Problems in textual criticism arise more frequently for scholars who work with manuscripts from the ancient and medieval periods than for those who deal with texts dating from a less remote time. Since readings of particular words and passages in manuscripts from the medieval era cannot always be attributed to the author of the text, one is confronted with the problem of deciding whether apparent anomalies within the text can be explained as intentional on the part of the author or as the result of scribal error. An important example of this type of problem is the Oxford manuscript of the *Chanson de Roland*. A significant number of lines, approximately ten percent of the text, do not conform to the epic decasyllabic meter used in Old French. In some of these lines, the irregularity is purely graphic, while a small number of the lines have either a regular alexandrine or octosyllabic structure. Yet many of the lines which violate the decasyllabic structure simply have one syllable too many or too few. Some editors of the text, including Jenkins and Hilka, have emended the lines to make them conform to the metrical schema expected in Old French epic poetry. However, since many of the metrically irregular lines are grammatically correct, significant changes must sometimes be made in order to create a new line that is both grammatically and metrically well-formed. Bédier and other editors since his time, for example, Whitehead and Moignet, finding this procedure objectionable, have refrained from altering a line just because it contains an abnormal number of syllables.

Those editors of the text who have chosen to emend these lines have assumed that the unmetrical lines are due to faulty scribal transmission, while those who have let the irregular lines remain apparently attribute the existence of these lines to the poet who created them. In this latter case, one must inquire into what would cause a poet to produce abnormal lines; to do this, one must have an understanding of how the poet composed.

Many Romance scholars now feel that the poet of the *Chanson de Roland* used repeated phrases, or *formulas*, as part of his compositional technique. The classic definition of the formula was given by the Homeric scholar Milman Parry: "la formule peut être définie comme une expression
qui est régulièrement employée, dans les mêmes conditions métriques, pour exprimer une certaine idée essentielle. However, this definition has come under increasing criticism in the last fifteen years, for a variety of reasons. An important theoretical objection has been raised by J. B. Hainsworth: Parry formulated his definition with the intention of identifying traditional phrases, but since his 1928 definition was formulated, the formula has come to be studied not as a traditional element but as a compositional unit.

On the practical level of data observation, the Parry definition has also proved to be inadequate. Parry himself recognized some of the problems with his definition and proposed the existence of formula-systems, sets of expressions which have one term in common with a regular formula. For example, the regular formula ἀ’λγε ’έθηκε 'he laid woes' is the source of the Homeric formula-system consisting of ἀ’λγε ’έδωκε 'he gave woes', ἀ’λγε ’έπασχον 'they suffered woes', and ἀ’λγε ’έχουσιν 'they have woes'. Note that all the derived phrases have the same metrical shape as that of the basic formula, ἄλγε ἔθηκε, a fact which reflects Parry's belief that the formulaic diction was formed by the influence of the meter. But as the following data demonstrate, phrases which express the same idea do not have to have the same metrical configuration; similar examples can also be found in Homer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2X a l’estreu li tint</td>
<td>they laid woes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3113a l’estreu li tindrent</td>
<td>they laid woes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2820b l’estreu li unt tenut</td>
<td>they suffered woes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This and other examples like it indicate that formulas are more flexible than Parry originally conceived. A theory of the flexible formula has been developed for the Homeric epics by J. B. Hainsworth. Hainsworth has proposed four general techniques of adapting formulas, exemplified by the following examples from the Roland.

1. Grammatical modifications of various types:
   a. declension, e.g. 3083b Tierris li dux d’Argone—3534b Tierri le due d’Argone, including changes in gender, e.g. 2392b est alet a sa fin—3723b est a sa fin alee.
   b. nominal modifiers can be substituted, added, or omitted, e.g. 2X b le bastun e le gauant—2727b sun bastun e sun guant.
   c. different pronouns, e.g. 6X a si li ad dit—1164a si lur ad dit.
   d. conjugation for person, number, tense, and mood, including suppletive paradigms, e.g. 3X a cleimet sa culpe—1132a clamez vos culpes; 828 n’en unt pour ne de murir dutance—3613 n’en ad pour ne de
murir dutance; conjugation often alters the number of syllables in a formula and therefore may be accompanied by compensatory modifications, e.g. 36b s'en deit ben repairer—135b devez ben repairer.

