THE CHANSON DE ROLAND is valuable from the historical and socio-ethical point of view in that it reveals the opinion that Christian Europeans of the eleventh century may have had of the Moslems in Spain. Beginning with the first laisse and continuing throughout the epic, the narrator clearly and unconditionally declares his adherence to the Christian side of the conflict. Marzouki asserts that the author-narrator's prejudicial attitudes toward Islam and Moslems are the result of his almost total ignorance of Islamic culture. As evidence of the poet's prejudice and ignorance, the author points out that Islam, a fervently monotheistic religion, is portrayed as a polytheistic religious system based on the unholy trinity of Mahomet, Apollin, and Tervagant; Moslems are depicted worshipping statues and idols, although Islam strictly forbids such practices; the names given to the Moslems frequently begin with the prefixes "mal" or "mar," and, in the case of Falsaron, "fals" or "faux," to indicate their moral perversion, or the names are so cacophonous that the mere sound awakens terror and repugnance in the listener; the fact that non-Moslem peoples, such as the Esclavons, Huns, Hongrois, Bulgares, and Pyncenois, are listed among the Moslem ranks indicates that the author possesses a Manichaean vision of the world which divides men into two categories: Christians and "païens," composed entirely of Moslems; Saracen lands are depicted as dark, tormented, forbidding, and hellish countrysides; the physical portrait of Moslems is dominated by two characteristics—ugliness and horrifying gigantism; their moral portrait is scarcely more flattering, for they personify, in the Chanson, treachery, felony, and cowardice.

The second part of the article outlines the rôle of legend in coloring the historical event and the influence of the fervor of the Crusades on the chauvinistic and biased presentation of the Islamic world in the Chanson de Roland.

This article is a clearly arranged and logical presentation of the idea that the Chanson de Roland is a justification and demonstration of the postulate: "Païen unt tort e crestiens unt dreit." Although the article is at times rather sketchy and of a somewhat peremptory tone, the author
succeeds in persuading the reader that Bédier's statement "notre poète se fait de l'Islam une représentation d'ensemble qui est juste, après tout, en ses grandes lignes," needs to be reexamined from the Moslem point of view.

Sharon E. Harwood
Memphis State University


Professor W. T. H. Jackson, in The Literature of the Middle Ages (New York, 1960), commented on the ambivalence and, at times, "unsatisfying" figure of the emperor. In this article, Niles suggests ways to eliminate the "apparent" contradictions in the depiction of Charlemagne, thus to permit "a satisfactory reading of the work as a whole." Charlemagne should be viewed as the "ideal ruler" according to Byzantine canons, as illustrated by art forms which later influenced Romanesque art. The correspondence between two particular sculptures and laisse VIII reveals three principles inherent to the chosen examples: principles of hierarchy, of animation, and of dependence. In all three works reality is secondary to the representation of an ideal, timeless order. The imposing presence of Charlemagne, as recognized by Pauphilet, Albert Lord, and Karl Uitti, ensures the unity of the poem from its first line to its last. A mythic element appears in the so-called Baligant episode. "The death of Roland, like the death of Patroklos in the Iliad, seems to trigger the release of immense energies": the king becomes an awesome warrior who realizes the goals set at the beginning of the Chanson. His self-restraint, not his lack of feelings, sets him apart from Roland and yet as part, the head, of "the same living body." Sole survivor among the major heroes of the epic struggle, his victory has a bitter taste and does not change the human destiny of suffering and death. "The true triumph celebrated in the poem, the triumph of man over his own weakness . . . is Roland's, of course," but, in a more spiritual way, "Charlemagne['s] as well."
Professor Niles is most convincing when comparing *laisse* VIII to Byzantine iconography.

Andrée Kail

University of Colorado


Noiriel studies the *geste des Lorrains* to see to what extent literature and history coincide. The aristocratic and knightly society portrayed in *Garin le Loherain* (1150-1170) is compared to that, more bourgeois, described in *Hervis de Mes* some seventy-five years later. The economic, social, and ideological evolution which marks the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Western Europe is clearly seen in these two poems and reflects the passage from the first to the second feudal age.

The study of *Garin* confirms recent historical research on the knights. Their essential activity is warfare or preparation for warfare, they have considerable economic power, they are socially and ideologically superior, they function as a group which does not coincide absolutely with the aristocracy but whose hierarchy corresponds more to that of the guilds. The internal social relationships (family, feudal) of the group, and its relationship with other social groups (religious, bourgeois, villein) are treated at some length.

In *Hervis de Mes* increased emphasis on bourgeois values, often opposed to those of the knight, reflects the growing economic and social importance of the bourgeoisie. This leads to a reaction within the aristocracy whose class consciousness is strengthened by this external threat as well as by the internal threat of weakening feudal bonds. The results are a closing of ranks—knights and aristocracy making up one class—and an exaggeration of knightly values.

Whereas in *Garin* the mentality was essentially secular and feudal, and the hero was a warrior-knight in the service of a liege lord, in *Hervis* the hero becomes the soldier of God, defender of order and of Christianity. Courtly influence is seen in the importance given to the
description of material surroundings, in the poet's portrayal of the rôle of women, and in the place accorded to love. Noiriel concludes by examining some of the problems confronting the historian who uses epic literature as source material.

This article gives the result of research developed in the author's mémoire de maîtrise, "La Chevalerie de Garin le Loherain à Hervis de Mes" (1973). As such, it reflects the structure of a thesis and contains some repetition. The bibliographical references are useful, and the article could be recommended as a departure point for beginning research on a similar subject.

Rae S. Baudoin
University of British Columbia


Professor Ribard argues that the silences of the Chanson de Roland have two functions: either to indicate pauses that have a lyrico-poetic value or to mark pauses that are more explicit and have a dramatic value. A study of the art of such silences reveals yet again the lyrico-dramatic character of that poem as opposed to the narrative, as Rychner and Delbouille have also argued. Ribard begins his own discussion with Bédier's famous statement: "Roland se tait et ce silence est la chose la plus sublime de la Chanson de Roland" (532 and n. 1, from Légendes épiques, 3e édition [1929], III, p. 439).

Sometimes—but not always, cautions Ribard—the indication of AOI in the text is a sign akin to a musical pause, which is written as . in a musical text (point d'orgue). (None of the examples he gives do, in fact, have AOI.) These musical pauses are further divided into "evocative pauses" and "transitional pauses." Examples of the former are in vv. 1830, 2512, 2271, 2629, 2646, 2973, 3345, 3560, 3633, 3658, 3675, 3873, where the récit is interrupted for lyrical descriptions. Another musical pause in the text is characterized by a "véritable ballet" of descents from
and mountings of horses, which also mark transition from one scene to another (vv. 660, 2704, 2765, 2457, 3096). Another lyrical pause noted by Ribard corresponds to what amounts to chapter markings at vv. 1169, 1187, 3704. A final category of lyrico-musical pauses distinguished by Ribard are the "rapid evocations" of background, as in vv. 1098 and 3264.

Ribard devotes the majority of his remarks to the second function of silences in the Chanson de Roland, that is, to those silences which have a dramatic value. Among dramatic silences he distinguishes collective silences and the silences of principal characters. The collective silences of the French or of the pagans (vv. 22-23, 217-18, 263, 407-11, 2411, 3273-74, 3540) are sometimes accompanied by weeping (vv. 3120, 3722). These silences are a dramatic commentary on the action like the commentary of the Classical Chorus.

The silences of principal characters are sometimes accompanied by gestures or attitudes. Silence underscores the solemnity of these gestures in a way that commentary would weaken. Both parallels and antitheses between silences and gestures or attitudes enhance the dramatic qualities of the poem.

Charlemagne is generally characterized as being "avare de paroles" (vv. 140-41, 1812, 1834, 1842). When the emperor is shown acting silently (vv. 3121, 1842-43, 3121-22), the antithesis created increases the effect of menace: silence, for example, "double l'impression" of the invincible, ineluctable progress of Charles toward victory over the Saracens.

Characteristic of Charles is his static posture of pensive silence (vv. 138-39, 771, 772, 2982, 3816). He is also silent when he catches Aude in his arms (v. 3726), clasps the body of Roland (v. 2879), and holds the victorious Thierry (v. 3939). For Ribard, such silence serves to enhance the pathos of those scenes. The antithesis (not mentioned by Ribard) of these scenes is, of course, the long lamentations of Charles on the devastated battlefield when the "man of few words" unleashes his sorrow.

Baligant is the counterpart of Charles and is also characterized by pensive silences (vv. 2788, 3504-05, 3520). These silently pensive rulers invoke the passive silences of King Arthur (cf. Bezzola and Le Gentil, cited by Ribard, p. 538, n.1.).

