

Reviews of Recent Articles

Octavio Armand. "El verso 20 del Cantar de Mio Cid." Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos, 269 (1972), pp. 339-348.

Line 20 of the Cantar de Mio Cid, which reads "¡Dios, qué buen vasallo, si oviesse buen señore!" has in the last thirty years repeatedly drawn the attention of scholars anxious to explain or eliminate the ambiguity of the second hemistich. As Octavio Armand reminds us in his article, Amado Alonso's departure from the traditional reading of this line ("¡Dios, qué buen vassallo! ¡Si oviesse buen señore!" RFH, VI [1944] pp. 187-191) drew a rebuttal from Leo Spitzer, and has since created a polemic among those who set out to interpret the poem. Amado Alonso, believing that a conditional si would imply something less than complete fulfillment by the Castilian hero, prefers to consider the si optative and to indicate by punctuation two exclamations: "¡Dios, qué buen vassallo! ¡Si oviesse buen señore!" Asserting that both history and the poem are misconstrued by those who read "Lord, what a good vassal he would be if he had a good liege," he suggests that the poet recited the lines so that his audience would understand "What a good vassal! Would that he had a good liege!" In answer, Spitzer argued in favor of the conditional si, reconstructing the line to read "What a great knight [everything would be perfect] if he had a good king" ("¡Dios, qué buen vasallo si oviesse buen señore!" RFH, VIII [1946], p. 134). Despite a difference in the interpretation of the grammatical function of si, both critics find the Cid to be the epitome of knight-hood and the king to be something less than an ideal figure.

In his article, Armand complains that the two initiators of the controversy considered the si a fulcrum upon which pressure is exerted in favor of one interpretation or the other. He prefers to join Bandera Gómez (El "Poema de Mio Cid:" Poesía, historia, mito [Madrid, 1969], p. 37) in recognizing the unavoidable ambiguity of the second hemistich and in recommending a more eclectic approach to criticism, not dependent upon the conditional or optative use of si. He sees the evolution of a new interpretation which does not consider the personal attributes of the principal characters but the feudal relationships which bind them. Each one in his own sphere represents an ideal; each surpasses the norms which define his particular station in life. Although Edmund de Chasca ("El verso 20 refleja la realidad histórica," El arte juglaresco en el "Cantar de Mio Cid" [Madrid, 1967], pp. 69-74) has pointed out some defects in Alfonso's character, Armand accepts Bandera Gómez's estimation that both the king and vassal are good. Moreover, he accepts the premise that in medieval epic the characters are by nature either good or evil and, therefore, incapable of moral growth. Like Gustavo Correa ("La

honra en el Poema del Cid," *Hispanic Review*, 20 [1952], p. 129), he finds that the poet successfully attributes the qualities of goodness and honor to both of the main characters. According to this new interpretation, the king should not be identified with the forces of evil. Armand claims, along with Spitzer ("Sobre el carácter histórico del *Cantar de Mio Cid*," *NRFH*, 2 [1948], p. 115), that the achievement of a balanced relationship between the Cid and Alfonso is basic to the poem; two-thirds of it are related directly or indirectly to the hero's search for reconciliation.

Further attempts to clarify the meaning of line 20 by Bandera Gómez (p. 41) and Joaquín Casaldueiro ("El Cid echado de tierra," *Estudios de literatura española* [Madrid, 1962], p. 47) focus upon the citizens, the men and women who exclaimed, "Lord, what a good vassal! Would that he had a good liege!" These critics point out that the poet allows us to witness the popular admiration of the hero and the general sympathy aroused by his plight. The exclamation is purely emotional, an impassioned response to the tragedy of the moment. These words should be taken, not as a meditated opinion, but as a spontaneous reaction to the hero's misfortune. In fact, Armand identifies the second hemistich as "the only purely emotional outburst which the Cid inspires in the whole work" (p. 346). He sees in this exclamation the people's realization that the king has made a grave error and concludes that "el verso 20 es profecía, es todo cuanto su ambigüedad le permite ser" (p. 348).