(e) different inflections, e.g. 1234 Munjoie escriet ço est l'enseigne Carlu—1350 Munjoie escriet ço est l'enseigne Carle.

(f) different stems, e.g. 499b l'espee en ad branlie—3327b la hanste en ad branlee.

(g) different suffixes, e.g. 2880b tant par est anguissus—3444b tant par est anguisables.

(h) prefixes, e.g. 1293b li rumpit la ventaille—3449b le desrumpt la ventaille.

(i) syntactic changes, including verb deletion, e.g. 91a li frein sunt d'or—2491a lesfreins a or, the presence or absence of a negating word, e.g. 1168a nuls reis de France—3334a li reis de France, or the substitution, addition, or omission of prepositions or other particles, e.g. 3X a a grant dulor—1762a par grant dulor—2541a en grant dulor—3488a de grant dulor; 3X a d'or e d'argent—2X a or e argent; 5X a Guenes li quens—2X a mais li quens Guenes.

(j) elision and hiatus, which are accompanied by other adaptations such as pattern substitution, e.g. 314a ço est Baldewin—1528a ço est Climorins, etc. vs. 1310a ço est Chernubles—2047a ço est Gualer.

(k) rearrangement, e.g. 999 e gunfanuns blancs e blois e vermeilz—1800 e gunfanuns blancs e blois e vermeilz.

II. Movement, e.g. 2X a jointes ses mains—233 qu'il devendra jointes ses mains tis hom. This adaptation is frequently found in conjunction with one or more modifications, for example, prefixation and particles: 3X a cleimet sa culpe—2014b si recleimet sa culpe.

III. Expansion and related phenomena.

(a) simple expansion by the addition of modifiers, e.g. 7b la tient ki Deu nen aimet—3261b ki Deu nen amat unkes; frequently, the expansion of a formula involves movement, e.g. 727a el destre braz—2X. b le destre braz del cors.

(b) expansion by coordination, e.g. 2134b unkes n'amai cuard—1486 unches n'amai cuard ne cuardie.

(c) complex formulas, which differ from simple expansion in that the word is not merely an additional modifier of something in the basic phrase, e.g. 20X a li reis Marsilies—2X b dist Marsilies li reis.
In each of the above types of expansion, one can also consider the shorter phrase as being the result of contraction.

(d) conflation takes place between two phrases which have one member in common, e.g. 4X a Carles li reis and 4X a si l'orrat Carles have been conflated in 1714b si l'orrat li reis Karles.

IV. Separation, e.g. 4X a de ço qui calt— 3339b d'iço, seignurs, qui calt.

A fifth type of formulaic adaptation which was not examined in detail by Hainsworth is pattern substitution. The importance of this technique as a means of adapting formulas in the Chanson de Roland was noted by Joseph J. Duggan in his book The Song of Roland: Formulaic Style and Poetic Craft (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), p. 10. According to Duggan, the function of the substitutions is to express a certain idea in different assonances. The technique, demonstrated in the example below, is extremely useful and examples occur frequently in the text.

However, pattern substitution is not restricted only to the end of the line, for changing assonance is but one of its functions, found only in Old French or versification types like Old French. Pattern substitution also occurs in Greek, where its function is to change the metrical configuration of a formula, e.g. 2X κελαινη νύξ 'dark night' --- vs. 3X έρεβεννη νύξ 'murky night' ----, or to adapt an idea to different semantic contexts, for example, the idea 'someone spoke': 22X προσέøηναληγερέτα Ζεύς 'Zeus the cloud-gatherer spoke', 11X προσέøη κορυθαίολος "ΕΚΤΩΡ 'Hector of the shining helm spoke', and 11X προσέøη χανθος Μενέλαος 'fair-haired Menelaus spoke', all of which fit into the metrical shape --- or----, which can fill the same position at the end of a line. This semantic function is found in the examples with assonance, but also occurs alone when there is substitution in a first-hemistich formula, e.g. 942a oil sunt felun—3562a cil sunt vassal—3875a cil sunt produme.

