

Article Abstracts and Reviews

Samuel G. Armistead. "The *Mocedades de Rodrigo* and Neo-Individualist Theory." *Hispanic Review*, 46 (1978), 313-327.

ARMISTEAD, one of the three or four most distinguished specialists on the *romancero*, concentrates on the results and implications of the convincing case made by Alan Deyermond in his *Epic Poetry and the Clergy* (1969) that the text of the *Mocedades de Rodrigo* found in MS Paris, B.N. esp. 138 propagandizes in favor of the diocese of Palencia (and thus undoubtedly reveals strong clerical influence), but his discussion takes in a wide range of studies on Spanish epic. He calls attention to the tendency of a group of Hispanists, primarily but not exclusively working in Great Britain, to dismiss or grossly underestimate the importance of evidence external to the poetic texts themselves—references to now lost *cantares*, versions reflected in chronicles, redactions which gave rise to *romancero* traditions—in favor of interpretations based solely or predominantly on the poems alone. While Ian Michael and Deyermond are mentioned several times, Colin Smith's conclusions come in for the most severe criticism; at the same time, Armistead goes out of his way to praise the "splendid erudition" of these three scholars. What is at issue is theoretical stance and principles of evidence.

Armistead reviews, with abundant bibliographical references, the evidence for the existence of seven variant versions of the *Mocedades*, at least four of the *Poema de mio Cid*, three of the *Cerco de Zamora*, three of the *Siete Infantes de Lara*, and three of the *Roncesvalles*. He objects to the positivistic position that it is better not to attempt a reconstruction of the Spanish epic tradition because of a "void" in textual evidence or a supposed lacuna in our knowledge of the processes of chronicle prosification.

While the text of this article provides a useful corrective, its footnotes carry on a parallel argument in which the implications of Armistead's logic stand out more clearly. The long, final note pleads for rejecting, once and for all, two individualist misconceptions: first, that Menéndez Pidal, who published two revolutionary books at age 90 (on the *Roland*) and 94 (on *Las Casas*) respectively, and who completely revised his views on the composition of the *Poema de mio Cid* at age 92, was intellectually intran-

sigent; secondly, that traditionalism is incompatible with the study of epic texts as literature. This reviewer is especially appreciative of Armistead's remarks on the latter, a thesis which has long served as a straw man, supposedly showing that traditionalism cannot incorporate specifically literary approaches. That Armistead's message will not be easy to get across has already been demonstrated by David Mackenzie's uncomprehending reaction in *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies* (vol. 40 [1978], pp. 255-256), a bibliography whose medieval Spanish section has been marred in recent years by a tendentiousness out of keeping with its informational function: "[Armistead] misses the point. Surely what is being said [by neo-individualists] is that, since what we have are learned compositions, even though they are certainly related to a large body of oral material, it is quite proper to study them as works of art in their own right. " One wonders why works passed on in oral tradition should not be studied "as works of art in their own right." *Interest* in the esthetics of medieval epic has grown steadily through this century independently of theories of creation and transmission: what such theories do affect is the *kind* of esthetic approach one considers to be apt, since the esthetics of oral and written creation differ in important ways. Individualism as it is practiced by its most positivistic proponents does not so much result in a finer awareness of the literary values of medieval epic as in the application of inappropriate literary standards and criteria. Armistead notes that "the process of literary composition in the Middle Ages, *whether oral or written*, must have differed radically from that of modern creative writers" (p. 316n; my italics), a cautionary remark that medievalist literary critics would do well to ponder. One can only applaud his call, unfortunately printed in reduced footnote type and not in the boldface it deserves, for "renewed efforts to identify the multiple layers of superimposed and conflated material, both traditional and learned, that are doubtless present in all the epic evidence—poetic and historiographic" (p. 325n).

This is a fundamental article for anyone interested in the models and suppositions behind current controversy over the history of the medieval Romance epic, lost epic texts, and, subsidiarily, the relationship between history and epic.

Joseph J. Duggan
University of California, Berkeley

Carole Bercovi-Huard. "L'Exclusion du Sarrasin dans *La Chanson de Roland*." In *Exclus et systèmes d'exclusion dans la littérature et la civilisation médiévales*. Senefiance, No. 5. Aix-en-Provence: Cahiers du Centre Universitaire d'Études et de Recherches Médiévales d'Aix-en-Provence, 1978, pp. 345-361.