Ribard considers Marsile and Ganelon to be counterparts in terms of
the "jeu des silences" in their scenes in the poem. Ganelon, however, is not a man of silence. His silences (vv. 281, 462 ff., 499-500, 641, 1816-28, 3741, 3749, 3762, 3964-73) mark the breaking off of speech, the inability to speak, or the unwillingness to speak. Ribard mentions only three of Ganelon's moments of silence: when he is seized by the cooks, when he is first brought in to the trial, and after his sentence is pronounced. Seldom mentioned, and not mentioned here, is Ganelon's long silence during the investiture scene. I shall return to this in detail.

In order to appreciate the function of Ganelon's silences, one has first to recognize that he is a talker, perhaps the longest-winded of any in the poem, Ganelon's speech is generally characterized by contradicting, conniving, and lying. He first speaks in the poem to oppose Roland and to accept the Saracen emissary (v. 220 ff.). After conniving with Blancandrin and plotting traitorously with Marsile, he returns to submit a preposterous lying report to Charles and to make the murderous designation of Roland for the rear guard defense. We are not to hear from Ganelon again until he swinishly defends himself at the trial.

Of the three silences of Ganelon mentioned by Ribard, he says only that they are "frappant." When Ganelon is seized by the cooks, he is given nothing to say. But what would he say? Ganelon has an assigned rôle to play. He is the villain, the traitor of the piece, and all of his speech is suitable to the villain's rôle. He lies, he connives, and he denies the truth, but he is not a coward and thus does not cry out; he is not a woman and thus he does not plead and beg; and he does not pray, this is for heroes and saints. In other words, Ganelon has nothing assigned to him to say that is not in character.

This brings us to the most revealing case of silence in the poem, and one that Ribard does not mention, that of Ganelon's failure to volunteer as ambassador to Marsile. A great deal is to be understood about the investiture scene if one realizes that this is a case of silence on the part of Ganelon. Charlemagne's "famous silence" after the naming of Ganelon by Roland is emphasized in every discussion of the scene.↑ After

Ganelon's proposal to accept Marsile's terms, which is seconded by Naimes and ratified by the barons, Charles asks for the designation of an emissary back to Marsile. Immediately Naimes, Roland, Olivier, and Turpin volunteer. The barons keep silent, and Charles becomes increasingly angry as one by one the peers volunteer themselves. Charles's fury arises from the fact that the logical designate for this dangerous mission keeps silent. Should not the one who proposed the mission despite (or rather in view of) the dangers mentioned by Roland volunteer himself? Even if he felt it beneath his dignity to seek such a rôle, should he not have volunteered at least after Naimes did so? Charles shows by his anger that he is waiting for the logical candidate to propose himself. The barons cannot say a word. When Roland finally calls upon his stepfather, he is only indicating the just and logical candidate who should have spoken up himself in the first place. The silence of the very one who should speak underscores the whole dramatic intensity of the scene.

Ganelon's silence is a refusal to speak. This is the "signification" with which the silence of Ganelon is laden. The scene is of course seething with


The most recent is by Gerard J. Brault who concludes. "Roland proposes Ganelon in order to unmask his cowardice" (p. 137). For an opposite view, see Lejeune op. cit.

For support of this view see T. Atkinson Jenkins, ed., La Chanson de Roland (Boston, 1924, 1929, Repr. 1977), note to v. 277; Edmond Faral, La Chanson de Roland, étude et analyse (Paris, 1933), p. 67; and Jules Horrent, La Chanson de Roland (Paris, 1951), p. 270; "La désignation de Ganelon par Roland n'a rien d'anormal. L'inquiétant, c'est le silence de Ganelon et son emportement contre son fillâtre."

See my comments on this line of reasoning à propos Demoulin's article (op. cit.), in Olifant 5 (1978), 326-329. Lejeune and Vance also espouse mainly psychological interpretations.
all kinds of implications. Perhaps Charles wishes to protect Roland against Ganelon because Roland is really his own son; perhaps hatred of his stepfather is felt by Roland; whatever is true about these conjectures, it is nonetheless true that the villain and traitor does not volunteer himself like a hero. He does not step out of his rôle as villain *nor can he*. One must not confuse psychological factors and other implications with motive. It is unfortunate that the villain imputes the worst motives to a just decision, but this is the essence of the drama, and it is incorrect to posit a guilt-ridden Charles allowing an unjust choice of ambassador in order to protect a beloved nephew (or son). The correct view of the situation is even more interesting. Ganelon the coward (Brault, I, p. 137) is less interesting than Ganelon the villain.

Charles may have been glad that his nephew (or son) was not the one to go, and that Ganelon was chosen, whom he may have disliked for any number of reasons, *but we cannot say that Roland nominated him because of these things*: Roland nominated him because it was the correct choice, and Naimes, Charles, and the barons approved because it was an appropriate choice. All the other emotions, charges, relationships, ill will, and so on, make the situation exceedingly rich in significance. We do not need a guilt-ridden Charles acting from personal motives. It is the essence of great drama that a just choice should be made of someone who has every reason to believe he is the victim of a plot, and who, as a result, retaliates murderously and treacherously. Ganelon so behaves because he is the villain and does not reason like a hero. He sees Roland as an enemy and thus interprets his behavior to him as hostile and guilty. Ganelon is a villain named to a hero's rôle, and there is no possibility that he can act the hero. Psychological criticism has a tendency to reverse rôles, to see Ganelon as wronged and Charles as guilt-ridden. Such an interpretation is tantamount to indicting Charles for illegal, immoral behavior. Neither Charles nor Roland can act in a base way. One must not accuse Charles of using his office for private vengeance: this is Ganelon's rôle! Ganelon as villain is unable to distinguish private from public and so brings down 20,000 Franks to avenge himself on one. The drama derives intensity from these other factors: avarice, incest, insinuations of past hatreds, jealousy, envy, and so on; but we cannot accuse the heroes of acting from these motives. Later Charles will have to accept Roland's appointment to the rear guard, something he does *not* want, but again he does so because
it is an appropriate, logical, and just choice! This is the real parallelism in the two events. The rich complexity of relationship makes the otherwise neutral act of a King's Council and a choice of ambassador into an endlessly fascinating drama. The complexity elevates a mere legal hearing into the preamble of a tragedy. But we do not need to reverse rôles of villains and heroes to accomplish this. Before Ganelon first appears, the text has already warned us (v. 178) that he is the villain. In the investiture scene, we watch him prove it. Only the heroes volunteer, the villain cannot. Charles's fury, the barons' uneasy silence, and Roland's scorn all demonstrate that they recognize Ganelon for what he is not. The complexity of the figure of Ganelon resides in the fact that he is an attractive villain. This contradiction of rôle and attribute creates a villain worthy of the dignity of the events of the drama. Ganelon is probably meant not even to have recognized that the King, barons, and peers were waiting for him to speak up. He may have first spoken to accept Marsile's proposal only in order to oppose his nephew. His private hatred of Roland was so strong that he may not have realized that his public statement implied responsibilities. When he is designated as ambassador, it comes as a shock to Ganelon. He cannot see that the choice is logical, just, and appropriate. Having acted out of private emotion, he sees in Roland's nomination only the notion of personal insult to himself. Later, Ganelon behaves the same way in his own defense at the trial. Never does he see that his private quarrel became a treasonable (public) act. Again, it is consonant with his rôle as villain not to be able to interpret events appropriately. Moignet, in his edition, pointed out (p. 45) that Ganelon sees in his designation by Roland a trap, a vengeance, an insult, and a menace against his life. Because he himself acts from these motives, never does it seem to occur to Ganelon that there are actions, events, with meanings outside of his personal interpretation. It is obvious from the moment Charles asks who should go that it is Ganelon who should propose himself. That is the essence of the tension in the drama of the scene. The irony is that only Roland has the courage to name the appropriate candidate who in turn will reward the just deed with treason and murder. Modern criticism which tends to elaborate upon Charles's guilty silence in the investiture scene fails to see Ganelon's guilty silence, the one that forms the backdrop to Charles's increasingly angry rejection of the heroes who are willing to carry out the proposal of the villain. Nor does such criticism even account for Charles's anger, only his silence. To
interpret Charles as guilt-ridden and hostile is to accept Ganelon's view and to trivialize Charles's rôle! The critic must not diminish the stature of the tragedy by imputing back-stairs motives to momentous decisions of state.

BLANCANDRIN IS THE SARACEN COUNTERPART to Ganelon. Like Ganelon, he is a man of words, and it is his words that break the stalemate with which the Roland opens. Ribard somewhat misses an opportunity when he couples Ganelon-Marsile rather than Ganelon and Blancandrin. The noisiness of the lying, plotting emissaries forms a counterpoint to the pensive, silent dignity of Emperor and Emir. The men of words significantly disappear when the action begins.