The formulaic adaptations which have just been discussed can now be examined to discover how a formulaic analysis might help to explain the metrical peculiarities of the Oxford manuscript. Bédier, in his 1927 commentary on the Roland, also examined many of the metrically irregular lines in the text, dividing them into several types: alexandrines, lines with a caesura after the sixth syllable, lines with a lyric caesura, and
lines with a word containing a mute e. Bédier argued that these types of lines were acceptable to Anglo-Norman audiences of the twelfth century, citing as support for his position examples of similar lines in other Old French texts. This method of argumentation, however, is potentially circular and does not explain how the poet came to create such lines. The different types of metrically irregular lines such lines. The different types of metrically irregular lines proposed by Bédier will be analyzed vis-à-vis a formulaic explanation for them; this will be followed by a presentation of cases which a model of formulaic flexibility can account for but which Bédier could not explain. Nevertheless, it must be kept in mind that perhaps no theory can explain all of the metrical irregularities in the Chanson de Roland.

Some of the lines in the Roland which do not conform to the standard epic decasyllabic structure nevertheless contain regular tetra- and hexasyllabic hemistichs. For example, an alexandrine line consists of two hexasyllabic hemistichs. Bédier attempted to justify the existence of the two dozen alexandrine lines in the Oxford text by referring to other examples of alexandrines in other manuscripts of the Roland. But this in no way explains why the lines are there.

In addition to the alexandrine lines, the Oxford manuscript also contains a half-dozen lines which are octosyllabic, as well as two lines with three tetrasyllabic "hemistichs" and one line which has a $4 + 4 + 6$ structure. Many of these and the alexandrine lines can be shown to be the result of stringing together formulas in combinations other than the expected $4 + 6$ pattern:

(a) alexandrines: 1368 *que sis cumpainz Rollant* li ad tant demandee is related to the second-hemistich formula in 1929b *Rollant sun cumpaignun*; 608 *la traisun jurat* e si s'en forsfait appears to be a contraction of 605 *la traisun me jurrez de Rollant*.

(b) octosyllabics: 2790 *sire amiralz dist Clariens* can be compared to the first-hemistich formula 2X a *dist Clariens*; 685 *ki l'en cunduistrent tresqu'en la mer* contains the formula also found in 3a *tresqu'en la mer*.

(c) others: 2701 *li quens Rollant trenchat ier le destre poign* contains two formulas, 33X a *li quens Rollant* and 4X a *le/el destre poign*; 2292 *apres li dit culvert paien* cum fus unkes si os also contains two formulas, 3X a *apres li dist* and 1253a *culvert paien*.

Bédier also pointed out the existence of some twenty lines which are hypersyllabic if they are analyzed as standard epic decasyllabic lines; if,
however, these lines are regarded as having a $6 + 4$ structure, there is no problem with the number of syllables:15

1140 ben sunt asols // e quites de lur pecchez
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
but 1140 ben sunt asols e quites // de lur pecchez
1 2 3 4 5 6 e 7 8 9 10

The $6 + 4$ analysis is frequently supported by evidence that the tetrasyllabic second hemistich is attested elsewhere as a first-hemistich formula. Thus, 1140b de lur pecchez corresponds to 2370a de mes pecchez. Other examples include the following:

(a) 1416 e li Franceis ifierent cumunement—3416a cumunement;
(b) 2197 en pareis les metet en sentesflurs—1856a en seintes flurs;
(c) 3753 si me tolit .xx. milie de mes Franceis—2X a de noz Franceis.