CAROLE BERCOVI-HUARD BEGINS HER STUDY of the exclusion of the Saracen in the *Chanson de Roland* by stating an apparent paradox: in the earlier parts of the poem, the pagan court is seemingly based on the same feudal model as that of Charlemagne. The suzerain asks his nobles for counsel, distributes fiefs, and is linked to his vassals by personal bonds. The Saracens exchange the same oaths and kisses, use the same symbols of the glove and staff. In fact, the author even asserts that Saracen society, in which wealth and splendor abound, is an idealized version of Christian reality. Rather than attribute the anomalous depiction of pagan society to the ignorance or ethnocentricity of the poet, Bercovi-Huard posits that the hyperbolic favorable portrait is designed the better to expel the Saracen from the realm of Christian feudality. This initial hypothesis is not resumed later in her study and thus becomes a red herring which tends to detract from her observations. A selective presentation of certain positive details from the overall depiction of the Saracens in the *Chanson* does not demonstrate that the two camps are part of one feudal reality. Superficial similarities in vocabulary or usage cannot mask the dissimilarity between Christian and Saracen beliefs and mores as evident in the work. Are the Saracens faithful to their oaths, for example?

In any event, if one uses exclusion in the sense of rejection or refusal to admit, the Saracens certainly can be considered "social rejects," irrespective of the author's theory regarding feudality. Bercovi-Huard enumerates a number of signs of exclusion which are primarily linguistic. She spends considerable time on a discussion of the pejorative connotations of many Saracen names which reflect the diabolic associations of their bearers. Even their wealth is a result of demonic pacts. Further, they are black, ugly, and bestial, all signs of their spiritual deformity. Finally, the insults which Roland and the peers employ to refer to the Saracens, such as *culvert* and *felon*, demonstrate the repulsion and loathing felt by the Christian Franks.

Bercovi-Huard cites the work of Jean Dufournet (*Cours sur "La Chanson de Roland."* [Paris: Centre de Documentation Universitaire, 1972]), as the source for her argument that the feudal system lies at the heart of the expulsion of the Saracens in the *Chanson*. If they had accepted Charlemagne's offer of a fief, order would have been restored. However, she stipulates that without abandoning their false gods, the pagans could never participate in the Christian universe. Their religion is negative, demonic; they cling perversely to idols whose inefficacy finally brings about their downfall. Justice also demands their conversion or their destruction. The Saracens are excluded on the political and religious planes because they refuse to accept duly constituted order. Thus, despite Bercovi-Huard's theorizing, it seems that the traditional reasoning for the implacable enmity of the two parties does not change even when viewed through the grid of a system of exclusion.

Steven M. Taylor
Marquette University

Micheline de Combarieu. "Image et représentation du *vilain* dans les chansons de geste (et dans quelques autres textes médiévaux)." In *Exclus et systèmes d'exclusion dans la littérature et la civilisation médiévales*. Seneffiance, No. 5. Aix-en-Provence: Cahiers du Centre Universitaire d'Études et de Recherches Médiévales d'Aix-en-Provence, 1978, pp. 7-26.

MICHELINE DE COMBARIEU'S DISCURSIVE REMARKS on the peasant in the *chanson de geste*, the *Roman*, and the *chanteuble* arouse the reader's interest. She cites a number of textual examples of descriptions of *vilains* in her discussion. However, her statements are sometimes surprising and without transition. For example, in her introduction, she claims that peasants are found in very small numbers in "all" *chansons de geste*, whether of the twelfth or thirteenth century. These token class representatives play a minor rôle in most works, whence she concludes that the first depiction of the *vilain* is one of "pure absence." The reader is faced with the necessity of accepting such conclusions without the reasoning process which led up to them.