In his article Armand also notes Menéndez Pidal's warning that "the Cid, upon being exiled, ceased to be Alfonso's vassal and had to look for another liege to serve" (*Cantar de Mio Cid, gramática y vocabulario*, III [Madrid, 1946], p. 1221). Given this information, which was shared by the poet and the audience, a scholar must exercise considerable restraint in his use of the eclectic approach. This bit of historical information obliges one to study more carefully the significance of *señore*, a word overlooked by most commentators. The fact that the Cid's exile terminated his vassalage strongly implies that *señore* refers not to Alfonso but to anyone whom the hero might choose to serve. Surely, line 20 derives some of its meaning from the proverb in line 850, which states that "Qui a buen señor, siempre bive en deliçio." The people realize that the Cid can most easily and quickly overcome his difficulties by entering the service of another liege. Without violating Alfonso's injunctions and without passing judgement upon the wisdom of his act, the citizens of Burgos accept the inevitability of exile and only regret that their hero no longer has a worthy lord. If *señore* refers to someone other than Alfonso, there is no dilemma, no need to rationalize the troublesome exclamation. Despite the king's error, despite the harshness of the punishment meted out, he remains a good person, one who has acted in good faith.

The Cid himself recognizes that the king has been deceived by the lies of jealous courtiers (*mestureros*, v. 267) and he offers no recriminations. By abandoning *Gastilla* rapidly (v. 6), he demonstrates his respect for the feudal custom which deprives him of lands and protection. By sending the king gifts of horses rather than the vassal's normal contribution (*la quita*, v. 492), he reveals that he is technically no longer a vassal. The often expressed lament (vv. 610, 834, 1104, 1643) that he and his followers have to earn their bread by fighting in Moorish realms is a direct result of his having no liege. As Menéndez Pidal has indicated (*La España del Cid*, I [1929], p. 296), it was a serious matter for the medieval warrior to be without a lord. Only a strong leader and skillful fighter like the Cid could have survived the perils of such an existence.

However, because the Cid is convinced of his own innocence and because he wants to serve his "natural liege" (vv. 895, 1272, 2031) rather than a rival prince, he makes every effort to be accepted once again as a vassal. Through loyalty and generosity, he is able to regain Alfonso's love, that is, to earn a pardon for alleged offenses. Having humbled himself before Alfonso (v. 2022), he can once again benefit from royal patronage. At this point, the problem introduced by the second hemistich of line 20 is resolved. The loyal knight has a worthy liege, the very king who had originally exiled him.

Only by assuming that *señore* refers to someone other than Alfonso can we avoid the contradiction implicit in the supposition that Alfonso was, within the artistic conception of the poem, a good king, but that he was not recognized as such by his subjects. In order to arrive at an interpretation of line 20 which is consistent with the overall characterization of both liege and vassal, we must try to understand the poem within its social and cultural context.

Donald E. Lenfest
Ohio Wesleyan University

-o-oOo-o-

Edward A. Heinemann. "Sur le valeur des manuscrits rimés pour l'étude de la tradition rolandienne: Tentative pour trouver les filiations des manuscrits TLP." MA, 80 (1974) 1, 71-87.

Heinemann explains that the following remarks by Alfred Foulet were the origin of his study: "Does the note of deep pessimism with which Horrent and, in his wake, [Rosellini] end their discussion of the rhymed Roland mean that it is impossible to obtain a clear picture of the interrelationships within the PLT group, of P, L, T's links to CV7, and of V4's extraction from Roncevaux? I believe that a determined

attempt to reconstruct the archetype of the rhymed Roland would prove a sufficiently rewarding task, despite the difficulties involved and the incomplete and at times uncertain text which would result. This text, whatever its inevitable shortcomings, would lead to a neater definition of the Alpha and Beta versions of the assonanced Roland and would doubtless cast additional light on the genesis of the V4 redaction." (Romance Philology, 18 [1965], p. 369). Heinemann's article is a succinct presentation of one of the aspects to be found in his doctoral dissertation, "The Roman de Roncevaux: Prolegomena to a Study of the Manuscript Tradition of the Chanson de Roland" (Princeton University, 1970).