The third couple that Ribard treats in terms of silences is Roland-Olivier. Ribard cites the silences after vv. 1736, 1092, 1109 and 1123 as examples of a profound gulf between these two characters: "Sans vouloir donner dans le thème à la mode de l'incommunicabilité, il faut reconnaître qu'ici le poète a su, autant par le jeu des silences que par les propos échangés, bien marquer l'incompréhension profonde qui rend étrangers l'un à l'autre deux natures, deux esprits" (p. 540-41). I suggest, without reducing Roland and Olivier to mere symbols, that the incomprehension signaled by silences at the end of these dialogues is not that of differences of character, but one of two differing and valid interpretations of a situation that has, unknown to them, been deliberately falsified. The impasse of this duel in dialogue (signaled by silences) is paralleled by similar impasses in the action of the poem that require outside intervention to permit action to proceed. In the dialogues, both Roland and Olivier are correct, i.e., there is a true dilemma, but not one of character, rather one of situation. The action of the drama is fueled by such unresolved differences.

Ribard points out that the moment of death in the case of Olivier and Turpin is characterized by silence. Each one dies in Roland's arms gazing silently at his companion and friend. Ribard concludes that such silence adds a dimension of dignity and pathos to the death scenes. He could also have added that the counterpoint to these silent deaths is in Roland's dying leave-taking of Durendal. Roland seems to speak for all the heroes who die just as Charles laments all of them.

Ribard concludes from his brief study of the "jeu des silences" in the
The author examines only the tenses of the indicative, especially the present (P) and simple past (SP), which are the most frequent. He finds that, when SP follows P for no immediately apparent reason, it expresses (1) the consequence of the event stated in P, (2) a subsequent but related act, (3) an explanation, (4) supplementary information, or (5) an authorial desire for dramatic presentation. (There is no attempt to see whether P following P ever expresses the same ideas.) He explains that the poet uses P to state "la réalité brute" and SP to mark his own intervention in the reality evoked. The sudden shift from SP to P produces "un contraste saisissant" between factual reporting and "la vision épique des faits." Considering SP alone, M. Ruelle then mentions its occurrence with mar(e) in affirmations of regret. He concludes the first half of the article with a page on scribal "pièges," i.e., verb forms that do not or may not express the tense they seem to.

Examining the compound past (CP), the writer observes that it occurs variously as (1) a present perfect, (2) a present, as in the original Latin construction, and (3) a preterite; in the last use, CP is interchangeable with SP, and tense selection is governed not by a desire for variety but by "facilité" (which is not defined). He briefly notes the scarcity of futures, imperfects, and pluperfects in the Roland and then the tendency to use SP in statements that would require the imperfect in Modern French. There is barely any effort to explain these phenomena. This is followed by some consideration of the past anterior and future anterior.
The article presents several concluding remarks: (1) there is no appreciable difference in indicative usage between the Roland and other verse compositions of the twelfth century—an issue touched on only fleetingly; (2) the poet is a master of verb syntax; (3) the artistic justification of tense variation lies in the oral and musical nature of the chanson de geste.

Tense usage in Old French, particularly in epic poetry, has challenged the descriptive and explanatory powers of philologists for at least a century. To read this article, however, one would think that M. Ruelle had no predecessors, for none is ever acknowledged, nor does he contribute anything discernibly new. The subject is treated superficially, the facts neither described nor explained adequately. Some statistics would have helped; so, too, as previous research has demonstrated, would an attempt to distinguish between narrative examples and examples found in dialogue. And what have we learned about the expression of consequence through a shift from present to simple past, if nothing is said about the possibility of consequence in a passage that shows no such shift?

S. N. Rosenberg
Indiana University


Specht devotes two articles to the fragment of two folios of the Entrée d'Espagne discovered by Angelo Monteverdi and first presented to the meeting of the Société Rencesvals in Poitiers, 1959. The fragment (= R) is now at the Biblioteca Municipale of Reggio Emilia.

The first article deals with folio 2, which does not correspond to any part of the only extant MS of the Entrée (Venice, Bibl. Marciana, fr. XXI,
= M) and is therefore to be considered as containing part of the text of the lacuna between vv. 13991 and 13992 of A. Thomas's edition of M. Specht tries to make out the most relevant points of the story (a difficult task indeed, since the conditions under which the fragment has been preserved are not optimal) and to detect any possible relationship between it and the tale as it is told in M, the Spagna and the Fatti di Spagna. On the basis of differences observed he states that R is possibly the witness of a further version.

Specht's thesis is to be accepted as fact, in my opinion. However, occasional details should be corrected; for instance, on p. 500, where he translates:

Por c.[ ] dit le p(ro)verbe dou vieus home canu:
Che [ ]... se doit pener s(er)vir sempre autru.
Che [ ]... foi vient un seul che li rend le salu
Dou [sal]us ch'il a fait ao gra(n)d e ao menu.

(vv. 143-46)

as "Dice il proverbio del vecchio uomo canuto (un saggio?): [L'uomo?] deve sempre sforzarsi di servire altrui. / Perché [una volta?] viene un solo (Cristo?) che lo ricompenserà / del bene che ha fatto ai grandi e ai piccoli." Here it is obvious that the author is quoting, in the form of a Wellerism, some proverb of the series of Ps. Seneca such as Ab alio expectes alteri quod feceris (Publilius Syrus, 2; cf. O. Friedrich, ed., Publilii Syri mimi Sententiae, [Berlin, 1880; rpt. Hildesheim, 1964], p. 23; notice the pronouns alio / alteri). The context of the quotation is not religious, as Specht believes, but moral and learned.

The second article studies folio 1, which corresponds to vv. 12309-12545 of Thomas's edition. Specht first compares the graphic, morphological and lexical habits of the scribes of R and M; then he evaluates the genetic relationship between the two texts. A certain number of "common errors" (which I do not always find to be such) shows that both descend from a single archetype; the quality of R is certainly better and leads Specht to emphasize some useful suggestions and corrections proposed by Thomas.

In the last part of his article Specht tries to decide whether R is a fragment of one of the texts quoted in the inventories of Francesco Gonzaga's library; his evidence that R is not to be identified with
Gonzaga 57 is more convincing than that provided by Ruggieri. Specht's thesis should be accepted.

Perhaps it is possible to advance a codicological hypothesis about the position of fol. 2 in the original MS. In my study of flyleaves and parchment in bindings, I reach the conclusion that when two leaves of parchment were utilized as flyleaves or binding material in a single volume, they were usually contiguous in the same fascicule, since the binder would tear off double leaves starting from the center of the fascicule of a MS. If we consider as an hypothesis that fol. 1 and fol. 2 were contiguous in the same fascicule and that fol. 1 ends with line 12545 while fol. 2 is to be placed after v. 13991, we must conclude that between the two folios there were at least 1,400 lines, i.e., at least seven folios (each folio of R contains about 200 lines). Since folios 1 and 2 were contiguous, we need an even number of folios between them, and the most logical conclusion is that they were the first and last folios of a five-leaf fascicule (i.e., ten folios; we must also recall that this kind of fascicule was the most common in Italy, whereas in France they more frequently used four-leaf ones), separated therefore by eight folios. We can thus conjecture a more precise position for fol. 2 in the lacuna in M and even, indirectly, give some indication of the length of the lacuna itself.

Alessandro Vitale-Brovarone
Torino


Comparing the plots of Sophocles's *Antigone* (=A.) with those of the *Roland* (=R.) and the *Ludus Danielis* (=D.), Sturgis is struck by the fact that a king, in the latter two, is duped by evil counselors, and, in all three, is "forced to condemn someone he loves." The bulk of the essay is then devoted to differences in the treatment that these common themes receive in the works under consideration. Not surprisingly, R. and D. are found to differ markedly in plot design and development, characterization, discursive style, and denouement. S. makes no mention of generic distinction (drama vs. epic), nor of the shift in perspective estranging the Christian Middle Ages from pagan antiquity. To be sure,
the death sentence pronounced on Antigone by her uncle the king, Creon, displays a certain parallelism with the fatal choice by Charlemagne of his nephew to lead the rear guard. But the two stories involve a basic metaphysical shift, with the abstract destructive force characteristic of Greek tragedy concretized in the Satanic figure of the false counselor (Ganelon and the consillii in R. and D.).