In the subdivision dealing with the portrayal of the peasant, the author describes the negative traits of the peasant "archetype" which purport to justify aristocratic rejection of the entire category. These include physical ugliness, lack of proper hygiene and dress, bestiality, and diabolical attributes. The stock peasant is also typically naïve, ignorant, and cowardly. The primary works cited are *Garin le Lorrain*, the *Couronnement de Louis*, and *Jourdain de Blaye*. This discussion ends with the hypothesis that medieval poets included such dissonant and disgusting characters in their works to prove their own tolerance and generosity, as well as those of their noble audience. A more plausible reason for such rhetorical inconsistency might have been the desire to create an occasional antithetical portrait to serve as a foil for chivalric virtues; including vulgar types in an elevated genre helped to highlight better the aristocratic hero.

The discussion of "positive peasant figures" seems to be a misnomer for two reasons: the characters included are not truly peasants, for they either have some noble blood or do not conform to the category in other ways; and, secondly, there is no indication that the poets wanted the peasants themselves to be viewed positively, but rather certain of their traits which were positive because considered inherent in nobles. Furthermore, the loyalty or bravery shown by the characters cited is the product of their admiration of a truly noble *seigneur*. Isolated positive behavior did not really alter the outcast status of the peasant; it simply reinforced the luster of the aristocracy.

"Negative Peasant Figures" illustrates cases from *Jourdain de Blaye*, *Aspremont*, and the *Couronnement de Louis* which indict the whole class as treacherous and greedy. Jealous of its prerogatives, the aristocratic public could wholeheartedly applaud instances where the upstart peasant was kept in his place. This fixed order explains for Micheline de Combarieu why the integration of a *vilain* into aristocratic life was relatively impossible. Peasants were excluded from the epic community by birth and by the chivalric oath. While the author does not fully succeed in her aim to convey what the mental image of the peasant was in the consciousness and imagination of the poets and their audience, she does provide insights into the pariah status of the *vilain* in some *chansons de geste*.

Steven M. Taylor
Marquette University

Günter Holtus. "Zur Edition der franko-italienischen Fassung von *Aliscans*." *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 94, Nos. 1 & 2 (1978), 14-26.

IN THE LOGS AT THE MARCIANA, in which the names of scholars examining Franco-Italian manuscripts are recorded, I noticed in 1978 the repeated signature of Günter Holtus, who for some time has been studying this curious literary corpus. His scrutiny of manuscripts has led him to believe that the *Bataille d'Aliscans*, Cod. Marc. fr. VIII (*M*) occupies a particular position in the manuscript tradition due to, rather than in spite of, its Italianization; the purpose of the present article is thus to justify the publication of a new edition. *M* is one of twelve extant integral texts; it first appears in the 1407 Gonzaga library inventory, is then unrecorded until the eighteenth century, when it became part of the Marciana collection. The manuscript contains 7,773 verses on 101 inscribed folios written by one hand in Gothic script.

Holtus notes previous studies by Madeleine Tyssens and P. Lorenz, who have pointed out that *M* is closely related to B.N. fr. 1448 (*D*) and is probably closer to a lost original. Tyssens traced three developmental stages of the *Aliscans* in *La Geste de Guillaume d'Orange dans les manuscrits cycliques* (Paris, 1967): an early form, imperfectly represented by vv. 1918ff. of the *Chanson de Guillaume*; an initial *remaniement* preserved in *M* and, to a lesser extent, in *B*, *D*, and *F*; finally, a text corrupted by long interpolations, preserved in most copies.

Holtus then examines the various editions of *Aliscans*. He laments the inadequacy of the linguistic and philological work on *M*, and he notes that several editors of the poem have not consulted *M* at all. The 1903 Wienbeck, Hartnacke, Rasch edition, which Holtus finds otherwise useful, decries the Italian copyist's ignorance of French and his consequent "Wortmonstra," while Tyssens claims that *M*, composed early in the thirteenth-fourteenth century period of Franco-Italian, contains fewer Italianizations than some other works. Holtus argues the need to study *M* in its relationship to other manuscripts and for its literary qualities. Noting that some sixteen per cent need emendation, Holtus specifies where and how corrections should be made. He encourages an exhaustive analy-

sis of eighty identified Franco-Italian language traits, and he stresses that these should be recorded individually and tested against other texts, rather than judged as corruptions of the two source language systems.

In conclusion, Holtus believes that the proposed edition can contribute to our understanding of French-Italian cultural relations during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and can help us to understand the process by which a literary work is reproduced in a foreign language. His arguments, though repetitive, are well taken. Joining in Alberto Limentani's exhortation in his "Epica e racconto: Osservazioni su alcune strutture e sull' incompiutezza dell'Entrée d'Espagne,"¹ I would like to see, in the projected edition, some utilization of current critical methodologies as well.

