotten “char frache.” According to the Petit Robert, such butchery has also been memorialized in the commonly held epithet of Napoleon, “l'ogre corse,” for his having gotten butchered so many of France's young men in his wars of conquest. If a man responsible for great bloodshed can be labeled an ogre, then certainly Bluebeard merits the moniker.

The exact reason why Bluebeard butchered these unfortunate souls is unclear. It could be argued that his actions are even more barbarous than the ogres' actions, which might be excused for the less illegitimate reason of acquiring nourishment. Bluebeard, one must suppose, murders his wives for sport, or perhaps only for their disobedience. Then, for some unspecified reason, he keeps the corpses as grim trophies in a private chamber. Perhaps he often returns thence to look on and enjoy the sight as a serial killer might. Of course, had Bluebeard, a human, actually eaten the poor women, his consumption would be considered cannibalism, a far more serious transgression than the

ogres' frequent acts of devouring mankind. Bluebeard's cannibalism might be the only act more heinous than his current crimes. In any event, the man is a true monster who is at least as ogreish as any ogre.

At least one other scholar, Marina Warner, sees the commonality between Barbe Bleue and the typical ogre. In her work *From the Beast to the Blonde*, she states: the metaphor of devouring often stands in for sex: ogres like Bluebeard eat their wives, we are told, even though the story itself reveals their bodies hanging whole in the secret chamber" (257). Hunger and lust are often associated, and with good reason; they are among the most powerful drives of man and also of wolf, as portrayed in medieval bestiaries. Man's reaction to these drives, in turn, delineates his nature and corresponding status in literature: if he restrains these drives, he remains a man. If he indulges them, he becomes something monstrous, whether it is called an ogre or a wolf or Barbe bleue.

As a case in point, Warner alludes to Perrault's hypothetical source for the Barbe Bleue story: Gilles de Rais, a felon sadist notorious for the butchery of children. Simonsen recounts also how "L'abbé Boissard a voulu voir comme source de *Barbe-Bleue* Gilles de Rais et les légendes locales qui se sont constituées par la suite de ses crimes" (68). Krell also equates this notorious criminal with ogrekind: "A case in point is Gilles de Rais, fifteenth century nobleman and a French historical prototype of the ogre" (79). To support this conviction, it should be noted that de Rais' victims were also children, the preferred prey of the typical French ogre. And as with ogres, magic is associated with the villain. Warner concludes on a similar note: "the ogre has metamorphosed in popular culture for adults, in the mass murderer, the kidnapper, the serial killer" (269). The "metamorphosis" magic is another characteristic of French ogres.

The link between key traits of Perrault's ogres, Bluebeard, de Rais and wolves bears further investigation. To say the least, significant evidence abounds linking these characters.

It is worthwhile to wonder why Bluebeard bothers to give the key to the chamber of horrors to his new bride and practically invites her to discover his horrible secrets. Perhaps it can be understood as a test of her loyalty and obedience. Perhaps he actively hopes that she will fail the test and supply him with a pretext (in his own warped mind) to butcher her as well. Clearly, Bluebeard has no regard for any of his wives. He seems simply to enjoy the act of slaughter per se.

Having failed the test, however, the unnamed bride seeks to hide her discovery and thereby prolong her survival at the hands of this blood-thirsty monster. In order to prevent him from discovering her knowledge and betrayal of his trust, she attempts in vain to wipe clean the key that bears bloody testament of her ingress: "Ayant remarqué que la clef du cabinet étoit tachée de sang, elle l'essuia deux ou trois fois, mais le sang ne s'en alloit point...car la clef estait Fée & il n'y avoit pas moyen de la nettoyer tout-à-fait" (26). Here we see that Bluebeard is not without his share of magical items. French ogres may have their Seven League Boots, but Bluebeard has his fairy key. No humans have magical items unless they are given them by a supernatural source, usually a Fairy, or steal them from an ogre, as in *Le Petit Poucet*. Whence then Bluebeard acquired his magical key is a mystery. Perhaps he has dark dealings with ogres, Witches, Fairies or other denizens of the world of *merveil*. This would account for his matching brutality as well. Perhaps that was the nature of his unspecified business afield. If so, his blood-thirst either earned him their respect and company, or it is a consequence of their fraternization.

Ultimately, Bluebeard is a bearer of violence at least as much as he is a human. Such might also be said of ogres.

Assured by the bloody key of his wife's treachery, Bluebeard accords her a few minutes to prepare herself before her death. At three intervals, he screams at her to hurry up and finish so that he may add her to his morbid collection in the secret chamber. At each iteration, his rage manifests in increasing volume, until finally, his terrible cries shake the very house, a trait typical of ogres more so than of humans: "La Barbe bleüe se mit à crier si fort que toute la maison en trembla" (Perrault 28). No human could be literally capable of this deed without use of hyperbole. In that case, the volume of ogres might also be said to be hyperbolic.

It should also be noted again how this tale can be understood on a "collective" or metaphorical level, as suggested by Verena Kast. Though unique to Perrault, this is not the first instance in which an ogreish husband oppresses an unfortunate young woman coerced into a marriage. Faced with death at the hands of her murderously controlling spouse, her only defense is to destroy him before he destroys her. This act she accomplishes with the help of her family, both brothers and a sister. However, this tale is not an indictment of marriage in general because in the end, the young wife does marry a young man who helps her forget her experiences with Bluebeard. Again, happy marriage and peace are the issues emphasized in this tale, a reflection of the author's contemporary society. To the brutish husband alone is reserved the sobriquet of ogre, whether per se or through a similarly unpleasant epithet such as Bluebeard.