As stated, one important result of a study of the rhyming versions of the work is a better conception of what the Beta branch of the Roland stemma can reveal concerning certain lacunae and errors in the Alpha branch, as represented by the celebrated Oxford manuscript (0). Another is an insight into the transformation from the earlier assonant form to the later rhymed one. For the purposes of the article, Heinemann considered only the major "French" or Franco-Italian manuscripts of Beta, V4 plus the established rhyming subgroup Gamma and its two further subgroups Delta (Ch, V7) and Epsilon (T, L, P). While the Delta relationship is quite clear, the Epsilon subgroup creates particular problems. Heinemann has chosen 300 lines of the Delta version along with equivalent lines in Epsilon (a little more than 200 in 0) for close study. He has become so familiar with the MSS in the tradition and their characteristics that he presents them as one would present a cast of characters in a play. Through a series of intricate and convincing steps, he arrives at the following hypothetical stemma: Delta is broken down into Delta-1 (thereby explaining by contamination the often more authentic lessons of P) and Delta-2 (Ch, V7); Epsilon consists of T (which also shows a fascinating contamination from the assonant Alpha branch) and the further subgroup Zeta (L, P). Heinemann concludes: "L'hypothèse de deux familles, Epsilon et Delta, plus ou moins monolithiques, a permis de mettre en évidence des leçons exigeant une nouvelle interprétation des faits. L'hypothèse que nous émettons ici servira à de nouvelles recherches ... Il va sans dire que la preuve définitive réside en l'étude minutieuse du poème entier, étude qui devra tenir également compte des versions étrangères."

Heinemann complements his arguments with the delicate feat of reconstructing the equivalent hypothetical archetypes Beta, Gamma, and Delta for 0 97. He divides the lines of the laisse into two parts (A and B) at the hemistich in accordance with his earlier definition of a formula, "l'unité minimum de l'expression stylisée, longue d'un ou deux hémistiches selon la syntaxe, et résultat de la rencontre du mètre et de la syntaxe." (Romania, 94 [1973], 11). Each archetype is followed

by a list of pertinent variants which show the MS groupings. A list of tables follows which helps to clarify the relationships further.

Cesare Segre, in his new and important critical edition of the *Chanson de Roland* (1971), states: "Purtroppo, l'effecto negativo dei *Commentaires* è stato di bloccare, o quasi, le indagini sullo stemma della *ChR*, già così intense, anche se con varietà di successo. Basta una scorsa alle bibliografie, per vedere quanto siano numericamente scarsi dopo Bédier i contributi sistematici allo studio sui rapporti tra i manoscritti ..." This article demonstrates that the tide has turned and the long-standing need has begun to be met.

William L. Hendrickson
Washington University, St. Louis

-o-oOo-o-

Herman, Gerald. "A Fourteenth-Century Anti-Hero: Baudouin de Sebourc." *Romance Notes*, 15 (1973) 2, 355-360.

In reading this brief note, one wonders whether the terms of its title have been clearly defined. Anti: against what/whom? Hero: in what sense? Is the author speaking in reference to the courtly world or the knightly one; literary tradition or historical practice? These are some of the basic questions not completely resolved. Indeed, the rather common belief that these times and mores were destroyed or greatly modified by the rise and sway of bourgeois class and manners is not to be found in the note where, instead, one is told that the author of *Baudouin de Sebourc* delights in presenting his protagonist as, "an ambivalent figure, midway, as it were, between the world of knight and churl, incorporating traits of each yet belonging to neither," (p. 357).

One of Prof. Herman's main theses is that Baudouin was just as ready, if not more so, to exercise his physical prowess as to practice his knightly duty (never specified) and so is anti-establishment, i.e., his class. (One deduces that, since Baudouin is a scion of a noble family, this makes him into one who mocks the code of the nobility by his strong inclination to indulge himself and put damsels in distress.) But is this conduct truly so revolutionary in either an historical or literary context, and is this mode even as comical (the other hinge of this note) as all that? Would it not be, in fact, more productive to consider that later epics (such as, *Baudouin de Sebourc*, *Le Batard de Bouillon*, etc.) mirror the changing social climate more than ever and give witness to their authors' penchant for realistic reportage and characterization.