In this comparative study of "the ironic subject of a king... forced to condemn someone he loves" (15, emphasis added), S. would have benefited from some familiarity with Aristotle's Poetics. Using the term "ironic" to characterize the theme treated here, S. misses the essentially tragic dimension of what Aristotle describes and prescribes, in the chapter devoted to fear and pity, as the most effective tragic act:

Such acts are necessarily the work of persons who are near and dear (close blood kin) to one another, or enemies, or neither. But when an enemy attacks an enemy there is nothing pathetic about either the intention or the deed, . . . nor when the act is done by "neutrals": but when the tragic acts come within the limits of close blood relationships, . . . those are the situations one should look for (trans. Gerald Else).

It would surely have been worth noting, in the comparison of A. with R., that Creon is Antigone's uncle (substitute father) no less than Charlemagne is Roland's, and that the Christian poet of the R. adhered with a sure but tempered sense of the "Aristotelian" tragic to the precept quoted above. Indeed in the context of S.'s discussion, this avuncular parallel is far more striking, more precise, more powerful, than the chosen motif of "the king misled."

Jonathan Beck
Emory University

In this important article, Alan Deyermond reviews four papers read at the 1977 Modern Language Association special session on "History, Narrative and Diction in the Late Castilian Epic: Trends in Contemporary Research," with particular reference to their bearing on the Refundición de las Mocedades de Rodrigo (=RMR) and its learned authorship and clerical inspiration. D. notes that three of the papers confirm his earlier findings in Epic Poetry and the Clergy (London: Tamesis, 1969) and that the fourth, mine, begins with an acceptance of his conclusions in this regard.

D. points to John Geary's contention, based on a calculation of the percentage of formulaic hemistichs, that "the extant MR is the work of a learned poet" (p. 108) and notes that John S. Miletich, comparing the ratio of "elaborate" to "essential" style in RMR, finds that it and the Cantar de Mio Cid both have "a much lower percentage of elaborate style repetition than [Yugoslav] poems known to have been orally composed" (p. 108).

D. devotes special attention to Ruth H. Webber's argument that the diffusion of the poem by juglares, subsequent to learned authorship, cannot be substantiated. He reaffirms his belief (Epic Poetry, pp. 198-202) that the extant MS of RMR descends from a text "ineptly dictated ... by [a.] juglar to [a] scribe" (p. 110). D. also calls attention to John D. Smith's important discovery in the Indian tradition of Rajasthan, of orally performed and highly formulistic epics which, contrary to the expectations of Parry-Lord formulists, were memorized and not improvised.2

D. then goes on to review my paper,3 correctly pointing out that in a medieval context the distinction between author and adapter is far from

1See the abstracts in La Corónica, 6, No. 1 (Fall 1977), 7-9.
clear, in that much medieval literature involves "refashionings or adaptations of one or more source works" (p. 110). Concerning my emphasis on chronistic evidence, he rightly warns that "we may not always know whether new features in a particular chronicle's account of an epic subject reflect a new version of the poem or merely the chronicler's own preferences and innovations" (p. 110).

D. concludes that, in the case of RMR, "neotraditionalist theory was falsified . . . . its predictions did not match the new experimental data" (p. 111). He calls for "a modified, more flexible, and therefore more fruitful neotraditionalism" (p. 111).

I would like to add just a few, brief comments. D. may well be correct in arguing that the RMR MS is ultimately based on "inept dictation." I still tend to favor the alternate hypothesis that it may be "the work of a copyist who began by prosifying the poem . . . , but soon abandoned the effort and merely copied the verse text" (p. 109). Some of the "more extreme irregularities of the verse" (p. 109) may indeed be the product of dictation, but my own work with MS Paris B.N. Espagnol 138 convinces me that many are the result of haplography—visual errors by which the copyist's eye skips from a given word to the same word a line or two further on and thus omits the intervening material. The immediate predecessor of B.N. Esp. 138 was, I believe, certainly another MS. In evaluating the learned character of RMR, it is important to bear in mind that this is, all the same, a very "traditional" narrative. If we set aside the Palencian "superstrate" discovered and so penetratingly studied by D., the poem still embodies a story which began to circulate almost a century earlier on (as evidenced in the late thirteenth-century chronistic

---


5D. is in agreement. See Epic Poetry, pp. 199-200. I will offer details concerning each of these lacunae in a critical ed. of RMR now in preparation.
allusions)\(^6\) and which, by 1300, had achieved an essentially identical structure centered around Rodrigo's oath to win five *batallas campales* as a prerequisite to marrying Jimena.\(^7\) D.'s brilliant scholarship has demonstrated beyond doubt that *RMR* itself is a learned poem, but we must remember that it is a learned poem based largely upon a traditional narrative. There is, I believe, still a great deal of evidence concerning the traditional nature of Castilian epic—internal, chronistic, balladic—which simply cannot be explained solely from a neo-individualist point of view. The even-handed, eclectic perspective of Deyermond's *Epic Poetry and the Clergy* and of the article here under consideration offers a model for future inquiries into the complexities of the medieval Castilian epic.

S. G. Armistead  
University of Pennsylvania


The starting point is Guillaume's timely return from hunting to crown the cowardly Louis. M. Trotin notes two other points in the poem in which Guillaume is recalled from the pleasure of the hunt to defend the possessions of his king.

M. Trotin then examines the transitions between episodes, pointing out that throughout the poem other elements likewise serve to express Guillaume's desire to rest; he is never able to do so, for he must protect Louis's kingdom. His pilgrimage to Rome is disrupted by the Saracen attack; his marriage is abruptly interrupted by Louis's messengers calling for help; and his hope for peace, after three years of war against rebellious vassals, is also in vain.

\(^6\)See my "Earliest Historiographie References to the Mocedades de Rodrigo," *Estudios . . . a Helmut Hatzfeld* (Barcelona: HISPAM, 1974), pp. 25-34, and D.'s very generous comment (in n. 16).

\(^7\)See my "Structure of the Refundición de las Mocedades de Rodrigo" *Romance Philology*, 17 (1963-64), 338-345.
The function of Guillaume's peaceful activities, which are situated at the turning points in the narrative, is to separate the major episodes of the poem. This brings Trotin to the second part of the article, where he examines another system of structuring the text, based upon the localities where the five different "branches" take place:

1) v. 1-271: Aix-la-Chapelle;
2) v. 272-1449: Rome pontificale;
3) v. 1450-2225: Tours; guerre de trois ans dans le sud-ouest de la France et en Espagne; forêt de Lyons (cf. v. 1979 "dedenz un bos");
4) v. 2226-2648: Rome impériale;
5) v. 2649-2695: Montreuil, Paris, Laon (p. 43).

Like Frappier\(^1\) (whom he cites), Trotin notes the alternation between France and Rome but also points out further parallelisms and organizing principles.

M. Trotin makes valid observations in his study of the two structuring systems, but his conclusion seems to overemphasize Guillaume's asceticism. Trotin stresses a spiritual ascension "qui l'éloigne à jamais des joies terrestres les plus légitimes"; a passion du héros épicque composed of military prowess and physical suffering but which finds an original means of expression in the transitions of the Couronnement.

Carol J. Chase
Knox College

FOR Vos, if Roland's heroism is to be fully appreciated, such appreciation must include aspects of biblical typology present in the *Chanson*. Her article on Roland states that his "particular heroism and visual radiance alludes briefly, strongly and disconcertingly to the living Christ who performed his miraculous deeds on earth during three years, who gave his life as sacrifice, and who was resurrected after three days." To substantiate her interpretation, Vos succinctly presents some fifty Christological parallels and draws from over fifty sources, ranging from Pliny and patristic exegesis to recent articles in *Olifant*, all in thirteen columns of text and notes. Obviously such a concise presentation leaves room for much future elaboration. Other figures in the *Chanson* are also considered: Count Thierry is "Rollandus Alter," who "alludes to David in his youth and size (he is frail and slender as the 'veltres', opposing the huge Pinabel-Goliath), in his determination to fight, and in fighting for the right side and the right cause." Vos also writes: "in my particular view Charles and Baligant's engagement take[s] on eschatological meaning and become that of the Returning Christ at the end of time to engage with the adversarius antechristus and his overwhelming host.

Most of Vos's parallels, however, connect Roland directly with Christ, the Christ of the Passion, as in these few examples:

*It is important to note that just as Christ fell on the long way to his death on a hill, so Roland falls with exhaustion on his own via dolorosa several times before his death on the green hillock...*

*Olifant, the horn, causes him to bleed (v. 1763-64), its call is heard "XXX lieues", and his horse, too, bleeds at thirty places. He is dying on a hill (as did Christ) and knows and wills his death. Christ prayed for others in his final hours, so does Roland. Christ called out to a heavenly figure, Eli (Aram. 'ēlī=my God), whom he calls his Father, and Roland addresses his "Veire Paterne" (v. 2384) in the same way, as well as Charlemagne, the father figure in his life...*
After victory and reward, the second and true entry into Jerusalem is invoked. Thierry (Roland Christ) will ride joyfully into Aix (Aachen—elsewhere compared with Jerusalem).