Finally, Bluebeard meets his bloody end at the hands of his brothers-in-law who come to the rescue of their sister. Interestingly, it is not a fair prince who saves the

princess. For this common girl, there is no such noble hero. She must rely on her siblings to care for her, which they certainly, definitively, do: « Les deux frères le poursuivaient de si près qu'ils l'attrapaient avant qu'il pût gagner le perron. Ils lui passèrent leurs épées à travers du corps et le laissèrent mort » (Rouger 28). Uncharacteristically, Bluebeard dies by the force of man's hand and by the trickery of his bride, who stalls for time to allow her brothers to arrive in time to rescue her. His death, however, is not the result of animals or his own doing, but rather of man. Though ogres often fall victim to the tricks of their captured wives, they are never vanquished in direct combat with unaided humans. It might be said in Bluebeard's case, though, that it was not a fair fight. First of all, there are two brothers. Second of all, each brother is a professional soldier: a dragoon and a musketeer. Third, they are armed with swords and rifles. Bluebeard fights alone without the benefit of military training or armament. Therein lies another compatibility of Bluebeard with ogres.

The last of the French tales with an ogre-like antagonist comes from le Chevalier de Mailly: *Le Prince Guerini*, reproduced here as it appears in *Nouveau Cabinet des Fées*. In this tale, our protagonists are pitted against a group of combative giants. In this tale, the reader is introduced to giants as dangerous and terrible enemies that must be vanquished by battle. It is the protagonists' duty to: « combattre des géans qui faisoient trembler tous ses sujets, & lesquels, après avoir de tems en tems fait de grands désordres dans la plaine, se retiroient dans les montagnes, où personne n'osait les aller chercher » (81-82). Giants in this case are couched initially in terms of agents of disorder and chaos who must be stopped for the good of the entire kingdom. Unlike ogres, they make their dwelling not in forest, but in the mountains. But for both giants and traditional ogres,

their home is in the wilderness and far removed from human society. In contrast to some of the French ogres who occasionally frequented the court, giants inspire fear in the subjects of the king, perhaps because of their bellicosity or perhaps because of their intrinsic gigantic nature. No other clue or reason is given to explain why they make men tremble so. Regardless, their fearsomeness puts them on the level of ogres in the estimation of their human adversaries.

Mailly underscores the giants' cruelty as he continues his narration of the sad state of the human kingdom beleaguered by the giants. The heroes are to « délivrer ses états d'ennemis si cruels » (82). Here we learn that the giants seem to be winning the war. This is not surprising since ogre-kin cannot normally be defeated by man by unaided force of arms. What is more, we see that giants directly threaten the state of a king, another recurring trait among ogres. To extend this metaphor, it might be argued that any who oppose the king are like ogres. This idea, pleasing to any monarch, especially France's contemporaneous king, Louis XIV, might very well be plausible coming as it does from the pen of Monsieur le chevalier de Mailly.

And as is also the case with some ogres, there is no hope of cohabitation with humanity. The two species are mutually exclusive. It therefore becomes the duty as well as the desire of the heroes to utterly extirpate the giants: « les deux chevaliers étrangers vouloient enterprendre d'exterminer les géans » (82). This need is reiterated on page 84 as well: “détruire la race des géans qui désoloient ses états, ou du moins de les chasser bien loin” (84) The verb choices of ‘exterminate’ and ‘destroy,’ rather than merely conquer or repulse, is significant because it implies that the best recourse available for human safety and peace of mind is complete divorce from even the potential of ogre

contact. Failing total annihilation, geographical separation and isolation might be a distant second best alternative, but that subject is never even broached. Either way, there is no question that the two groups cannot live together. Humans and giants are in constant competition for their very survival. They may literally be fighting for their lives, not only as individual warriors, but also as a whole species.

As to the exact nature of these giants, Mailly offers only military logistics, rather than an anthropological study such as Aulnoy or Auneuil offered. The following lengthy description serves more as reconnaissance than as characterization:

Les géans étoient en grand nombre, & un seul étoit capable de mettre en fuir une troupe comme celle qui les alloit chercher. C'étoient des hommes d'une taille & d'une force prodigeuse ; ils étoient même d'une mine si affreuse, qu'on ne pouvoit seulement soutenir leurs regards ; ils étoient armés chacun d'une massue, faite d'une grosse branche d'arbre ; & ils n'avoient jamais trouvé hommes, ni animaux, qui eussent pu leur résister ; ils passoient la nuit dans des cavernes, dont ils fermoient l'entrée avec de grands rochers qu'ils manioient comme il leur plaisoit ; ils se repassoient de sang & de carnage, & ne portoient pour tout habit que le peaux des lions & des ours qu'ils avoient vaincus. Voilà les ennemis » (85).

The above passage mentions directly the military advantages of the giants over their human adversaries: their stronger numbers, their individual prowess, their larger stature, their superior strength, their capacity to intimidate, their enormous weapons and lastly, their protective sleeping habits. The latter quality might well be an allusion to Polyphemus of *The Odyssey*, or any cyclopean monster that dwells in caves and needs shelter from men or the sun. What is of particular importance is Mailly's use of the word "hommes" in depicting the giants, which explicitly argues that giants are not a race apart, but merely humans who are so monstrous that they are best described in metaphorical terms equating them with mythological creatures. Furthermore, these men are known to wear the skins of lions and bears. This animalistic outward appearance recalls the link

between these giants and ferocious predators not unlike wolves. For that matter, human berserkers donned the skins of fierce predators when they engaged in combat, so in that regard, the giants' clothing can be seen as human, engaging human beliefs that characteristics associated with these fierce animals can be transferred via their skins. Certainly, both wolves and giants are quite fierce enemies.