Nancy Bradley-Cromeey
Sweet Briar College

Rita Lejeune. "Variations sur la fin épique du cheval Bayard." *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature*, 16, No. 1 (Strasbourg, Centre de Philologie et de littératures romanes, 1978), 323-333.

MME LE JEUNE, in this brief but amusing article, traces the development of the account of the fate of Renaud de Montauban's enchanted horse Bayard from the thirteenth century manuscript *La Valière* to late prose accounts in the mid-nineteenth century.

The episode of Bayard occurs at the beginning of the third major episode of *Renaud de Montauban* where the hero, having been granted a conditional pardon by Charlemagne, is obliged to forgo his marvellous horse, for the latter has offended Charlemagne by its feats of strength and prowess.

¹Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti. Venezia: Classe di scienze marali e lettere, 133 (1974-75), 393-428.

The feats of Bayard are as amazing as his origins, and one such feat, that of carrying both Renaud and his brother Alart into the battle while still enabling them both to fight, leads Lejeune to question whether anyone has pointed out in connection with this episode that the seal of the Templars shows two people on one horse as a mark of poverty. Not only can the similar episode with Bayard indicate the poverty of the outlaws, but also surely their unity of purpose, as in the episode of *Erec et Énide* where the hero and heroine mount one horse as a symbol of reconciliation.

Lejeune's main concern is to demonstrate that the location of the attempted drowning of Bayard in the Liège MS is not only the country, but also the town, since the MS speaks of the bridge over the Meuse from which the horse is forced into the water. This is the famous *Pont des Arches*, and the text further elaborates on its surroundings, mentioning the millstone and a nearby pool.

The latter half of the article deals with later printed versions of the episode, all of which locate the action at or near Liège on the Meuse, although some versions no longer mention Liège in particular, nor the *Pont des Arches*. Lejeune specifically details one eighteenth-century account, that in the "Bibliothèque bleue" edition published by François-Joseph Desoer, and points out the extent to which the version has been adapted to the moral tastes of the day. Such an adaptation should not surprise anyone familiar with the convolutions of later versions of the *Chanson de Roland* adapted to the demands of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century opera performances, or indeed to the later visual arts.¹

Margaret Burrell
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

¹See "The Decline of the Roland Theme in Visual Art," Chapter 6 of *The Legend of Roland in the Middle Ages* by Rita Lejeune and Jacques Stiennon, vol. 1 (London: Phaidon, 1971), 378-390.

Jean-Louis G. Picherit. "Réalité et fiction géographiques dans *Lion de Bourges*." In Frans C. Amelinckx and Joyce N. Megay, eds., *Travel, Quest, and Pilgrimage as a Literary Theme: Studies in Honor of Reino Virtanen*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1978; pp. 61-76.

THIS STUDY PROVIDES us with a well-researched account of the geographical elements in *Lion de Bourges*, ranging from the precise to the purely fictional. These references are numerous, since the characters in the poem move within a vast territory: France, Germany, Italy, and the Middle East. In order to sort them out systematically and to distinguish those which are factual from those which are imaginary, Picherit analyzes each region separately. In the process he adduces evidence which he attempts to use in determining the date of composition of the poem.

The task of deciphering the real and the fictional proves to be problematic. Although some landmarks lend themselves readily to historical investigation, even these are difficult to trace. For example, the poet describes a palace in Bourges which is decorated with copper and brass bas-reliefs conveying the hero's ancestry. Picherit proposes as a possible historical model the château of the Duke of Berry, which dates from 1367 and was built on the site of the former residence of the Counts of Bourges. He admits, however, that although the Duke of Berry was known to have been a patron of the arts, pictorial accounts of his palace fail to corroborate the type of bas-relief described in the poem.