After many such parallels, Vos's conclusion is:

to affirm that Roland's refusal to blow the horn represents his true heroism, that he is free of guilt and that his death was preordained just as was Ganelon-Judas' treason. It was the prelude to the necessary martyrdom of this saintly Christlike person. . . . Ultimately, then, one may agree that Roland did not fight for Christ (nor Thierry after him). From the symbolic and allegorical context illuminated now, it becomes apparent that he battled as Christ. This otherwise inexplicable posture and seemingly useless death can then be accepted, as did eleventh-century audiences. The harsh reality of bloody warfare symbolizes the human condition here on earth. The pride displayed by Roland (and Thierry) in taking on a gigantic superhuman opponent is not arrogance as was convincingly shown but the steadfast valiant heroism of the only perfect martyr.

In her study of Baligant, half the length of "Roland's Heroism" but most similar in spirit and construction, Vos identifies the pagan emir with the Antichrist, much as she identified Roland with Christ, using specific source references and typology. A long quotation from a bestiary begins the article, setting the tone and equating the Dragon with "le roi de l'orgueil." Detailed references relate the Dragon and other beasts to Baligant and Marsile. For example:

Pour la Chanson de Roland, il est utile de consulter l'exégèse médiévale où les dragons étaient vus comme "persecutores Ecclesiae" et "ministri diaboli" ou simplement comme "homines nefandi." Dans le mythe biblique, le dragon est certainement la forme développée du serpent originel, c'est-à-dire le "serpens antiquus" qui annonce celui des derniers jours et qui est exprimé par un épithète donné à l'Émir: "Baligant . . . le vieil d'antiquité" (v. 2615)

Babylon is the abode of the Antichrist, and there is even an Anti-Trinity. The imposing stature of Evil, of course, gives importance to the struggles of the Good. In conclusion, Vos warns against the temptation "de voir trop d'ordre et trop de symétrie dans les œuvres médiévales et dans l'art roman; il ne faut cependant oublier les "imponderabilia" subtils et les indéfinissables qui constituent la vie et le souffle des modèles organisés et de leurs structures de base."
HESE TWO ARTICLES are just a slight indication of the work Vos has done on this theme. She has published similar articles in the USF Language Quarterly and refers to her University of Rochester dissertation, Aspects of Biblical Typology in "La Chanson de Roland" (DAI, 31 [1971]). If the conciseness of these articles is characteristic, there is much still to be debated concerning the validity and interpretation of these findings.

Frank P. Norris
University of Miami


LE PROPOS DE L'AUTEUR est d'étudier, en utilisant les moyens que fournit l'usage d'un ordinateur et selon une méthode statistique rigoureuse, le système prépositionnel du Cantar de mio Cid dans une perspective principalement diachronique: les résultats de l'enquête devraient permettre de situer dans le temps ce système et de dégager ses caractéristiques fondamentales tant du point de vue statique que dynamique.

Voici quelques-unes des conclusions que propose M. R. Pellen: 1) parmi les prépositions dont la fréquence est faible dans le poème, certaines n'étaient qu'au début de leur carrière (ante, contra, desde, entre, hacia, tras); d'autres, au contraire, formaient pour des raisons diverses un groupe fragile appelé à disparaître (delante, allende, cabo, cerca, des, par, so); 2) le système prépositionnel du Cid, déjà normalisé, est plus proche de celui de la General Estoria (1272-1284) que de celui de textes variés du XIIe siècle: il daterait donc du XIIIe siècle; 3) la confrontation de la distribution des prépositions et de leurs occurrences dans les trois (?) chants pris ensemble, deux à deux, puis séparément permet à l'auteur de classer les vocables selon leur "disponibilité" et leur "probabilité d'emploi" dans le discours, de façon à dégager le "noyau le plus solide du système"; 4) l'étude de l'évolution interne du système révèle un accroissement de l'emploi relatif des prépositions d'un chant à l'autre qui, en probabilité, ne serait pas dû uniquement au hasard; 5) cette configuration dynamique
ascendante des occurrences globales ne se vérifie que dans le cas de l'emploi des vocables les plus utilisés: le nombre des occurrences de ceux-ci progresse dans de telles proportions qu'il ne serait pas interdit de parler d'une modification profonde dans "l'articulation syntaxique des phrases."

Enfin, évoquant quelques perspectives d'avenir, M. R. Pellen pense que la contradiction qu'il y aurait entre, d'une part, l'homogénéité lexicale, formelle, et statistique du système prépositionnel et, d'autre part, l'hétérogénéité de la distribution des catégories grammaticales ainsi que des caractères de la syntaxe pourrait mener à une révision des rapports entre l'œuvre et le temps (cantares séparés à l'origine et réunis ensuite, oeuvre initialement une ayant subi plusieurs refontes; oeuvre fragment conservé d'un ensemble plus vaste perdu).

L'article de M. R. Pellen est digne d'être lu avec attention plus en raison des moyens nouveaux qui y sont mis en œuvre pour la connaissance du castillan médiéval que pour les conclusions chronologiques et les perspectives nouvelles qui s'en dégagent à propos du Cid. Peu nombreux sont, en effet, les spécialistes qui datent encore le poème conservé de 1140 et nombreux sont ceux qui, au contraire, situent sa rédaction à différents moments du XIIIe siècle. Les conclusions de M. R. Pellen n'ont donc rien pour nous surprendre. Les propositions présentées à la fin de l'article comme de nouvelles hypothèses de travail appellent la même remarque: toutes ont déjà été soutenues ou le sont encore actuellement (voir M. E. von Richthofen pour la première; R. Menéndez Pidal et ses disciples pour la seconde; A. Bello, au XIXe siècle, pour la troisième).

Quelques autres remarques nous viennent à l'esprit. 1) L'auteur ne dit pas sur quel texte repose son enquête. Sur une édition critique (si oui, sur laquelle?), sur la transcription paléographique du MS ou sur sa photographie? 2) La comparaison du Cid avec les textes invoqués des XIIe et XIIIe siècles peut paraître peu probante, en raison de la disparité des genres auxquels ces textes appartiennent (documents d'archives, Fueros, œuvres religieuses, etc. pour le XIIe, chronique en prose pour le XIIIe siècle). Pourquoi ne pas avoir mis à profit le fragment du Roncesvalles ou le Fernán González qui, à tout prendre, permettaient une comparaison plus fructueuse que la General Estoria? 3) Il ne paraît pas invraisemblable que le scribe ait pu rajeunir en partie le texte qu'il copiait (cf. fue
dans des laisses où l'assonance requiert *fo, 2057, 2766, 2814, etc., forme attestée par fosen, 2001; cf. aussi les formes diphtonguées ue dans des laisses en où la diphtongue plus ancienne uo est nécessaire). 4) La préposition cabe figure bel et bien dans le Cid au v. 3682 (cabel coraçon et non *cabol coraçon, cf. Bendiziendol, 541; movios, 550). 5) Enfin, il n'est pas inutile de signaler que certaines prépositions présentées comme archaïques sont encore vivantes aujourd'hui dans certaines expressions ou dans la langue écrite ou poétique (so, so color, so capa, so pena de; cabe).

Jacques Horrent
Liège


This essay sets down some of the findings resulting from a trip taken in 1971 by Rita Hamilton, A. D. Deyermond, H. L. Sharrer, and the author through the lands of the Cid. It addresses the problems of toponyms along the exile route of the Cid, pinpointing the actual sites mentioned in the PMC and the probable exit route of the Campeador. It also passes on Menéndez Pidal's and Criado de Val's text emendations derived from their respective reconstructions of that route. To a lesser extent, interpretations of Riaño Rodríguez and Luis Rubio García are adduced. Finally, some revisions of the traditional view on the provenance of the PMC poet are suggested.

Among the toponyms revisited and evaluated figure Arlanzón, identified as the river and not the village of that name. Against Criado de Val, Michael backs Menéndez Pidal's inversion of the order of vv. 394-95 that make reference to Spinaz de Can, but he leaves the latter unidentified. Menéndez Pidal's emendation of lilon in v. 398 to read Atiença is rejected; instead, the name is associated with present-day Ayllón. Riaño's tentative identification of La Figueruela as Iruela receives support, as does Menéndez Pidal's tracing of La sierra de Miedes
to the Sierra de Pela; but Menéndez Pidal's as well as Criado's suggestions concerning the Cid's itinerary after reaching the valley of the Jalón present unresolved difficulties. Alcocer is positively identified as Castejón de las Armas, the río Martin as rising east of el Cid's Poyo. The Poyo itself is one of two impressive hills dominating the village of El Poyo. The mention of Tévar as site of the Cid's encampment reveals the poet's lack of geographic accuracy. Michael supports Criado in the identification of Alucad, and does his own reordering of vv. 1145-56 that refer to Murviedro and Cebolla.