Despite the daunting battle before them, the human knights endeavor to meet their enemy on the field of battle, but only daring to do so with magical weapons given to them by a Fairy: « ce fut ce qui causa la perte des géans » (85). The Fairy's magical arms give them their only hope of beating these giants. Again we see an alliance between humans and fairies against the ogre-kin. When threatened with this alliance, the Giants are massacred: « ils furent percés de coups de lance, & se retirèrent dans leurs cavernes avec des cris épouvantables » (86). Here the victory does not belong to man alone, but also to the fairies who provided the magical weapons.

The conquest is total. Even the giants realize that there is no hope for victory through force of arms against this superior foe. And as with *La Princesse Couronné par les Fées*, the vanquished foes become pathetic losers suing for pardon: « ceux qui avoient évité la mort s'étant assemblés la nuit pour tenir conseil, firent un signal au point du jour, avec une manière de drapeau blanc, pour demander la paix » (86). Once ferocious monsters to be feared throughout a kingdom of men, these Giants have been stripped of their power, domesticated and cowed, dependant on the clemency of humans for their very survival.

In very human terms, the giants offer peace: « deux géans s'avancèrent aussi, & offrirent de la part de tout leur corps, de se retirer fort avant dans les montagnes, & de

donner des sûretés qu'ils n'entreroient jamais dans la plaine, pourvu qu'on jurât de les laisser les maîtres dans une étendue de montagnes qu'ils demandoient » (86-7). To go one step further towards humanity, the giants might sign a peace treaty. In short, they are quite humanized. Humbled in defeat, their pride deflated, the giants are not so different from men after all. Being giant then, in its metaphorical sense, here includes the connotation of pride as well as prowess.

Finally, humiliatingly, the beaten giants must accede to the terms imposed by their conquering human enemies: « aux conditions que deux des principaux géans se laisseroient conduire enchaînés jusqu'à la cour ; qu'ils y demeureroient quelques années en ôtage, & que Guerini pût faire emporter, pour marque de sa victoire, les têtes de ceux des géans qui étoient morts de leurs blessures, ce qu'on lui accorda » (87). One cannot help but wonder what happened to the human insistence on utterly exterminating the Giants. Apparently, a sudden twinge of mercy made the victorious humans forget their earlier prerogative.

The key idea that links this work to its predecessors is the supremacy of man over monsters. Man dictates terms to even mighty giants. But this is possible only with the help of the Fée. This theme is hardly unique in literature of any time period or locale. Man and a supernatural ally pitting themselves against the old order of chaos is a common theme not only in Fairy Tales, but also in mythology. Going beyond a level of simple plot there is another, deeper interpretation, that of progress and supremacy of humanity overcoming a barbarous past. The formula has not changed in centuries: Evil is greater than Man, but God plus Man are greater than Evil. Such is often, though not always, the case. Many Fairy Tales portray Man as greater than Evil, but only by virtue

of his intelligence. Yet one might understand “intelligence” in Cartesian terms, that is, a gift from God and therefore an inexorable unity with the divine that never fails to conquer.

To conclude this chapter, it is necessary to note the following regarding the relationship between the quasi-ogre and mankind: Perrault’s human character, Bluebeard, though essentially human, is extremely ogre-like. He shares the ogre’s propensity for violence, magical items and is physically repulsive. He effectively kidnaps a wife, and threatens her with carnal violence, associating himself with lupine sexuality. And like the wolf, he is tricked by his more intelligent victim-to-be. He is not, however, a man-eater, perhaps because this characteristic ogre trait would make him a cannibal. Because he represents a diminished threat to man (he will not eat them), he can be defeated by mankind unassisted by supernatural allies, thereby firmly rooting him in the realm of the human. Maily’s giants appear perhaps even more human than Bluebeard does. They do not share the ogre’s traditional associations of riches, transformational magic and interaction in human society, but on the other hand, they cannot be defeated by humans without the assistance of a supernatural force, a fairy. The overlap between man, ogre and quasi-ogre is considerable, and can be corroborated by the tables and corresponding analyses found at the end. A comparison between these giants and their ogre counterparts can be found in the quantitative comparison tables below, wherein eight traits are found to be in common. Furthermore, the author’s labeling of the giants as men and their lack of man-eating tendencies could be used to corroborate the case for Maily’s giants to be considered more similar to man than monsters. If this is the case, it reinforces our theory that French ogres, the model for Maily’s and Perrault’s quasi-ogres, are likened more to

humans than beasts. As humans, however, they retain their bestial and violent instincts, and retain their adversarial function, also demonstrating the application of lycomorphism.

III D: Ogre Characteristic Analysis

The following is the list of the Fairy Tales, perhaps more aptly called Ogre Tales, considered in this work. Of the seventy-nine tales considered, those that represent an ogre appear in bold face type and those that represent an ogre-like antagonist (quasi-ogre) appear underlined.

