Critics at least since Bédier have noticed the careful construction of the Oxford (O) version of the Chanson de Roland. In one of the more popular and widely disseminated introductions to the epic, Pierre Le Gentil remarks that "les richesses du Roland . . . sont tout intérieures" and that "il ne suffit pas de considérer les ensembles et les masses pour apprécier à leur juste valeur les mérites de l'auteur. Il faut le voir mettre, dans sa construction, chaque détail en place."¹ One attempt to appreciate the manner in which the poet "puts each detail in place" that has found particular favor with critics is the isolation of parallels and symmetries between various lines, laisses, and episodes. On the first level, that of the individual line, "The numerous formulae which are the basic building-blocks of the poem have been analyzed and catalogued extensively in recent years. On the second, that of the laisse, the presence and function of the laisses similaires have likewise been widely investigated. On the third level, many structural parallels between episodes have been noted, but only rarely have critics attempted to relate them to the thematic base of the work as a whole. Yet the value of such structural approaches is not in and for themselves, but rather for the light which they can shed upon the deeper significance of the poem. One of the earliest attempts to relate structure to meaning, albeit in a very superficial manner, is that by Edmond Faral in La Chanson de Roland: étude et analyse.² Faral notes the effective use of symmetrical passages in the poem:

"C'est déjà contre l'ordinaire du poème narratif, dont la règle est de se développer en une ligne plus ou moins sinuose, mais toujours progressive, que [l'auteur de la Chanson] se plaît à une architecture étudiée, où les mêmes motifs reviennent en rappels savants. Ces correspondances ingénieuses, qu'on a eu bien tort de prendre parfois pour un simple jeu, tendent toujours à des effets précis. Ici le conseil de Marsille réuni à Saragosse, là le conseil de Charlemagne réuni sous les murs de Cordes; ici les douze pairs de France, là les douze pairs d'Espagne; ici Roland, le neveu de Charlemagne, là Aelroth, le neveu de Marsille; ici les dix corps de bataille de Charlemagne, là les trente corps de Baligant: c'est une"

²Paris, 1933.
manière de marquer, par ressemblances ou contrastes, le caractère des puissances qui s'affrontent et le sens de la lutte qu'elles engagent. Ici la désignation de Ganelon pour l'ambassade, là la désignation de Roland pour l'arrière-garde: c'est une manière de faire ressortir, en deux circonstances analogues, l'opposition de deux attitudes. Ici Roland refuse de sonner du cor quand son salut est encore possible, là Roland décide de sonner quand il ne peut plus espérer aucun secours: c'est une manière de rendre plus saisissant le défi héroïque du preux à la sagesse. Douze Sarrasins viennent attaquer Roland et se faire tuer dans l'ordre même où ils ont juré sa mort devant Marsille; deux autres Sarrasins, Climbortin et Valdabron, qui ont été les premiers à combler Ganelon de présents après sa trahison, sont aussi ceux qui portent aux Français les premiers coups mortels, avant de périr à leur tour: c'est une manière d'exprimer tout à la fois l'horreur du crime dont le traître s'est rendu coupable et la présence d'une justice providentielle qui châtie la perfidie païenne. Ainsi, par le moyen d'une disposition symétrique, le poète agit d'une action subtile sur l'esprit de son auditoire et lui inculque les sentiments dont il veut le pénétrer.3

In a more recent study, Karl-Josef Steinmeyer adds to the parallels listed by Faral the two groups of dreams, the two advisers (Naimon and Blancandrin), the two embassies to enemy camps (Blancandrin's and Ganelon's), Charles' and Baligant's swords, and the Christian and pagan preparations for battle.4 Steinmeyer, in an essentially structuralist approach, goes well beyond Faral in suggesting how the symmetrical patterns of the Chanson can be used to help determine the meanings of the dream-episodes. In studying these dream-episodes, Steinmeyer noted a parallel which I would like to examine here in the broader context of the whole epic: that between the rôle of Roland in the first council scene with Charlemagne and that of Tierri in the judgment of Ganelon section.