Prof. Herman's closing remarks hint at this but then, it seems, fall wide of the mark with the statement: "His [Baudouin's] anti-heroism reflects the tastes of a new, pragmatic, and non-aristocratic

public, no longer much interested in such literary conventions as chivalric honor and courtly refinement." (p. 360) How then explain the assiduous cultivation of medieval los (a goodly part of renaissance virtu) by the condottieri; sundry kings of France and England (among whom, Henry V, François Ier; also René d'Anjou); and the enormous success of Froissart, Antoine de La Sale; and even Ariosto and Castiglione, a full century and more after the composition of Baudoin de Sebourc?

Thomas E. Vesce
Mercy College, Dobbs Ferry

-o-oOo-o-

C. Bruce Fitch. "A Clue to the Genealogy of the Gran conquista de Ultramar." Romance Notes 15 (Spring 1974) 3, 578-580.

Professor Fitch has detected a scribal emendation in the well-known MS. 2454 of the Biblioteca Nacional: the word bujaron, senseless as it stands, can be seen correctly, under photographic examination, to read oviaron, as the initial letter is an "o" which was carefully written over an erroneous initial "b." Since the same reading bujaron is found in the princeps of 1503, Fitch concludes that the 1503 edition is a direct descendant of MS. 2454.

This is interesting prima facie evidence, but if Fitch is correct it should be possible to find additional textual evidence in the two versions to establish their relationship. If 1503 were set from MS. 2454, this would be very important news indeed, as it would enable us to study in detail an early peninsular typesetter at work; if MS. 2454 be merely one link in a textual chain, one might well ask why the compositor and earlier copyists all accurately reproduced a reading which was meaningless to them.

Daniel Eisenberg
Florida State University

-o-oOo-o-

Franca Di Ninni. "Il manoscritto marciano gall. X: per una nuova edizione del Gui de Nanteuil." Cultura neolatina, 33 (1973), 69-103.

The stated aim of this article is to contribute to the discussion of the textual and critical problems faced by the editors of the Gui de Nanteuil, its fragments, or its Prologo. In point of fact, it is essentially a critical review, unfortunately often somewhat carping, of James R. McComrack's fine edition of the work, which appeared in 1970 in Droz's Textes Littéraires Français series, and which Miss Di Ninni

characterizes as having the merit of recalling this chanson de geste to the attention of Romance philologists, but which, in her final analysis, leaves the way open for a more satisfactory edition.

Before entering upon her lengthy discussion of the McCormack edition, the author summarizes her appraisal of Paul Meyer's edition of the Montpellier manuscript of the Gui de Nanteuil, which, she points out, excludes important complementary material that could have been supplied by the Venice manuscript, had the French scholar's disdain for the language of that manuscript not deterred him. After calling attention to Jacques Monfrin's publication in Romania of the Paris fragments, she reviews briefly Cavaliere's edition of the first 943 verses of the Venice manuscript, a reworking of the Chanson d'Aye d'Avignon, which serves as a prologue to the Venice Gui de Nanteuil.

In her review of McCormack's edition, the author takes exception to most of his critical and editorial work, including, for example, the order of arrangement of certain related sections of the Introduction and his interpretation of Aiglentine's psychology as proximate to that of the courtly lady (which Di Ninni sees as motivated only by the need to set up textual support for the suggested date of composition). She does not approve of McCormack's decision not to include the text of the Venice prologue in his edition, nor of the details of his linguistic study of the Venice manuscript.

Her own contributions to the study of the Gui de Nanteuil are limited largely to a re-evaluation of the ideological relationship between courtly literature and the epic and to a cataloguing and exegesis of some formal linguistic differences between the Montpellier and Venice manuscripts.

It is obvious from the numerous issues raised by the author that a definitive edition of the Gui de Nanteuil, based on and adequately reproducing the texts of both the Montpellier and Venice manuscripts as well as of the Paris fragments, would go a long way in clarifying the many problems, both literary and linguistic, posed by the Franco-Italian epic tradition. Miss Di Ninni appears to be very well qualified and equipped to undertake such an edition.

Joseph Palermo
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University

-o-oOo-o-

Colin Smith. "Per Abbat and the Poema de mio Cid." Medium Aevum, 42 (1973) 1, 1-17.