Charles Perrault (8):

La Belle au Bois dormant

Le Petit Chaperon Rouge

La Barbe bleue

Le Chat botté

Les Fées

Cendrillon

Riquet à la Houpe

Le Petit Poucet

La Comtesse d'Aulnoy (26): Babiole

Finette Cendron

Gracieuse et Percinet

La Princess Printanière

La Princesse Rosette

L'Orangier et L'Abeille

Le Grenouille bienfaisante

L'oiseau bleu

Le Dauphin

La Fortunée

Le Prince Lutin

La Bonne petite souris

Le Mouton

La Belle aux cheveux d'or

Le Nain jaune

La Biche au bois

La Princesse Carpillon

Belle-Belle ou le Chevalier Fortuné

Serpentin vert

La Chatte blanche

Le Rameau d'or

Le Pigeon et la Colombe

Le Prince Marcassin

La Princesse Belle-Etoile

TheWild Boar

Chevalier de Mailly (11) :
Blanche Belle
Le Roi Magicien
Le Prince Roger
Fortunio
Le Prince Guerini
La Reine de l'Île des Fleurs
Le Favori des Fées
Le Bienfaisant, ou Quiribirini
La Princesse Couronnée par les Fées
La Supercherie malheureuse
L'Île Inaccessible

La Comtesse d'Auneuil (18):
La Tyrannie des Fées détruite
Histoire de Cléonice
Histoire de la Princesse Mélicerte
Agatie, Princesse des Scythes
La Princesse Léonice
Le Prince Curieux

Elmedore de Grenade
Histoire de la Princesse Zamée, Prince Almanzon (sp?)
Histoire du Prince Elmedor de Grenade, de la Princesse
Alzayde
Histoire de Zulmayde, Princesse des Canaries du Prince de
Numidie
Histoire du Prince de Numidie
Histoire du Prince de Mauritanie de la Princesse de Castille
Histoire de la Fée des Grandeurs du Prince Salmaels (sp?)
Histoire de la Fée des Plaisirs du Cruel Amerdin
Le Génie familial
Histoire de la Princesse d'Isthrie (sp?)
Histoire de la Sultan Validé
**Histoire de la Princesse Patientine dans la Forêt
d'Erimente**

Sieur de Pré(s)chac (2) :
Sans Parangon
La Reine des Fées

Madame de Murat (8):
Le Parfait Amour
Anguillette
Jeune et Belle

Le Palais de la Vengeance
Le Prince des Feuilles

L'Heureuse Peine
Le Roi Porc
Le Sauvage

Mlle. de la Force (1) : Persinette (cf. Basile's Petrosinella)

Mme. Bernard (1) : Riquet à la Houpe

Eustache Le Noble (2): The Bird of Truth
The Apprentice Magician

Marie-Jeanne Lhéritier (2): The Discreet Princess or the Adventures of Finette
Ricdin-Ricdon

Evidently, there are relatively few ogre tales in the French Fairy Tale canon, but from the study of those that exist, many connections are made and many conclusions are drawn below. Each of the underlined and bold-faced tales above has been discussed in various chapters above in order to distill the nature of seventeenth century French ogres into the data contained in the tables below. The following tables more succinctly summarize the frequency of the most predominant and recurring characteristics of ogres from these tales. Naturally, no two ogres are identical, and there are exceptions to every generalization, but enough ogres share enough traits so as to be able to classify and quantify these shared characteristics in the following frequency:

French Quasi Ogre Trait Frequency Table :

Trait	Barbe bleue	Guérini
Married	X	
Male	X	X
Man-eating		
Tricked	X	
Appetite		
Rich/Gold	X	
Ugly	X	
Castle	X	
Kidnaps	X	
Huge		X
Lupine		X
Magic		
Violent	X	X
Woods		
Magic Item	X	
Loud	X	
Integrated	X	
Employs	X	
Anti-King		X
Killed	X	X
Anti-Sun		
Tricks		
Metaphor		X
Total :	14	8

French Ogre Trait Frequency Table 1:

	Belle au...	Belle au...	Chat Botté	Le...Poucet	Finette C	Finette C
Male	x		x	x		x
Ugly				x	x	x
Huge					x	x
Castle	x	x	x		x	x
Gold/Rich		x	x	x	x	x
Tricked			x	x	x	x
Magic	x		x			
Mag item				x		
Man eat	x	x		x	x	x
Appetite		x		x	x	x
Unnamed	x	x	x	x	x	x
Kidnaps					x	x
Defeated		x	x			
Enslaves		x			x	
Violent				x		x
Anti-king		x	x			
Lupine		x	x	x		
Anti-sun						
Tricks						
Married		x		x	x	x
Integrated		x	x			
Woods	x			x		
Killed		x	x			
Totals	6	13	11	13	11	13

French Ogre Trait Frequency Table 2:

	Princesse Carpillon	Orangier (Tourmentine)	Orangier (Ravagio)	Princesse Couronnée	Princesse Patientine	Total: (x/15)
Male			x	x	x	10
Ugly		x	x			6
Huge		x	x			6
Castle						7
Gold/Rich					x	7
Tricked		x	x		x	8
Magic				x	x	5
Mag item		x	x			4
Man eat	x	x	x	x		9
Appetite	x		x			7
Unnamed	x			x		11
Kidnaps		x	x		x	7
Defeated	x	x			x	5
Enslaves					x	5
Violent	x			x		6
Lupine			x			5
Anti-sun					x	1
Metaphor						(1)
Tricks					x	3
Married		x	x		x	9
Integrated						4
Woods				x	x	5
Killed						4
Totals	5	9	11	6	11	

Basile Ogre Characteristic Frequency Table 1:

	The Ghul	Peruonto	The Flea	Enchanted Doe	Parsley	3 Sisters	Violet
Male	X	x	x	x		x	x
Ugly	X	x	x				
Huge							
Castle					x		
Riches							
Tricked				x			
Magic	X	x		x	x		
MagicItem	X						
Man Eater			x	x		x	
Appetite							
Unnamed	X		x	x	x	x	x
Kidnaps			x		x		
Animal				x	x		
Employs	X						
Violent			x	x			
Wolfish				x		x	
Anti-Sun			x		x		
Metaphor		x					
Tricks	X			x			
Married			x			x	
Integrated		x			x		x
Woods	X		x	x		x	
Totals:	8	5	10	10	7	6	3