In the council scene, the first major episode of the Chanson de Roland, emissaries from Marsilie propose a truce on what appears at first glance to be favorable terms for Charlemagne's Christian army. Charles calls together his advisers to consider the proposal. Although the men acknowledge that "Il nus i cuvent guarde" (v. 192),5 Roland is

5This and all subsequent quotations from the Chanson de Roland
the only individual to speak against the majority decision, which is to accept Marsilie's proposal. In the Judgment Scene, the last major section of the epic, Charlemagne is again faced with a difficult decision which he submits to his advisers: what is to be done with Ganelon? Persuaded by Ganelon's impassioned pleas, or unwilling to face the consequences of adjudging him guilty (a one-to-one combat with the awesome Pinabel), Charlemagne's men declare,

... "Sire, nus vos prium
Que clamez quite le cunte Guenelun."
(vv. 3808-09)

Tierri alone opposes the majority decision.

The two episodes in question are closely related one to the other, and not only by the overall similarity of situation just sketched. Laisse XII of the first episode, which names the twelve peers who counsel Charlemagne and ends

Guenes i vint, ki la traïsun fist.
Des ore cumencet le cunseill que mal prist.
(vv. 178-9)

is echoed by Laisse CCLXXV:

Bavier e Saisnes sunt alet a conseill,
E Peitevin e Norman e Franceis;
Asez i ad Alemans e Tiedeis.
Icels d'Alverne i sunt li plus curteis.
(vv. 3793-96)

and by lines 3747-48:

Des ore cumencet le plait e les noveles
De Guenelun, ki traïsun ad faite.

Laisse XIII, in which Charles addresses his barons, stating the situation and requesting their advice, has its analogue in Laisse CCLXXII. Ganelon's proud speech in Laisse XV is balanced by Laisse CCLXXIII. The first episode prepares the treason which will culminate in the disaster at Roncevaux; the second makes good the wrong which has been perpetrated. It is the necessary counterpoise to the first.

There is, to be sure, one principal and necessary difference between the two scenes in question. In order for the treason to take place, Charlemagne must ignore Roland's warning; in order to avenge Roland, he must accept Tierri's offer of aid. This distinction, however, is on the level of the plot, and does not affect the moral posture of

the two barons. While it would certainly be excessive to pretend that Tierri is a "second Roland," it does seem evident that the poet intended us to recognize a close relationship between the two: both stand alone against the majority opinion, and both are ultimately proven right; both are eloquent speakers in the defense of Justice; both are concerned with their parenté. Roland bravely faces the overwhelming odds represented by Marsilie's troops, while Tierri, described as "heingre, graisle e eschewid" (v. 3820), boldly challenges the more powerful Pinabel. That the poet intended to relate the two scenes and characters becomes even more evident by the interpretation of the two dreams which relate to these episodes. Critics have long noted the analogies between Charlemagne's second and fourth dreams (Laisses LVII and CLXXXVI), but until Steinmeyer's study of them they were thought to be no more than two versions of the same theme. Steinmeyer, however, has shown persuasively that the second dream refers not to the Tierri-Pinabel duel but to the defeat at Roncevaux, while the fourth dream alone presages the duel. The similarities between the dreams thus intimately relate the two episodes, and it is significant above all that both Roland (in the second dream) and Tierri (in the fourth) are allegorized as veltres. The greyhounds represent the order and righteousness of Charlemagne's court against the anarchy and threats of the vers and urs.

However, it is not sufficient merely to note the analogies between the two scenes and the two characters. Such analogies might be no more than similar treatment of a basic motif or character type, in the manner in which, for instance, every "arming for battle" or every "single combat" scene in epics or romances of this period resembles every other. The parallels here are functional, for the rôle of Tierri in a sense "glosses" that of Roland: one cannot fully understand the Roland of the first scene without Tierri. In the initial scene Ganelon accuses Roland of giving Charlemagne "cunseill d'orguill" (v. 228) and, in a scarcely veiled reference to Roland, tells Charles, "Ja mar crez briercun," (v. 220). Swayed by this untrustworthy testimony by the traitor Ganelon, it has been possible for critics to argue that

6Digby 23, line 2563, reads, "De sun paleis vers les altres acurt," but editors have generally accepted the correction to "De sun paleis [un veltres i] acurt," a correction which Steinmeyer, Untersuchungen (Chapter IV) has shown to be warranted. He interprets The significance as follows: "Für Thierry wählt Turold im vierten Traum die gleiche Allegorie wie für Roland im zweiten-'veltres'. Damit zieht er eine bewusste Parallele zwischen den Charakteren der beiden Helden und kennzeichnet Thierry bereits in der Traumvision als den Nachfolger Rolands," (p. 133).