It would appear that Professor Colin Smith has finally found his Per Abbat. This recent article is a further attempt to confirm

the hypothesis of a poet-lawyer as the author of the extant version of the PMC: "Pedro Abad, layman and lawyer, who lived at the right time and who was sufficiently acquainted with the history and legend of the Cid to have been the refundidor of the poem in 1207" (p. 15). While Smith's article does not mark the very first time that hypothesis has been advanced,¹ it is certainly one of the more convincing attempts actually to identify Per Abbat. The reader, then, of this review should neither be content with my summary and paraphrase nor should he think of the article in terms of "a beautiful hypothesis" for it is a careful and illuminating piece of research into one of the most intriguing problems in Spanish epics.

The article is centered on the problems related to the explicit of the poem (vv. 3731-3), which, according to Menéndez Pidal, was composed in about 1140 and copied in its sole surviving manuscript by Per Abbat in A.D. 1307 (=Era 1345). Two expert paleographers, Léopold Delisle and A. Paz y Melia, consulted by Pidal, agreed with him that the handwriting of the manuscript is fourteenth-century. For Pidal, then, Per Abbat was simply a copyist (Cantar, I, pp. 12-18). In 1957, however, A. Ubieta Arteta submitted Pidal's theory to serious questioning and came to the conclusion that "Pudo existir un PMC escrito en 1140, y aun antes de 1128, pero es evidente que sufrió refundiciones ... La fecha de mayo de 1207 dada por el PMC en sus últimos versos nos está dando con precisión el momento en que un refundidor del viejo Poema lo actualize." [Cf. "Observaciones al PMC," Arbor, 37 (1957), pp. 145-70.] Smith therefore concludes that "the date in the explicit of the manuscript is the true one, requiring no emendation, and Per Abbat was not simply a copyist but a refundidor," (p. 2).

Seven years after Arteta's study, Jules Horrent, in a well-known study ["Notes de critique textuelles sur le CMC: I: A propos de l'explicit de Per Abbat." Mélanges Delbouille (Gembloux, 1964), II, 275-282] agreed with Pidal that the word escriuio makes Per Abbat the copyist, not an author of any kind. The original version of the explicit he was copying in the fourteenth century (MCCC [era 1245]) bore the date 1207 (MCC) which he mistakenly transcribed as if he were writing a text from his own century. As to whether Per Abbat was the scribe of 1207 or of the present fourteenth century manuscript, Horrent wrote that both views could be defended, though he preferred the second on the grounds of the mistaken roman numeral C.

¹Not long ago M. Criado de Val strongly affirmed that "El código único del Cantar . . . no es el resultado de una mecánica y torpe labor de copista sino obra de un juglar, consciente de su arte . . . Este juglar se llamó Per Abbat y lo 'escribió' en 1307." ZRP, 86 (1970), 105-6.

After reviewing these positions, Smith concludes:

I am very strongly inclined to accept what Ubieto says and parts of what Horrent says. My difference with the latter is simply that it seems more logical to me to suppose that an anonymous copyist at some date well on in the fourteenth century copied out entire the explicit of his model of 1207, with mention of Per Abbat and all, rather than to suppose that in the fourteenth century that copyist deleted the name in the original and put in his own (Per Abbat) while at the same time preserving the date of 1207. (p. 3)

Furthermore, "If Pidal, Michael and others are prepared to accept that escriuio in the [contemporary Libro de] Alexandre means that Juan Lorenzo de Astorga composed the poem, there is clearly a case for arguing that Per Abbat composed (escriuio, twice in the explicit) the extant version of the PMC" (p. 4).

I propose to conclude, then, with Ubieto, and with the support of evidence from the Libro de Alexandre, that Per Abbat was at least a refundidor of the Poema de mio Cid in A.D. 1207; further, that because refundición was such an essential and creative activity in the Middle Ages, and because we do not know what if anything went before, Per Abbat is fully entitled to the dignity of being considered a kind of author ... I would not have carried matters so far in the realm of what is, after all, supposition, if I did not have a candidate, an identifiable Per Abbat in mind ... I think I have found such a man. (p. 5)