The article is a valuable contribution to a more accurate understanding of the geographic setting of the PMC and of the movements of its hero. Yet the alternating emphasis on toponymic identification, on the reconstruction of the Cid's itinerary, and on textual emendations arising from these findings tends to obscure its real purpose. The concluding paragraphs that update Menéndez Pidal's speculations as to the origins of the PMC poet are more of an afterthought than necessary conclusions deduced from pertinent facts. It seems plausible that Alcocer is Castejón de las Armas and that the poet had a somewhat clearer picture of the layout of the Jalón valley than of the geography of San Estéban de Gormaz, while his knowledge of the lands east of the river Jiloca appears least accurate. Be this as it may, none of it ties in directly with the evidence introduced in the article in support of the poet's connection with the Burgos area where the only extant MS of the PMC had been found.

M. J. Hanak
East Texas State University


Louis Chalon seeks here to highlight the methods by which the compilers went about their business. His study is "limited" to the first 364 chapters of the PCG, for which more than fifty sources have been identified.

The major portion of the study considers three areas wherein the compilers reveal themselves and their handiwork through direct interven-
tion into the text. The first area is in the chronology of events. Chapters 1-125 of the PCG are dated by the compilers with reference to the founding of Rome, counting from the era of Augustus or the birth of Christ. World history is divided into six great epochs—creation, flood, Abraham, King David, the Babylonian captivity, and the birth of Jesus. Frequently the compilers highlight the simultaneous happening of two events, such as the founding of Marseilles by Julius Caesar at the time when Hercules arrived in Spain.

Another form of compiler intervention in the PCG shows in the structuring of the narrative. The compilers use formula-like expressions to remind the reader of events already treated. They add material to make a smooth transition to new items, or state that nothing worth recounting occurred during the breaks in chronology. Likewise, they announce agreement or divergence of opinion among their sources, impose moral reflections on the events recorded, or improve and emphasize the material by stating that an event fulfilled some prophecy.

The third area of Chalon's study treats complementary information introduced into the narrative. This material may be introduced to illustrate the differences between the past and the present; the compilers may explain what some of the Latin terms mean, or they may add material to lists taken from earlier sources.

Chalon finally notes that the compilers' few mistakes tend to be in the nature of paleographic errors, twisted historical facts, or problems in genealogy. Above all, the tremendous documentation and translation labors of the compilers resulted in a coherent organization of history and a monumental example of historiography.

This article provides the beginning student with greater insight into what is meant by source studies and opens new ground for exploration by scholars. Beneath the façade of history may be seen glimpses of life and learning as they were viewed by educated men of Alfonso's time. The PCG is not only a collection of past knowledge and events, it is a showplace for the realities of the present. What is needed now is further investigation of the compilers' additions. For example, how did they decide what to include and what to exclude? Did the compilers structure their use of the material for specific purposes? Do later histories use the same materials as the PCG in the same way and for the same purposes?
Chalon's article has summarized succinctly what work has already been done and has provided the direction for further research.

Arthur Clyde Olds
Michigan State University


By the use of her rather catchy title, Professor Beer implies that the *Roland* may not be perceived as a living work if it is taught in translation. She proceeds to examine the problem through a close look at laisse 171. One modern French translation (Larousse) changes the assonanced verse to prose and rearranges the word order often to the disadvantage of the meaning of the original. In some instances the vocabulary itself is changed, such as the substitution of "chevalier" for "vassal," a word which fails to convey the feudal implications of the original. The notes supplied to the modern edition sometimes help to explain exotic terms such as *sardoine*, and Larousse in particular gives a *Notice* which provides the student with historical information that can be expanded by the teacher as the occasion demands. At other times, the notes seem to explain the obvious.

For Professor Beer, the modern translation reduces the *Roland* to plot and characterization and eliminates any linguistic value to the work. Therefore, although the modern translation may be helpful to introduce students to medieval literature, problems such as the lack of inuendo present in the original, the substitution of vocabulary, and the constant need for the teacher to explain the context, threaten the life of the *Roland*. Although the teacher must take into account the kind of student he has, the only solution which will keep *Roland* alive is to teach it in the original.

Jacqueline Bouchard Cross
Eastern Kentucky University

It is always useful to be asked to focus one's attention on a particular detail or motif, linguistic or literary. Thus Minnette Grunmann does us a service by offering us the results of her investigations into the use of the formula ez vos, found in Old French from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. Her conclusions, however, will surprise few readers. Ez, followed by the ethic dative vos (tei, li and lor also occur), serves to stress a dramatic moment, the arrival of a messenger (perhaps bearing news which will influence the course of events) or to intensify characters, situations or objects, by highlighting their unexpected, colorful or exciting qualities. The formula can present a knight or knights entering into combat, underline the flurry of excitement engendered by an important visitor, make us eye-witnesses to a spectacular event. It is frequently preceded by atant, an adverb which marks surprise, and often allows the suppression of a finite verb.

The originality of Dr. Grunmann's account, which follows close on the heels of the article by Diana T. Mériz, "À propos du classement d'ancien français ez (< ECCE)," Romania, 95 (1974), 533-43, is that it presents an analysis of six basic structural patterns in which the formula ez vos appears, i.e., in combination with a proper name, a substantive, a present participle, a finite verb, an adverbial or adjectival phrase. I quote one example from each category: (1) "Atant es vos Guigambresil" (Chrétien, Perceval, ed. Roach, v. 6034); (2) "Que que cil chante de Fromont, / Ez vos le vallet contremont / Le degré . . . (Guillaume de Dole, ed. Lecoy, vv. 1368-70); (3) "As vos poignant Malpramis de Brigant" (Roland, v. 888); (4) "Es vus Willame al manger asené" (Chanson de Guillaume, ed. McMillan, v. 1691); (5) "A tant e vos par la valee / Venir le Sor de Montescler" (Le Bel Inconnu, ed. Williams, vv. 5612-13); (6) "Estes vos que totes les orent, / Grandes et roides et quarrees" (ibid.), vv. 2636-37).

The conclusions are based on "a limited and slightly random sample" of texts (p. 263), in fact ten texts, mainly romances. The author could have made more use of published concordances and complete glossaries as well as of more manual dépouillements. But I doubt whether much
additional information would have been revealed by a larger corpus of examples. We could have been told, however, that the first occurrence of *ez vos* is found in the *Vie de Saint Alexis* ("Est vus l'esemple par trestut le païs," ed. Storey, v. 182). A few other examples of *ez vos* (lur) which are not noted by the author are: *Vie de Saint Brendan*, ed. Waters, vv. 188, 310, 356, 582, 613, 656; *Charroi de Nîmes*, ed. McMillan, vv. 678, 1114, 1180, 1413; *Couronnement de Louis*, ed. Lepage, MS C, v. 136, see also MSS AB, vv. 325, 1368, 2201; *Gormont et Isembart*, ed. Bayot, v. 87; *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, ed. Koschwitz, 298, 333, 672; *Ami et Amile*, ed. Dembowski, v. 3046; Marie de France, *Le Fresne*, ed. Rychner, v. 20; Béroul, *Tristan*, ed. Ewert, v. 570; *Folie Tristan (Oxford version)*, ed. Hoepfner, v. 75; *Roman de Troie*, ed. Constans, vv. 4939, 2604, 7581; *Châtelaine de Vergi*, ed. Whitehead, v. 910; *Aucassin et Nicolette*, ed. Roques, 39 2; *Perceval Continuations*, MS T, v. 4592. The comment of L. Foulet, in his glossary to the Roach edition of the *Continuations* is perhaps worth reporting: "Dans ce dernier exemple ['Es vos qu'il reprenent lor poindre,' MS T, 4592] la proposition commençant par que joue un rôle de complément direct par rapport à es, vos s'adresse au lecteur ou à l'auditeur et marque l'intérêt qu'il prend, ou est censé prendre, à l'action annoncée" (art. es).