7Ibid., pp. 55-62, 135.
Roland acts in this scene and later with undue pride, that his advice to Charlemagne is based on self-interest and the desire for furthering his own glory and not on what is wisest militarily. Most recently, for example, Wolfgang van Emden in a very thought-provoking article has sought to counter those who would defend Roland's military strategy:

L'on a prétendu qu'il [Roland] doit se sacrifier avec les hommes qui lui sont confiés parce que c'est le seul moyen de pousser Charles à mener la guerre à bonne fin. Logiquement parlant, du moins, c'est faux. Si Roland sonnait du cor au moment où Olivier aperçoit les armées sarrasines, Charlemagne reviendrait; il constaterait la trahison et il écraserait infailliblement les païens, car c'est une donnée du poème (vv. 16-19, 567-9), que les forces militaires de Marsile ne sont pas capables de tenir tête à celles de Charlemagne. On parle beaucoup de la victoire de Roland, et il est vrai que Roland meurt, face à l'ennemi, seul survivant à son apotheose sur le champ de bataille; mais il convient de ne pas perdre de vue le fait que les païens s'enfuient parce qu'ils entendent les clairons de l'armée qui revient sur ses pas. Sa victoire, Roland la doit donc au fait qu'il a rappelé Charles, et elle doit être considérée en fonction des mobiles qui l'ont incité à sonner l'Oliphant quand les choses tourment mal.

Olivier a donc raison, du point de vue militaire. 

But van Emden, in suggesting what might have happened had Charlemagne been called earlier, is using a subjective argument which cannot be supported by the text. In reading the poem, one is struck rather by Charlemagne's weariness with battle and his desire to return to Aix, a desire which even his beloved nephew Roland cannot alter. It is true that the pagans flee at the sound of Charlemagne's trumpets, but their leaders have been killed or scattered and their numbers have been greatly reduced by the battle with the rear-guard; and it seems improbable in the extreme that the weary and weak Charlemagne of the Oxford Chanson de

---


Roland would have found the strength to do any more than rescue the members of the rearguard had he returned to Roncevaux before the death of Roland. It is, indeed, Roland's death which creates the vengeance motif that dominates the last half of the poem. To say, as van Emden does, that Olivier was right militarily, is thus only partially correct. We cannot but agree that the sounding of the Olifant did have as its proximate result the recalling of Charlemagne's main forces. In this sense, Olivier was correct; but Roland too, and surely everyone else, recognized that it would have this effect, so Olivier's military insight should not be unduly stressed. Roland alone realized that an ultimate sacrifice was required to force Charlemagne to complete the conquest and to assure the victory of Good over Evil, of Christian over pagan.

It is the scene with Tierri which enables us to appreciate the wisdom and insight of Roland. Like Roland, Tierri defends an unpopular position, and like him he is proven to be right. The truth of Roland's position is sometimes obscured by arguments about his excessive pride and by the fact that he must die to assure the triumph of the Good. Tierri's victory is immediate, neat, and incontestable. God's miracle on Tierri's behalf ("Deus i ad fait vertut!" v. 3931) is the unmistakable sign that He acknowledges the truthfulness of Tierri's position (Laisses CCLXXII-CCLXXIII), and that He will not permit Evil to prevail over Good ("El Deus," dist Carles, "le dreit en esclargiez!" v. 3891). In the same way, God's miraculous interventions earlier in the epic, at Roland's death (Laiss CLXXVI) and to make possible Charlemagne's triumph over the pagans (Laiss CLXXIX), show His approval of Roland's position, which is to assure the victory of Christianity at whatever cost. By establishing the analogies which we have seen between the character of Roland and Tierri, the poet seems clearly to intend us to recognize God's approval of both the victory and methods of Roland through His approval and intervention in that of Tierri. More clearly than ever it shows that, with apologies to Turolus,

\[
\text{Guenes ad tort e Rollant ad dreit.}
\]
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