Another type of metrically irregular line discussed by Bédier is that which has a lyric caesura.16 These lines are, at first glance, hyposyllabic, but according to the principles of lyric versification, a mute $e$ can count as the fourth syllable. Once again, Bédier merely cited other examples of lines with a lyric caesura as justification for their presence in the Roland. However, his claim that the mute $e$ must be pronounced in these lines is inconsistent with another of his claims, discussed below, namely that there are cases where the final mute $e$ was not pronounced.

While formulaic analysis cannot account for all of the lines with a so-called lyric caesura, it does elucidate some of these metrically aberrant lines. For example, 2405a $u$ est Otes must have been generated by pattern substitution from a formula-system which contains the phrases 2404a $u$ est Gerins, 2490a $u$ est Gerard, and 2770a $u$ est Marsilie. This formula-system appears to have also given rise to two hypersyllabic hemistichs, 2403a $u$ est l’arcevesque and 1363a $u$ est vostre espee.

Bédier attempted to explain two other categories of metrically irregular lines as the result of phonological changes in Anglo-Norman. The change which characterizes the first group is the loss of the final dental sound $[\theta]$. Bédier claimed that "le poète se réservait la liberté de tenir compte de la dentale ou de la négliger"17 with the result that ignoring the final dental would permit elision of a schwa before a word beginning with a vowel. Thus, in Bédier's estimation, the first hemistich of line 365 entre en sa veie should be read as if it were written entre en sa veie.18 Opposed to Bédier's list of sixteen lines in which he claimed that the final dental was to be ignored are about thirty cases in which the dental must be maintained in order for the line to be metrical, e.g. 2235a guardet aval.
To support his argument that the pronunciation of the final dental was optional, Bédier cited twelve lines in which the scribe omitted the final dental. However, in only one case, line 3462 *n'i ad celoi que n'i fierce o ni capleit*, does the absence of the -t affect the syllable count; but in spite of the absence of the -t, the line is still hypersyllabic. The orthographic evidence, therefore, does not lend convincing support to Bédier's claim because none of the examples of the loss of the final dental is found in a line rendered metrically correct by the absence of the -t.

The last set of metrically irregular lines which Bédier tried to account for share one feature: all of the lines contain a word that has a mute e which Bédier claimed should be ignored in the syllable count. This position appears to be incompatible with Bédier's other claim that the mute e must count in the lines with a lyric caesura, a problem which has already been discussed.

The cases of mute e which Bédier treated together actually constitute two different phonological phenomena: (1) the syncope of schwa in the middle of a word, and (2) the apocope of schwa in the final syllables -e and -es.

The orthographic evidence in the former case, that of syncope, is not completely conclusive. The omission of an internal schwa is found twice in hyposyllabic lines, 300a *einz i frai* and 2106b *mult malment nos vait*, while occasionally the syncope of the schwa in a future verb form gives a correct syllable count, e.g. 605 *la traisun me jurrez de Rollant* and 3X a *jo vos durrai*. However, the schwa is written in a majority of words in both metrically irregular lines, e.g. 573 *en dulce France s'en repairerat li reis*, and in those lines which have a correct syllable count, e.g. 2109b *isnemente chevalz* and 7X a *isnemente*. The existence of a hypercorrect *greisele* in 3118 allows one tentatively to conclude that, for the scribe, the word-internal schwas were in the process of being lost from the language and that the scribe was at times unsure about when a schwa should be present. Whether the poet shared this incertitude, however, is more difficult for us to judge.