Glyn S. Burgess
Liverpool


Alice Planche's long, thoughtful article on the legend of Ami and Amile breaks into two sections, to reflect both narratological and thematic aspects of the story. A feeling of "insatisfaction" over the story leads her first to group the existing texts into six categories, in order to compare the various versions. Eleven pages of analysis of the corpus—including a list of the fifty-two principal narrative sequences and several *tableaux récapitulatifs*—are followed by an examination of various "keys" which might unlock the significance of the *récit*. A cursory review
(and rejection) of possible sources in folklore is followed by a discussion of three "keys": a possible forgotten blood relationship between the two men; an allegory of Friendship; and an ana
gogical interpretation based on the Passion of Christ. Of those, only the second is accepted by Mlle Planche, and that only partially; in the end, her "insatisfaction" remains before the enigma of Ami and Amile. The article concludes with a subjective reading of the text which emphasizes the unity of the two individuals and which leads to considerations on the theme of the Double in European literature and an argument for an approach to the story based on "lectures plurielles."

The article provides both a useful introduction to the study of this puzzling story of two identical friends and a concise recapitulation of past work for those readers already familiar with the story. The delineation of the corpus is well done, and the section on exchanges between Ami and Amile is particularly new and helpful. Also useful is the discussion of the three principal "keys" to the legend. Finally, the article can be read as suggesting possible future areas of exploration, of which the most important is that of the significance for medieval social relations of this kind of friendship.

In the end, however, this article leaves us with the same feeling of "insatisfaction" as does the story itself, for it seems to skim over the surface of the mystery: too many approaches are suggested only to be left aside. The analysis of narrative structure in the first part, for example, does not contribute significantly to the thematic analysis of the second part. The attempt to find a "schéma minime" is put aside before the fundamental elements of the récit have been described. This noyau narratif appears to be made up of three sequences underlying much of European myth; the conflict between a young man and a father-figure for the older man's woman; the union of the young man with the woman; the death and resurrection of a son. It is the posing of a double identity for the younger man in Ami et Amile that makes possible a remarkable series of substitutions and exchanges.

Another possible reason for dissatisfaction with this subjective reading is its concentration on post-medieval manifestations of the motif, rather than on the reasons for which "l'aventure d'Ami et Amile a tant ému l'Europe médiévale." Ultimately our dissatisfaction is only with what
the article fails to do, for what it sets out to do it does well. It is essential reading for anyone concerned with *Ami et Amile*.

Heather Arden
University of Cincinnati


CHANSON DE GESTE RESEARCH has quite logically turned to the romance for comparison and explanation and thus ignored the rich possibilities of the fairy tale. The thematic, historically minded, and research oriented literary historians would often like to blame all problems of the fairy tale on the Volkskundler. Furthermore, they are more comfortable with a purely structural collection of motifs than with the often fruitless efforts to find the parameters of special points of emphasis. Epic scholars have reason to expect from fairy tale investigators that they will endeavor to achieve a broader, more comprehensive perspective which will also take into consideration the poet—not merely search for minutiae.

With this goal in mind Kurt Wais lists and summarizes a large number of *chansons de geste* which are related to fairy tales. He especially concentrates on texts related to Berte ans grans piés, Robert le Diable, and Loher und Maller. The main motifs are those of the "wildman," the "election of a successor by means of a golden hair," the "child-savior," the "substitute bride," and the "waterbird." The material dealt with here is neither easily accessible nor well-known. For this reason scholars working on the subject of fairy tales should find the article helpful—even if they are not specifically looking for correlations between the fairy tale and the epic.

With respect to the discussed interdependencies it is inevitable, according to Wais, that *chanson de geste* investigation in cases such as
Berte aus grans piés and Robert le Diable should once again assume connection with fairy tale research. Wais seems to excuse scholars of the past who did not find these relationships to be obvious. He claims, for example, that it is understandable in the case of research on Berte that equivalencies with epics were considered more revelant, that it did not at once recognize the feminine reinstated person of Berte in the masculine one and consequently that it did not discover in the Berte epic the helpful waterbird (goose, duck, swan, etc.) of the fairy tale.

In the Middle Ages there was little effort critically to analyze or question traditional motifs. Wais attempts to show that the first isolated resistance against the contemporary honnête homme turned against the impositions inflicted by the expectations of the fairy tale; however, Gottfried von Strassburg's complaint regarding the swallow bringing the golden hair in its beak appears to be an isolated example of medieval introspection. The works by medieval poets examined here indicate that historical limits must be placed upon fairy tales, as irrepressible as they may be.

Stephanie Cain Van D'Elden
University of Southern California


This article first traces the various attitudes of Germanists toward the Theory of Oral-Formulaic Composition. Some have accepted both the Theory and Milman Parry's original definition of the formula; others have questioned the applicability of the Theory to medieval literary production.

At the center of the debate is the Nibelungenlied, which survives in over thirty manuscripts and manuscript fragments; these represent three versions preserved in three thirteenth-century manuscripts known as A, B, and C. The Oral-Formulaic Theory has provided the impetus to consider the mode of composition of the Nibelungenlied and to reflect on two important issues: "How and in what form did the material develop
from the Sate Migration Period to the time around 1200, and how do we explain the considerable textual diversity which exists between [manuscripts] A, B, and C, as well as within each of these groups?" (p. 65).

Curschmann makes three observations: (1) a careful study of the living conditions and cultural environment of the manuscript under consideration must precede any attempt to apply the Theory to medieval situations; (2) current obsession with a definition of formulaic usage at variance with medieval poetic usage is a stumbling block to be tackled before approaching the task set forth in (1) above; (3) the cultural phenomenon attached to the term "oral" when applied to the Middle Ages is considerably more complex than the living tradition from which the Theory derives.

Curschmann concludes by establishing a relationship between a hypothetical orally-composed Short Lay of Brünhild and the Nibelungenlied; any future interpretation of the latter, he asserts, must take into account the interdependence of written and oral traditions.

This article focuses on several different studies and points of view, and in this respect it is both thorough and enlightening. Its author upholds what Ruth Finnegan (Oral Poetry) and others have declared on numerous occasions: the Oral-Formulaic Theory has its limitations, and the absolute juxtaposition of oral and written modes of composition may impede an understanding of the poeticization and codification processes which underlie the medieval epic.

John S. Geary
University of Colorado, Boulder

Mikel de Epalza. "El Cid = El León: ¿ Epíteto árabe del Campeador?"
Hispanic Review, 45 (1977), 67-75.

MIKEL DE EPALZA HYPOTHESIZES that the epithet "Cid" given to Rodrigo Díaz in the Cantar de Mio Cid originally meant 'lion', and that the meaning 'senor' ('lord', 'master'), developed later and eventually prevailed. He reviews previous studies on the two Arabic words so far proposed as etyma of Cid (sayyid or sayyīdī, and, recently,
al-sīd), and he notes, in T. A. Makki's introduction to her Arabic translation of the CMC (Cairo, 1970), statements of difficulties in the etymology sayyid > Cid meaning 'señor', and evidence that the term al-sīd, which was applied to Rodrigo, does not result from phonetic evolution of sayyid, but is an old Arabic word sometimes meaning 'wolf' or 'lion'. From his own observations, Epalza adds that Tunisian schoolboys studying Corneille's Le Cid immediately identify the name "Cid" with that of 'lion', and that sīd, 'lion', a warrior's epithet in Hispanic epic, belongs to the same root as does the common Arabic word for 'lord' or 'master', and 'chief' or 'leader' sometimes used as a surname. He contends this interchange of meaning could have been common in medieval Spanish.

Recalling recent studies on the CMC lion episode and its possible symbolic meaning, adding from the romancero an example of Cid = Lion, and noting that 'lion' makes sense in the Cid's war cry, Epalza nevertheless advances objections to his theory, viz., the unknown historical origin of the epithet and the matter of the possessive mio, "which clearly does not fit in with the 'El Cid = El León' hypothesis. He concludes that it is quite possible that during his lifetime Rodrigo was called sīd ('lion', 'lord'), or, rather, sīd ('lion', 'hunter') as a normal Arabic warrior's epithet, which is an Arabic translation of the Romance campeador.

The Cid = Lion theory is plausible, especially in view of the old fabular character of the lion as animal-king, and of the analogous use of the lion figure in other cultures—e.g., Richard the Lion-Hearted and the bestowing of the name Singh ('lion'), often substituted for the surname, on all male Sikhs, the "warriors" of Hindu India. As for the slightly troublesome mio, especially in the Cid's calling himself "mio Cid" ("Ca yo so Ruydiaz, myo Çid el de Biuar"—v. 1140): could it originally have been an unrelated near-homophonous Arabic word or prefix accepted as mio through popular etymology or faulty transliteration?