Basile Ogre Characteristic Frequency Table 2:

	Serpent	The Dove	Cannetella	Corvetto	7 Doves	GoldenRot	3 Citrons	All
Male			x	x	x	x		10
Ugly		x				x	x	6
Huge								0
Castle				x				2
Riches			x	x		x		3
Tricked					x	x		3
Magic	x	x	x		x	x		9
MagicItem							x	2
Man Eater		x			x	x		6
Appetite								0
Unnamed	x	x		x	x	x	x	12
Kidnaps			x					3
Animal								2
Employs		x			x	x		4
Violent			x					3
Wolfish								2
Anti-Sun		x	x	x				5
Metaphor			x					2
Tricks			x					3
Married				x				3
Integrated								3
Woods		x		x	x			7
Totals:	2	7	8	8	7	7	3	

IV: Ogre vs Wolf Synthesis

The lion's share of this work has been devoted to cataloguing and analyzing the portrayals of both ogres and wolves throughout their extensive representation in French literature. At this point, some obvious commonalities between the two should be apparent. But it is also necessary to point out their differences. These commonalities and differences can be assessed on two levels of interpretation for both ogres and wolves: literal and symbolic. On the literal level, readers can obviously see the differences between the two types of antagonists. On the symbolic level, however, these differences are revealed as cosmetic and so become less significant. On a symbolic level, both figures serve as a foil to the hero who embodies the virtues of the time and region. Consequently, they exist to frighten and warn the reader. Their primary function is as the primordial foe of mankind: the threatening monster. And if one is to strip away all the layers of their varied guises and names, there is, at the base, a uniformity common to all monsters of all times.

David Gilmore recounts various definitions of this universal monstrosity in his work: *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and all Manner of Imaginary Terrors*. One such definition that is worth repeating is Ruth Waterhouse's, who has established "a paradigm of the Monstrous, based on the following criteria. First there is large size and deformity, but there is also the quality of inherent evil, that is, unmotivated wickedness toward humans" (6). Another worthy definition is attributed to Joseph Andriano, who states that "the main criterion of monsters is that they are dangerous objects of fear, but that this fear includes 'the primal fear of being eaten' (6). Gilmore himself concludes that "eating human beings is as critical an aspect of monsterhood as bigness, physical

grotesqueness, and malice” (7). Inasmuch as ogres often conform to these traits, they can qualify as monsters. However, French ogres who lack huge size and deformity may not be considered so monstrous. Instead, they are to be considered essentially human, but with lupine traits superimposed over their humanity, thereby exemplifying lycomorhism.

This work has attempted to examine the extent to which both ogres and wolves conform to the above definitions. In both cases, they can be classified as man-eating, animalistic antagonists. In a theoretical taxonomy of villains, one might see that ogres and wolves are closely related; perhaps they even share the same family or genus. Gilmore emphasizes only two principal traits common to all monsters: namely that “the monster is a metaphor for all that must be repudiated by the human spirit” (12) and “the place of monsters ...inhabiting an ‘outside’” (12). Yet ogres and wolves have far more in common besides these two credentials. If both were applying for a job as the antagonist in a story, an author might be hard-pressed to make a selection, as both present a fine resumé of misdeeds.

Fundamentally and primarily, they serve as a ‘bouche dévorante’ which represents man’s deep-seated human fear of not just death but of total annihilation. Being eaten is a double loss: the body is physically erased and worse, the identity is subsumed into the identity of another creature. This is total annihilation that combines the fears of death and of loss of identity. Thus it is more potent than any single fear. Its manifestation and representation can be the ogre or the wolf. But man-eating is only the primary, not the exclusive, function of these antagonists.

One difference between the ogre and the wolf lies in their respective motivation for devouring humans. For the wolf, it is a simple matter of filling his belly, satisfying his hunger drive and the demands of nature. A wolf devours a man as easily as he would a lamb, literally or metaphorically, and makes no distinction between them. For the ogre, it is more complicated. A capable hunter, the ogre could easily feed himself on the animals man hunts as well. But the ogre preys on humans in particular, and most especially on children. This can be better understood now in terms of the ogre's origin and evolution from Cronus and the Titans of antiquity. The ultimate aim of devouring human children may stem from the ogre's deep-seated fears of being usurped by the humans should they mature. In almost every ogre tale, this fear is indeed justified. Just as Zeus and his siblings overthrew Cronus, mankind has replaced Giant-kind as the dominant species in myth and literature. The ogre predator, ironically, is as susceptible to his psychological fears as is his human prey. If one is to interpret the ogre metaphorically, as is often the case, he can be construed as Cronus was: as time, the harbinger of man's inevitable aging/dying/oblivion. For this reason, no human is safe from ogres and immune to fear thereof.

Another difference between ogre and wolf lies in their secondary functions. It would be simplistic to say that they distinguish themselves in their secondary functions by embodying less prominent fears. It is commonly said that the wolf embodies the sexual carnality that would run wild in mankind without the suppressive mores of society. It is likewise said that the ogre necessarily embodies the non-sexual fear of violent, latent barbarianism in our shared human heritage that threatens to re-consume us in times of violence. The most visible manifestation of this contrast is clearly exposed in the novel

Eaters of the Dead by Michael Crichton, based on the manuscript of the Arabic explorer ibn Fadlan, who describes a quasi-mythical conflict between the men of a Scandinavian civilization and a group believed to be a lingering remnant of Neanderthals, called the Wendol. It is the basis of *Beowulf* and perhaps other tales as well. The literal warfare between man and an inhuman though humanoid adversary represents the struggle between man's baser impulses and his higher aspirations. cursory examination may conclude that the ogre and the wolf are alike in that they represent man's fears, though further scrutiny reveals that they differ in the specific nature of those fears. Yet as we have seen in many tales, wolves need not incarnate sexuality just as ogres need not incarnate violence. They can and often do, but such need not always be the case. Both ogres and wolves are more complex than these one-dimensional stereotypes.