In addition to the rule of syncope, Bédier proposed that a mute e was apocopated in cases such as 518b *en ert bel(e) l'amendise* and 3881b *les sel(e)s cheent a tere*. Jean Mazaleyrat, in his book *Éléments de métrique française*, agrees with Bédier that "l'apocope se trouve non seulement en fin de vers mais encore à l'intérieur de l'hemistiche." But Frederick Whitehead expressed doubt about Bédier's claim that final unaccented schwa had fallen in the early twelfth century. Indeed, the orthography of the text does not provide much evidence for apocope. The scribe did not
write the final schwa on three occasions, 210 guer, 1887 bataill, and 3595 sembl, but the two former cases cannot be confirmed by the meter because these words fall at the hemistich and the third word, which occurs at the end of the line, must be read semble for the assonance. Similarly, the one case of a hypercorrect addition of a posttonic schwa, tireres in line 2283, is not guaranteed by the meter because the word is located before the caesura.

There is a stronger argument that posttonic schwas were not being lost in the pronunciation of the poet: the distinction between masculine and feminine assonance is significant and always maintained in the text. Moreover, the grammars do not support Bédier's claims. Pope cites only examples of final schwas not protected by -s, -t, or -nt as being effaced in the first half of the twelfth century. And according to Johan Vising, the loss of posttonic -e is not confirmed by rhyme until the last part of the twelfth century.

In summary, Bédier sought to explain the presence of many metrical irregularities, in Whitehead's words, "as legitimate deviations from the conventional patterns and others as due to attempts on the part of the scribe or one of his predecessors to modify the metre of the original in conformity with Anglo-Norman principles of versification." But it has been demonstrated here that Bédier's assumptions about the language of the Oxford Roland cannot always be incontrovertibly supported by textual evidence.

Moreover, Bédier's theories, which rely heavily on the status of the schwa, can provide no explanation for irregularly scanned lines which do not contain a schwa, e.g. 416b salvez seiez de Mahun. By invoking the principle of pattern substitution from the theory of formulaic flexibility, one can easily see that 416b was generated by analogy with the phrase salvez seiez de Deu, which is attested three times (123b, 428b, and 676b). Furthermore, the proximity of 416b to 428b makes all the more acceptable the hypothesis that pattern substitution is the source of the line and that Hilka's emendation to sals seiez de Mahum violates the morphological-lexical pattern for the sake of the meter. Many other metrically irregular lines can also be explicated by the different types of formulaic flexibility, as demonstrated in the following paragraphs; the variant which does not scan is listed first.

I. Modifications.

(a) Declension: the hypersyllabic 2186b e Gerer sun cumpaignun is related to 2404b e ses cumpainz Gerers, which has a correct syllable
count because it uses the nominative case of the imparisyllabic noun *cumpainz*; the oblique case of the same noun in 2186b is one syllable longer.

(b) The presence or absence of modifiers such as the definite article can render a formula either hypersyllabic, as in 2894a *guardet a la tere*—cf. 1230a *guardet a tere*, or hyposyllabic, as in 2341a *cuntre ciel*—cf. 5X *cuntre le ciel*. Another source of hypersyllabicity is the replacement of an article by a demonstrative adjective: 2694b *de cele gent paienur*—cf. 2427b *de la gent paienur*.

(c) The presence, absence, or substitution of pronouns for semantic reasons can make a line unmetrical: 959a *quant ele le veit*—cf. 3640a *quant ele vit*; 2205b *les ad asols e seignet*—cf. 340b *l'ad asols e seignet*.

(d) Conjugational changes in the person, number, mood, or tense often alters the number of syllables in a verb, creating the potential for a formula to be unmetrical: 2793b *que Carles aveit tant cher*—cf. 547b *que Carles ad tant chers* and 3031b *que Carles ait plus cher*.

Metrical irregularity may often result from the introduction of a new form through linguistic change or through the existence of morphological variants, as the cases in (e) - (h) demonstrate:

(e) Different inflections. In earliest Old French, *grant* was a third declension adjective with no -e in the feminine forms. Later, by analogy with first declension adjectives, *grant* began to assume a gender inflection. Thus in 3745b *mult par est grande la feste*, the hypersyllabicity can be attributed to the new feminine form of the adjective; the older form is found in the metrically correct 152a *a la grant feste*.