Various events in the poem also lend themselves to conjecture about their historical antecedents. For example, in the episode which recounts the exile of Lion's father to Italy, we find long descriptions of battles between Calabria and Sicily, which Picherit sees as reminiscent of the wars between Frederick III of Sicily and the Angevins (ca. 1296). But once again, positive identification of the events recounted is difficult, because for every recognizable detail, there are at least three others which appear to be figments of the poet's imagination. Moreover, even those accounts which appear to be based on fact contain information which is imprecise or erroneous. The poet seems to have forgotten, for example, that Sicily is an island; thus nowhere in his description of the struggles between the Angevins and the Sicilians does he refer to the crossing of a body of water. Similarly, we find him misplacing certain cities. A case in point is Brindisi, which he locates between Rome and Bari.

Picherit is particularly successful in threading his way through this mixture of the real and the fantastic to identify precise geographical information provided in the episode in which Oliver becomes King of Spain. We are told that King Anséis of Carthage is threatened by the Saracens who have already captured a nearby city: "C'est la citeit de Bours, loialment le vous dis. / Il sont a Saint-Domin, une ville de pris, / et li roy est a Nadre, dollant et esbaihis" (vv. 24,827-30). Picherit proposes that Bours is Burgos, the historical capital of Castille. He then proceeds to identify the other cities mentioned, by analyzing additional details provided by the poet and by tracing those references on a topographical map of the area surrounding Burgos. In so doing, he demonstrates very convincingly that the cities in question are Najera and Santo Domingo de la Calzada, all in close proximity to one another and all located on the well-known pilgrimage route from southern France to Saint-Jacques-de-Compostello.

Having established the historical reality of these landmarks, Picherit proceeds to question where the poet obtained this information. He proposes as a possible source the *Chronique de Bertrand du Guesclin*, written by Cuvelier in 1380. This chronicle describes the struggles between the King of Castille and Henry of Trastamare, and, in particular, the Battle of Nadre, which took place in 1367 between the French, commanded by Bertrand du Guesclin, and the combined forces of the Duke of Lancaster and the Prince of Wales. Given the absence of references to Bours, Nadre, and San Domin in earlier *chansons de geste* from the same cycle, Picherit concludes that the poet must have obtained his information either from the *Chronique de Bertrand du Guesclin* or from eye-witness accounts of pilgrims and soldiers. From this, he deduces that *Lion de Bourges* must have been written after 1367, and possibly after 1380, the date of the chronicle. But here Picherit is on less firm ground. Although it is possible that the battle between the French and English which the chronicle describes was transformed into the traditional epic struggle between Christians and Pagans, we have no conclusive evidence to that effect. All we have to link the chronicle to *Lion de Bourges* is the brief mention of Bours, Nadre, and San-Domin, cities which undoubtedly saw many battles. Because these references are uncorroborated by other narrative details, Picherit's identification of the Battle of Najera and subsequent dating of the poem must remain hypothetical.

In spite of the thoroughness and scholarly value of his study, Picherit leaves certain questions unanswered and perhaps unasked. In his conclusion he attributes the lack of consistency in the rendering of geographic details to the poet's lack of knowledge and cites several occurrences of the "je ne sai" formula to prove that the poet is aware of his lacunae. Why view the "je ne sai" topos as a literal confession of ignorance on the part of the poet and not as a brevity device which serves to curtail the narrative? Examples of brevity topos are commonly found in romances dating from as early as the twelfth century. Similarly, given the inconsistent presentation of geography, why should such data be interpreted realistically rather than seen in the context of symbolic representation? If we examine other *chansons de geste* dating from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries, we find that there is a similar lack of concern for the precise rendering of time and space and that those indicators which do appear seem to have a symbolic function.

Presumably it was not Picherit's intention to treat such questions in the present study but to identify those landmarks in *Lion de Bourges* for which historical antecedents existed. In spite of the problematic nature of his task, he is successful in sorting out the maze of geographical details in the poem. The result is an impressive amount of documentation and some very valuable hypotheses about source material which help to illuminate the historical context in which the poem was composed.

Minnette Grunmann-Gaudet
University of Western Ontario

Ernesto Porrás Collantes. "Descripción funcional del *Cantar de mio Cid*."
Thesaurus. Boletín del Institute Caro y Cuervo, 32 (1977), 660-691.