Other differences, as mentioned in the introduction include the ogre's use as an allegory for brutal husbands or tyrannical noblemen, the ogre's reflection of society, 17th century France and thus encompassing societal issues such as marriage and the pursuit of wealth, presence in the court, etc., and the impact of genre on the ogre: no longer as the wolf in moralizing fables, but as a distinct entity with its own genre : the classical fairy tale, with a different purpose: to point out alterity and to point out its destruction.

Altogether, the ogre is quite a complex figure.

Their complexity is easily supported by many examples. Consider the oft-ascribed sexual associations of the wolf. On the other hand, many ogre tales depict ogre antagonists as sexual threats to human women. Many times, ogres kidnap women and even marry them against their will. This occurred in *Patientine*, *Barbe Bleue* et al. In practice, the wolf is associated as much with violence as with sex. The ogre can be freely

associated with either as well. As for the ogre's supposed association with brutality, this too is not always the case. More common perhaps in Basile's sources, relatively genteel ogres can be found within the French tradition as well, such as the one in *Le Chat botté*. Instead, there is no clear cut assignment of roles relegated exclusively to ogres or wolves. Both villains can be associated with either vice and when they are, they are almost always defeated.

At last, after establishing the frequency of wolf and of ogre characteristics in their myriad respective tales, the two data sets can be juxtaposed and synthesized into a final analysis. To summarize the links between the ogre and the wolf, and thereby establish that lycomorphy has occurred, it is necessary to compare the traits that most typically characterize both antagonists. What follows in the table below are the percentages of wolves and ogres from the tales that manifest the trait to their immediate left. The most commonly found traits are found at the top of each list, tapering to the rarest traits. Note: I have excluded the Basile ogres from the statistical figures as they were not French. The ogre column below is comprised of the French ogres and the French quasi-ogres only. The wolf column below addresses only wolves of literature and not of historical sources, i.e. Witchcraft Trials. It is through conformity to these most prominent characteristics that the wolf and the ogre might best prove to be similar. The dissimilarities tend to be of relatively minor significance in the tales and do not detract from the more significant overlaps among more frequent traits.

Ogre vs. Wolf Characteristic Table:

Trait	Ogres (x/15)	Trait	Wolves (y/15)
Male	67%	Male	93%
Married	60%	Woods	67%
Man-eating	60%	Violent	47%
Tricked	53%	Tricked	40%
Appetite	47%	Tricks	40%
Rich	47%	Transforms	33%
Kidnaps	47%	Married	27%
Castle	47%	Man Eating	20%
Ugly	40%	Integrated	20%
Huge	40%	Killed	13%
Violent	40%	Appetite	7%
Magic	33%	Riches	7%
Lupine	33%	Castle	7%
Woods	33%	Huge	7%
Employs	33%	Magic Item	7%
Integrated	27%	Metaphor	7%
Magic Item	27%	Loud	0%
Killed	27%	Employs	0%
Anti-King	20%	Ugly	0%
Tricks	20%	Anti-Sun	0%
Anti-Sun	7%	Kidnaps	0%

In confirmation of my theory establishing a similarity between the two antagonist types of ogres and wolves, the latter scored ‘highly’ on the ogre’s checklist of traits. There were many shared traits and naturally, some discrepancies, which are highlighted below as well. Although ogres and wolves do not share exact percentages of any given trait, those traits that characterize the ogre are frequently found among wolves and vice versa. Namely, the ogres’ five most common traits are among the wolves’ ten most common. Similarly, the wolves’ five most common traits are among the ogres’ ten most common traits. The other traits found at the bottom of the table help distinguish a wolf from an ogre.

Additionally, ogres and wolves share the same relationship to man: that of predator to prey. Ironically, it is almost always the case where the wolf or the ogre is vanquished by man, with or without the help of the supernatural in one form or another. To say the least, this common relationship between man and antagonist is one of animosity.

Due to this overlap in characteristics, it suffices to label ogres as lycomorphs due to its resemblance to man, which is lacking in the wolf. Ultimately, the term lycomorph applies to the ogre as a human rendered lupine by certain characteristics. As we have seen, human characters sometimes behave in violent, stupid and otherwise ogrish or wolfish ways. Wolves can behave in a very human or a very bestial manner. Ogres can and do behave in humane or bestial ways as well, but only the ogre is a true lycomorph. In a Venn diagram, the lycomorph is the overlap of both human and lupine character types. Though humans and wolves require relatively little explanation, the ogre is an invented creature that can and often is a useful allegory for man. Because the ogre is essentially a human(oid) form with lupine characteristics, it would be inaccurate to label the ogre as an anthropomorphized wolf. It is more accurate to label him as a lycomorphized human.