(f) Different stems. The source of hypersyllabicity in 3462b *que n'i fierge o n'i capleit* seems to be *capleit*, the subjunctive of *capleier*, a verb form which is needed for the assonance. In other occurrences of the formula a more common form of the verb, *capler*, is used without causing metrical irregularity: 3475b *ben i fierent e caplent*, 1347b *i fierent e si caplent*, 1681b *e ferir e capler*, 3888a *fierent e caplent*. Note that in the last example the formula has been moved to the first hemistich.

(g) Different suffixes. 827 *xx milie Francs unt en lur cumpaigne* is hyposyllabic because, for reasons of assonance, the shorter word *cumpaigne* was used instead of the longer word *cumpaignie*, which is found in 587 *xx milie Francs unt en lur cumpaignie*. 
(h) Prefixes. A common process in Old French was to add a prefix to a word, usually without changing the meaning. The addition of a prefix usually makes a line hypersyllabic, if no compensatory modifications accompany the addition of the prefix: 2202a *encunetru sun piz*—cf. 2174a *cuntru sun piz*.

(i) Syntactic changes such as the addition of a preposition to a formula for syntactic-semantic reasons can upset the scansion of a line: 1798a *d’osbercs e de helmes*—cf. 1809a *osbercs e helmes*.

(j) Rearrangement. The usual reason that an unmetrical line is generated by rearrangement is that a word with a final mute e syllable is moved from the end of the hemistich, where the mute e does not count, into the middle of the line, where it must count, e.g. 1278a *trenchet li le coer*—cf. 1506a *le cors li trenchet*. A second reason that rearrangement results in a line which does not scan is that the change in word order destroys an environment for elision, e.g. 131b *que carier en ferez*—cf. 33b *qu’en ferat carier*.

II. Movement. The movement of a formula from the longer second hemistich to the first hemistich will create an unmetrical line if adequate compensatory modifications cannot be made, e.g. 2X a *culchet sei a tere*—cf. 2013b *a la tere se culchet*.

III. Expansion, contraction, etc.

(a) Simple expansion by the addition of a modifier will make a formula hypersyllabic: 1496a *beste ne est nule* cf. 1598 *beste nen est*.

(b) Coordination: 2180 *jo’es voell aler querre e entercer* is one syllable short after expansion of the formula which is also found in 2661b *le voeil aler querant*.

(c) Because complex formulas are so rare in the *Chanson de Roland*, I can offer no examples of one which is metrically irregular.

(d) Conflation: 783b *apelet ses nies Rollant* is a conflation of 1975a *Rollant apelet* and 2X a *Rollant sis nies*. The poet used the nominative case *nies* in 783b instead of the expected oblique case *nevold*, perhaps in an attempt to avoid having eight syllables in the second hemistich.

IV. Separation. Examples of metrical irregularity with separation do not seem to occur.

V. Pattern substitution. By means of this technique, a poet may create hypersyllabic lines, as in 3245b *e la noefme de Clavers* and 3259b *e la noefme de Clarbone*—cf. 3229b *e la noefme de Gros*. Hyposyllabic lines may
also be generated: 2354 De li emperere en est ber e riches—cf. 2737 li emperere est ber e cumbatant.

The above examples demonstrate that the formulaic flexibility model can explain a wide variety of metrical irregularities, many of which could not be accounted for by earlier theories about the text. But a theory of the flexible formula not only provides elucidation of metrical peculiarities, it also offers strong evidence that the irregular lines should not be emended. Indeed, an important conclusion to be drawn from the study of formulaic adaptability and metrical irregularity is that the poet chose to obey the rules of grammar when confronted with a choice between grammar and meter.

But one question remains unanswered: why would a poet create metrically abnormal lines? One possible explanation is that the rules of versification for Anglo-Norman were different from those for continental verse. This view was adopted by both Bédier and Ramón Menéndez Pidal. While Bédier considered Anglo-Norman as having innovated as a result of the loss of mute e, Menéndez Pidal held that the insular dialect was conservative, preserving traces of an older form of versification, namely, the anisosyllabic system of meter which is maintained in a fuller form in the Cantar de mio Cid.