Dorothy Clotelle Clarke
University of California, Berkeley

SOME EIGHTY YEARS AGO, in a footnote to his work on the Leyenda de los Infantes de Lara, Don Ramón Menéndez Pidal expressed the belief that the subject matter of the Hernaunt (fourteenth century) was taken from the lines of the Fernán González which recount the imprisonment of the hero (vv. 564-684). The main argument in support of this theory was the similarity in the rôles played by the important characters in both epics. Don Ramón's point of view was well received by Menéndez Pelayo, later by Martín de Riquer and Erich von Richthofen, and recently by L. Chalon.¹

Prof. Horrent reexamines Menéndez Pidal's thesis in the light of a text of the Hernaunt that Don Ramon had not seen, namely MS Cheltenham 26092, edited by David M. Dougherty and E. B. Barnes in 1966. The verse text of the Cheltenham MS is closer to the original than the fifteenth-century prose version in Arsenal MS 3351, used by Menéndez Pidal.

After an extended summary of lines 564-684 of the Fernán González and of the Hernaunt of the Cheltenham MS, Horrent first shows the similarities between the two narratives, then the overwhelmingly larger number of divergencies. The conclusions of his careful comparison are: a) the similarities constitute a mere general analogy; b) the differences are too many and too important to permit us to support Menéndez Pidal's opinion that the Hernaunt de Beaulande is an imitation of the Poema de Fernán González.

Horrent's conclusions seem warranted: Analogies between chansons de geste do not necessarily imply derivation. Horrent and others have seen such analogies, for instance, between the Fernán González and the Mainet. René Cotrait, following Cristóbal Lozano's David perseguido y alivio de lastimados (1652), saw analogies between the Fernán González and the biblical episode in which Michol helps David to escape from

¹In his doctoral dissertation L'Histoire et l'épopée castillane du moyen âge (Liège, 1973-74), which has since been published by Champion (Paris, 1976).
Saul's attempt on his life. Reading the *Hernaut*, I have personally found some analogies between the Robastre-Frigonde pairing in the *Renaut* and that of Barroquer-Seuilla in the Spanish version of the *Chanson de Sebile*. However, as Cotrait points out, in such cases we are dealing with epic "commonplaces" rather than with the derivation of one from another.

J. Ignacio Chicoy-Daban
Scarborough College
University of Toronto


The first of the above articles was written to contest the view of John K. Walsh (*La Corónica*, 5 [1977], 100-109) to the effect that the behavior of the Infantes of Carrion in turning from cowards into respectable knights in the final duels is inconsistent to such a degree that it constitutes a structural flaw. Walker defends the Infantes' earlier behavior by stating that, although their baser instincts sometimes get the better of them, given time to consider the implications of their actions, pride comes to the fore and they comport themselves in acceptable knightly fashion. Probably not many scholars would be willing to accept such a theory. Walker brings in the lion incident and the battle against Búcar but passes over the *afrenta*, the vicious assault of the Infantes upon their wives. The fact that this despicable act was carefully premeditated undermines Walker's basic tenet.

The second article has greater substance and more serious implications for CMC scholarship. After reviewing the theories as to the source...
of the *Afrenta de Corpes* episode, Walker suggests that the *afrenta* derived directly from an early French version of *Florence de Rome* (FR).

In the episode in question in MS P of the *FR* (ed. Wallensköld, *SATF*, II), the text apparently used by Walker, Florence, empress of Rome, is persuaded to go on a journey with her brother-in-law. In revenge for her thwarting his political machinations and lustful desires, the brother-in-law leads Florence away from her company into wild, wooded country, where he attempts to rape her. Prevented from doing so by the attacks of various animals, by a hermit, whom he kills, and finally by the magic stone in her brooch, in his rage he ties her by her hair to a tree and beats her with a thorny branch. She is saved from death by the arrival of a hunting party.

It will be remembered that in the *afrenta* episode in the *CMC* the Infantes, under the pretext of journeying with their wives back home to Carrion, first plot unsuccessfully to kill and rob their Moorish host. Then, following a night of lovemaking in the forest, they send their retinue away. After stripping the Cid's daughters, they beat them cruelly with straps and spurs and go off leaving them for dead, happy at having avenged themselves for past insults at court for which they considered the Cid to be to blame.

The evidence that Walker offers for the dependence of the *afrenta* sequence upon the *FR* comprises a number of categories. The carefully planned journey is, of course, a necessary preliminary for both episodes. The setting is also similar since the crime takes place in both instances deep in the forest. It is true that the villains in both cases are seeking revenge, but here the similarity ends. In *FR* the brother-in-law is venting his fury upon the one who blocked his plan to take over the throne as well as repulsed him, while in the *CMC* the Cid's daughters are surrogates for the one the Infantes consider to be their enemy. Furthermore, in *FR* the intent is rape, while in the *afrenta*, despite the sexual overtones, it is the vicious beating that characterizes the incident. Nor can the preliminary plot against Abengálbon in the *CMC* be equated with the hermit in *FR*. The former takes place before any move is made against their wives and is motivated by greed for the Moor's wealth. The hermit, on the other hand, is burned to death because he sought to intervene on Florence's behalf.
Walker finds similarity in the instruments used for the beating, a thorny branch in FR and straps and spurs in the CMC, in that they are all ignoble weapons. Both acts manifest sadistic violence: the women are left seriously battered and bleeding, but Florence is in even greater danger of death by hanging. Nor is the aftermath the same, despite Walker's contention to the contrary. Florence is saved by the timely arrival of a hunter and his party, at which the villain takes flight. In the CMC the victims are abandoned unconscious and presumably dead. It is only somewhat later they are found by their cousin, whom the Cid had charged to look after them. Florence is cared for by the rescuer and his family, while the Cid's daughters are ultimately left in the care of someone else. That this person in the CMC should be named Diego Téllez after T(h)ierri(z), Florence's rescuer, is not easy to accept either since one then would have expected to find Terrin, a name familiar from the Roncesvalles. Florence's cure is rapid thanks to an unguent and an herb potion. Despite the fact that Walker claims an equally miraculous recovery on the part of the Cid's daughters, the evidence is not at all clear. The news has to be taken to Valencia, the Cid has to make arrangements for a party to go after his daughters, and they in turn have to make the journey back to San Esteban and seek them out before it is said the women are well again. In the version prosified in the Primera crónica general their protracted recuperation becomes a repeated motif (Chaps. 937, 938).

Walker, who believes the CMC to have been composed in writing by a learned poet, is convinced that the CMC poet was inspired by the FR in composing the afrenta episode and had at hand an early FR French verse text like MSP. Since there are obvious similarities between the two texts, the question must be asked as to whether what is interpreted by Walker as direct textual borrowing could perhaps be the product of oral tradition, a theory that Walker rejects out of hand.

Florence de Rome belongs to a large family of adventure tales in which a noble woman, although innocent of misdeeds, is cruelly punished by her husband or by her brother-in-law. In the first group the husband, misled by someone else into thinking his wife has committed adultery, orders her to be killed or exiled. Here are found among others Berte of Berte aus grans piés and Blanchefleur of Macaire, who appears as Sevilla in a Spanish prose version, Un noble cuento del emperador Carlos
Maynes, de Rroma, e de la buena enperatriz Seuilla, su muger (Amador de los Ríos, Historia, V). In the second group the brother-in-law both plots the vengeance and carries it out with rape as its object. The afrenta episode of the CMC can be related to the group of noble husbands who persecute their innocent wives, although the motivation is entirely different. At the same time the CMC shares with the set of stories characterized by the wicked brother-in-law the fact that the villains are both the plotters and the avengers.

Among the narrative elements cited by Walker as evidence of textual borrowing, the journey, the forest as a setting for inquisitive deeds, the victims' pleas and protests, the variety of blows inflicted upon the victims, the fortuitous rescue are all to be found in most versions as well as in other epic and adventure stories. At the same time, what are perhaps the most characteristic and stable motifs of the FR story, the magic chastity stone and hanging the victim by her hair, have no place in the CMC. In short, when the relationship between two texts is one of a highly complex, detailed text from which scattered themes and motifs appear to be incorporated into a far simpler narrative, and when these same themes and motifs are to be found in varying combination in other texts based on the same major theme, then oral transmission must be suspected. The evidence does not support the case for direct textual borrowing.

The great merit of Walker's study, however, is to focus attention on the fact that the chansons de geste and allied tales that were in constant circulation were a prime source for narrative material that was constantly borrowed back and forth and often woven into older stories to provide new novelistic detail. Among them the FR story together with certain stones of the Charlemagne cycle, all of which there is reason to believe were known in Spain, undoubtedly played a substantial rôle in the elaboration of the afrenta episode in the CMC. Walker's article, therefore, is extremely important in opening up a promising direction for research.

Ruth H. Webber
The University of Chicago