Bibliography

- Aulnoy, Madame de (Marie Catherine le Jumel de Berneville). *Contes I : Contes nouveaux ou les Fées à la Mode édition du tricentenaire*. Paris : Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1998.
- - -, *Contes II : Contes nouveaux ou les Fées à la Mode édition du tricentenaire*. Paris : Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1998.
- Aulnoy et al. *Les illustres fées. La tyrannie des fées détruite*. Genève : Slatkine Reprints, 1978, 1785
- Auneuil, Madame la comtesse d'. *Histoire de la Princesse Patientine dans la Forêt d'Erimente*, as appears in *Les Chevaliers errans et le Genie familier*. Amsterdam: Samuel Bernadon, 1710.
- Barchilon, Jacques and Peter Flinders. *Charles Perrault*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981.
- Basile, Giambattista. *Il Pentamerone: or the Tale of Tales*. Trans. Sir Richard Burton. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation: 1927.
- Basile, Giambattista. *Il Pentamerone*.
<http://www.surlalunefairytales.com/pentamerone/index.html>
- Beauvais, Pierre de. *Le Bestaire (version courte) Edition critique avec notes et glossaire*. Paris: Guy R. Mermier, ed. A. G. Nizet, 1977.
- Berrigan, Joseph R. *Fabulae Aesopicae*. Lawrence, Kansas, Coronado Press: 1977.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. *The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales*. New York: Vintage Books, 1975, 1989.
- Bishop, Morris and Kenneth T. Rivers. *A Survey of French Literature: Volume II: The Seventeenth Century*. Newburyport, MA : Focus Publishing/ R. Pullins Company, 2005.
- Bouget, Henry and Montague Summers, translated by E. Allen Ashwin. *An Examen of witches: drawn from various trials of many of this sect in the district of Saint Oyan de Joux, commonly known as Saint Claude, in the country of Burgundy, including the procedure necessary to a judge in trials for witchcraft*. London: J. Rodker, 1929.
- Briggs, Robin. "Shapeshifting, Apparitions, and Fantasy in Lorraine Witchcraft Trials" as appears in *Witches, Werewolves and Wandering Spirits: Traditional Belief &*

- Folklore in Early Modern Europe*. Edwards, Kathryn A. ed., Kirksville, MO: Truman State UP: 2002.
- Burgess, Glyn, trans. *The Song of Roland*. London : Penguin Books, 1990.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero With a Thousand Faces*. Novato, CA: New World Library, 2008.
- Canepa, Nancy L. "Ogres and Fools: On the Cultural Margins of the Seicento" as appears in *Monsters in the Italian Literary Imagination*. Keala Jewell, ed. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2001.
- Crichton, Michael. *Eaters of the Dead: The Manuscript of ibn Fadlan, Relating his Experience with the Northmen in A.D. 922*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1976.
- Daston, Lorraine and Gregg Mitman. *Thinking with Animals: New Perspectives on Anthropomorphism*. New York: Columbia UP, 2005.
- Descartes, René. *Discours de la Méthode*, as appears in Bishop, Morris and Kenneth T. Rivers. *A Survey of French Literature: Volume II: The Seventeenth Century*. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing/ R. Pullins Company, 2005.
- Doniger, Wendy. "Zoomorphism in Ancient India" as appears in Daston, Lorraine and Gregg Mitman: *Thinking with Animals: New Perspectives on Anthropomorphism*. New York: Columbia UP, 2005.
- Dundes, Alan. ed. *Little Red Riding Hood: A Casebook*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.
- Dupuis, Marie-France and Sylvain Louis. *Le Bestiaire : Texte intégral traduit en français moderne Reproduction en fac-similé des miniatures du manuscrit du Bestiaire Ashmole 1511 de la Bodleian Library d'Oxford*. Philippe Lebaud: 1988.
- Feher-Elston, Catherine. *Wolfsong: A Natural and Fabulous History of Wolves*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Penguin, 2004.
- France, Marie de. *Bisclavret*. Judith P. Shoaf, trans. 1998.
<http://www.english.ufl.edu/exemplaria/marie/bisclavret.pdf>
- Gilmore, David D. *Monsters : Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and all Manner of Imaginary Terrors*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Hamilton, Edith. *Mythology*. New York: Mentor Books New American Library Times Mirror, 1940.
- Hesiod. *Theogony*. Translated by M.L. West. Oxford UP, 1988.

- Homer. *The Iliad*. Robert Eagles, Trans. New York: Penguin Publishers, Inc. 1990.
- - - . *The Odyssey*. Robert Eagles, Trans. New York: Penguin Publishers, Inc. 1990.
- Hubble, Elizabeth A. « Hideous a desmesure: Monsters and Monstrous Knights in Early French Romance » article submitted to *Arhturiana*, September 2003.
- Institoris, Heinrich, et al. *Malleus maleficarum*. Edited and translated by Christopher S. Mackay. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006-
- Jacques-Lefèvre, Nicole. “Such an Impure, Cruel, and Savage Beast” as appears in *Witches, Werewolves and Wandering Spirits: Traditional Belief & Folklore in Early Modern Europe*. Edwards, Kathryn A. ed. Kirksville, MO: Truman State UP, 2002.
- Jacoby, Mario, Verena Kast and Ingrid Riedel. *Witches, Ogres and the Devil’s Daughter: Encounters with Evil in Fairy Tales*. Trans. Michael H. Kohn. Boston: Shambhala, 1992.
- Keightley, Thomas. *The fairy mythology: illustrative of the romance and superstition of various countries*. London: H. G. Bohn, 1860.
- Krell, Jonathan F. “L’ogre réécrit, l’ogre réhabilité” as appears in *Cahiers de l’imaginaire* Vol. 16, 1998.
- - - , *The ogre’s progress: images of the ogre in modern and contemporary French fiction*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, c2009.
- La Bruyère. *Les Caractères*, as appears in Bishop, Morris and Kenneth T. Rivers: *A Survey of French Literature Volume II: The Seventeenth Century, Third edition*. Focus Publishing: Newburyport, MA, 2005. (page 197).
- La Fontaine, Jean de. *Les Fables*. Elizur Wright, trans. Jupiter Books, 1975.
- Lang, Andrew. *Perrault’s Popular Tales*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888.
- Lauer, Bernhard, et al. *Rapunzel: Traditionen eines europäischen Märchenstoffes in Dichtung und Kunst*. Kassel, 1993.
- Lecouteux, Claude. *Les Monstres dans la pensée médiévale européenne*. Paris : Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1993.
- Lewis, Philip. *Seeing Through the Mother Goose Tales: Visual Turns in the Writings of Charles Perrault*. Stanford University Press: 1996.
- Lindow, John. *Norse Mythology*. Oxford UP: 2001.