The rest of Smith's article is a thorough analysis of the "Apócrifo del abad Lecencio," a diploma contained in the section "Cartulario cidiano" of Menéndez Pidal's La España del Cid (vol. II, 5th ed., 1956, pp. 840-4). Here is how Menéndez Pidal summarizes the content of the forged diploma: "1222 y 1223. Violencias cometidas sobre las heredades de Santa Eugenia entre el abad de Aguilar, el concejo de Cordobilla y don Pedro de Santa Ouenia (=Eugenia) en los años 1187, 1201, 1209, 1221. El abad de Aguilar, don Miguel, vence a Pedro, abad de Santa Eugenia, en 1223, ante el rey Fernando III en Carrión 'e fallaron sues cartas que traía Petro abbad falsas.'" Though the forgers were very clever in some ways, according to Smith they overdid certain things in their enthusiasm, such as the King's highly irregular way of addressing the Cid as don, the odd fashion of stating the date at the end of the diploma, which seems to be the work of someone full of epic memories, and above all the unusually high number of secular confirmantes (18) drawn at random from authentic documents of the years about 1075. Ten of these names, which Smith examines in detail, bring him to the conclusion that "It seems that those who forged the diploma were extraordinarily familiar with the Cid history and legend" (p. 11).

Smith also contends that Pidal's summary is inaccurate in two small but vital respects concerning Per Abbat's name in the diploma: in the phrase "Pedro, abbat de Santa Eugenia," i.e., Peter, Abbot of the Monastery of Santa Eugenia, "the comma should be deleted and Abad should have a capital letter" (p. 12). To justify this emendation, Smith quotes the note regarding the outcome of the court case in the records of Aguilar de Campóo, which allows him to say: "My conclusions from this original text are that the petº abad de sca eugenja of the second line is a secular person and that the words following his name refer to the village and not to the monastery" (p. 12). Further down in the diploma it clearly appears that Pedro Abbat is a secular person with two sons Juan and Pedro. The last section of the diploma names the lawyers in the case: first, the two who acted for the Abbot of Aguilar, and second, Pedro Abad assisted by his two sons as plaintiffs appearing in their own behalf. The whole diploma is obviously the work of someone with considerable legal expertise and accustomed to such materials and with the possibility of having access to the archives for the information he wanted, but not nearly so accurate when dealing with the names of ecclesiastical dignitaries. According to Smith, the man responsible for forging the Lecenio diploma was Per Abbat, and, although one cannot be specific about the nature of the materials relating to the Cid which were known to the early thirteenth century forger, we must credit the forger with strong interests in the literary Cid:

There is much speculation here, much hypothesis based on other hypotheses; but I trust that nothing I have said is inherently impossible or capable of immediate disproof. My purpose is to argue for the literal accuracy of the explicit of the PMC and to show that there was a Pedro Abad, layman and lawyer, who lived at the right time and who was sufficiently acquainted with the history and legend of the Cid to have been the refundidor of the poem in 1207. (Smith, p. 15.)

Professor Smith's article, though of great scholarly value, does not, of course, answer all the questions. Why, for instance, would Pedro Abad have forged the diploma? What is the connection between the act of forging the diploma (admitting that such a forgery was perpetrated by Pedro Abad) and the composition of the PMC? The diploma shows that whoever forged it was familiar with the history and the legend of the Cid, but that was nothing extraordinary around Burgos at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Many specialists of the PMC now agree that the extant version is the work of a single poet. We can also certainly say that that poet had a profound animosity towards the Condes de Carrión family. While that cannot yet be said of Professor Smith's Pedro Abad, the establishment of such a connection between the

224 *Olifant*/Vol. 2, No. 3/February 1975

hatred for the Condes in the PMC and Per Abbat would lead us to a more definitive identification of the author.

H. Salvador Martínez
Angelo State University

-o-oOo-o-

-o-oOo-o-

Jean Misrahi Memorial Volume

The forthcoming Jean Misrahi Memorial Volume (North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages, 1975; see Olifant, 2[1974]1, p. 46), will contain the following articles on the epic: Fabienne Gégou: "Du Roi de Sicile aux Voeux de l'Epervier," William L. Hendrickson: "Toward an Edition of Garin de Monglane," and John R. Allen: "Kinship in the Chanson de Roland."