A second theory about the existence of lines which do not scan is that the poem was created by an oral-traditional poet who, under pressure of composition, would occasionally produce a line which had too many or too few syllables. This phenomenon is well-attested in living oral traditions, including that of the South Slavic guslars studied by A. B. Lord and American spiritual preachers, whose rhythmic sermons have been investigated by Bruce A. Rosenberg.

Other evidence from the Oxford text also suggests that the Chanson de Roland is, directly or indirectly, a product of oral composition. There is, of course, the evidence of the "traditional" formulas, the data for which was presented in Duggan's excellent study, The Song of Roland: Formulaic Style and Poetic Craft, mentioned above; other evidence has been found in the stylistic elements of the text, thematic composition and the use of laisses similaires. Highly compatible with the view that the story of Roland was spread throughout Western Europe by poets composing orally is the existence of over a dozen divergent versions of the poem, not only in French but also in other European languages of the Middle Ages. Oral diffusion might also be the explanation for the presence in the Oxford manuscript of competing dialect forms, e.g. halbercs vs. osbercs and helme vs. elme.
Another indication of oral performance is the presence of phonological echoes in the poem. Most of the phonological echo in the Oxford Roland occurs within a single line, typically in the contrasting of proper names, e.g. 2641 laisent Marbrise e si laisent Marbrose. However, echoic parallelism such as this does not prove oral composition. Although not sufficient by itself, some of the best evidence which can be adduced in favor of oral composition is the phonological echoing of lines which are found in different parts of the text. The Roland contains one excellent example of this, 3885 Pinabels est forz e isnels e legers, which echoes 1312 e bels e forz e isnels e legers and 2278a bels fut e forz. But what is most interesting about line 3885 is not that it is an echo of 1312 and 2278a, but that in developing an echo, the poet created a metrically abnormal line.

Unfortunately, there is no manuscript which contains a musical score for the Chanson de Roland which would indicate how the metrically irregular lines might have been performed. However, a piece of music which can be assigned to another extant text has survived; the previously unedited manuscript was first transcribed by musicologist Jacques Chailley. The strophe with which the music is connected is found in the Bibliotheque Nationale on MS lat. 1139 from Saint Martial de Limoges. The poem, the language of which is Occitan, is written in an epic decasyllabic meter with an assonanced laisse:

Be deu hoi mais finir nostra razos.
Un pauc soi las que trop fu aut lo sos.
Leven doi clerces que dijen lo respos
Tu autem, Deus, qui est paire glorios:
Nos te preiam que t'remembre de nos
Quant triaras los mals d'entre los bos.31

One of the melodic phrases in the music cited by Chailley is patterned within the poem: it is repeated in the second hemistich of the second, fourth, and sixth lines. The melody of these phrases is

```
\begin{verbatim}
que trop fu aut lo sos
\end{verbatim}
```

What is of interest here is the hemistich qui es paire glorios from the fourth line, which, by virtue of having an extra syllable, should not fit into the musical phrase just cited. The manuscript shows an extra note for this phrase, but Chailley put the note in parentheses in his transcription:
Chailley commented that "ayant par erreur compté gloriös pour trois syllabes au lieu de deux, le scribe n’a pas trouvé étrange d’ajouter une note, visiblement interpolée." However, I must disagree with Chailley's interpretation because the word gloriös is trisyllabic in the poetry of both Old Provençal and Old French. This musical example thus appears to confirm the existence of metrically irregular lines and the viewpoint that these lines should be allowed to remain in an edition of the text.

Marjorie L. Windelberg  
Indiana State University  
Terre Haute

102X a should be read as "twice in the first hemistich." The examples cited are based on data taken from Joseph J. Duggan, A Concordance of the Chanson de Roland (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1969). To generate his Concordance, Duggan took the Mortier edition of the poem, Les Textes de la Chanson
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