- Loeffler-Delachaux, M. *Le Symbolisme des Contes de Fées*. Paris : L'arche, 1949.
- Magnanini, Suzanne. *Fairy Tale Science: Monstrous Generation in the Tales of Straparola and Basile*. University of Toronto Press: 2008.
- Mack, Maynard, et al, eds. *The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces: Fourth Edition: Volume 1: Literature of Western Culture through the Renaissance*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1956.
- Mailly, (Jean) Chevalier de. *La Princesse couronnée par les Fées*. As appears in Nouveau Cabinet des Fées VI: *La tyrannie des fées détruite*. Genève: Slatkine, 1978.
- Mazaheri, Homayoun. "L'animal dans *Les Caractères* de La Bruyère, » as appears in Cahiers du Dix-septième. University of Georgia, Athens, GA. Vol V, No. 2: Fall 1991.
- Medieval Bestiary, The. "Wolf." <http://bestiary.ca/beasts/beast180.htm>.
- Menninghaus, Winfred. *In Praise of Nonsense: Kant and Bluebeard*. Stanford University Press: 1999.
- Mistracco, Vicki. *Les Femmes et la tradition du Moyen Age à nos jours*. New Haven : Yale UP, 2006.
- Mitchell, Robert W. et al, eds. *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes and Animals*. State University of New York: 1997.
- Murat Madame de. *Contes*. Geneviève Petard, ed. Paris: Editions Champion, 2006.
- Muratore, Mary Jo. "The Discourses of Imprisonment in Perrault's *Contes*" as appears in *Actes de las Vegas*, Marie-France Hilgar, ed. Paris: Biblio 17, 1991.
- Online Etymology Dictionary. "ogre" : <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?search=ogre&searchmode=none>
- Orenstein, Catherine. *Little Red Riding Hood Uncloaked: Sex, Morality and the Evolution of a Fairy Tale*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
- Phoebus Gaston, Count of Foix. *Medieval hunting scenes: ("The hunting book" by Gaston Phoebus) / text by Gabriel Bise after Gaston Phoebus; translated by J. Peter Tallon*. Fribourg: Productions Liber, 1978.
- Preston, Cathy. "Review: Little Red Riding Hood" by Catherine Orenstein, as appears in *Marvels & Tales: Journal of Fairy Tale Science*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2004.

- Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968.
- Rouger, Gilbert, ed., *Charles Perrault: Contes*. Paris: Editions Garnier Frères, 1967.
- Rudwin, Maximillian. *The Devil in Legend and Literature*. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1970.
- Seigneuret, Jean-Charles, ed. *Dictionary of Literary Themes and motifs*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988. "eating," "monsters," "stupidity."
- Seton, Ernest Thompson. *Great historic animals: mainly about wolves*. New York: C. Scribner's sons, 1937.
- Shoaf, Judith P. Bisclavret. <http://www.english.ufl.edu/exemplaria/marie/bisclavret.pdf>
- Sidky, H. *Witchcraft, Lycanthropy, Drugs and Disease: An Anthropological Study of the European Witch-Hunts*. New York : Peter Lang, 1997.
- Simonsen, Michèle. *Perrault: Contes*. Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, 1992.
- Stephens, Walter. *Giants in Those Days: Folklore, Ancient History, and Nationalism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.
- Straparola. *The Facetious Nights*. W. G. Waters, trans. London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1894.
- Terry, Patricia, trans. *Renard the Fox*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1983.
- Thaün, Philippe de. *Le Bestiaire : texte critique publié avec introduction, notes et glossaire*. Emmanuel Walberg, ed. Librairie de l'Université de Lund. Suède.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *Introduction à la Littérature fantastique*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil, 1970.
- Verdier, Gabrielle. "Approaches to the Literary Fairy Tale : Questions of Genre and Gender" as appears in *Actes de las Vegas*, Marie-France Hilgar, ed. Paris: Biblio 17, 1991.
- Warner, Marina. *From the Beast to the Blonde: On Fairy Tales and their Tellers*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1994.
- - - *No Go the Bogeypman: Scaring, Lulling, and Making Mock*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998.
- White, T. H., ed. *The Book of Beasts being a translation from a Latin Bestiary of the Twelfth Century*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993.

- Widdower, P.F. *The Fables of Phaedrus*. Austin: University of Texas Print, 1992.
- Zipes, Jack, ed. *The Great Fairy Tale Tradition: From Straparola and Basile to the Brothers Grimm*. New York: WW Norton & Co., 2001.
- - - . *Beauties, Beasts and Enchantments: Classic French Fairy Tales*. New York: Meridian, 1991.
- - - . *When Dreams Come True*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- - - . *Breaking the Magic Spell: Radical Theories of Folk & Fairy Tales*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1979.
- - - . *Spells of Enchantment: The Wondrous Fairy Tales of Western Culture*. New York: Viking, 1991.

VITA

Dr. Koehnemann earned his AA Summa cum Laude from St. Louis Community College – Meramec, his BA Summa cum Laude from Truman State University, his MA Magna cum Laude from Saint Louis University and his PhD Summa cum Laude from the University of Missouri – Columbia.