WITH SOME EIGHT SCORE EXAMPLES (the bulk of the article) to illustrate his observation that the *CMC* poet, in depicting a state of harmony and its temporary disruption by discord, utilized the device of multiple and varied parallels, some made of similarities and some of contrasts, Porrás Collantes presents his arguments convincingly and concludes that "En este trabajo, en suma, hemos demostrado cómo las fun-

ciones entre resgos de los personajes en el *Cantar de mio Cid* definen tres funciones *sintéticas* centrales Cid-rey, que a su vez son definidoras de tres *estados* , estados que a su vez definen dos procesos en función opositiva, definidores últimos de la obra." Of the parallels presented, about ninety percent are categorized as narrative and the remainder as descriptive. Porras Collantes warns, however, against drawing absolute conclusions from a reading of the extant text, since the manuscript is incomplete and lacks, he believes, the introductory initial-harmony section that would make complete the three-part symmetry (*initial harmony-discord-final harmony) that he postulates for the work in its original finished form.

This matching-of-pairs approach to the comprehension and appreciation of the poet's skill, and especially of his techniques of narration and characterization, arouses in the reader an awareness of the intricate balance mechanisms and their rôle in enhancing the examples, individually viewed against Porras Collantes's setting, often prompts the reader to speculate on matters beyond those presented in the study. The mere juxtaposition of Elvira-Sol and *arcas*, in his example 20 ("Elvira y Sol = *arcas*, en cuanto tercio de comparación"), for instance, sets one to wondering whether the *robredo de Corpes* episode, perhaps, is a variation, on a high level, of the popular medieval "trickster tricked" motif, here designed to convey the basic moral lesson of the work, in that this episode serves as a signal example of (divine?) retribution for the sin of fraud, in this case committed by the Cid in his deception of Raquel and Vidas. Had the Cid not "borrowed" the money and thereby increased his own wealth, the Carrión brothers' greed would not have been excited. Further coffers/daughters parallels that strengthen the hypothesis of intentional relationship, and so of moral purpose, are the following (not mentioned in the article): the moneylenders deliver their most treasured possession to trickster Cid, as does the Cid his to tricksters de Carrión; each thereupon loses something vital to his well-being (money, honor); each actively seeks recovery of the loss; and the loss is—or, presumably, in the lenders' case (vv. 1431-1438), is to be—retrieved. If moreover, the Cid has been tested (on the heroes' scale) and found wanting, in an action on which he has founded his success and, therefore, his renewed *honor*, in the ensuing campaign, would it not be the duty of the poet to require repayment (and in heroic magnitude) from the fund of wealth and honor so gained? If these parallels are as expressive as they seem, especially in view of Porras Collantes's study, the *Raquel-e-Vidas/robredo de Corpes* offset not only

has enormous moral implications, but imparts to our epic the deep moral significance that medieval writers so often strove to give their works, and it evens the moral balance between Cid and King (and also, incidentally, explains the apparent extraneousness of the daughters' affairs, and justifies the seemingly disproportionate space given them). Perhaps the missing initial section postulated by Porras Collantes contained some hint of the hero's flaw, and so of a more complex situation facing the King, than the simple *mestureros* one (v. 267) we are presently led to assume.

Let this example of derivational speculation via Porras Collantes's method of parallels suffice to indicate some of the provocative value of our scholar's undoubtedly seminal study.

Dorothy Clotelle Clarke
University of California, Berkeley

Claude Régnier. "La *Prise d'Orange* dans le manuscrit B.N. fr. 1448." *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature*, 16, No. 1 (Strasbourg: Centre de philologie et de littératures romanes, 1978), 439-447.

RÉGNIER DISCUSSES, and refutes on several grounds, D. McMillan's recent (1974) opinion that version *D* of the *Prise d'Orange* (B.N. fr. 1448) indicates a written form of transmission. Although version *D* seems superior in one passage, namely the episode of the message to Tibaut (in which the queen does not send the message until the second time the Christians are captured, thus ensuring in Régnier's opinion a better structural placement of the incident), most of the examples he gives show that version *D* reveals evidence of oral composition.

In speaking of the somewhat modified state of version *D* (i.e., the *Couronnement de Louis* is shortened while the *Charroi de Nmes* and the *Prise d'Orange* are considerably modified), Régnier considers the changes to be the result of the scribe writing from memory; he agrees with Mlle Tyssens and M. Delbouille that all three epics are the work of a single scribe working from memory.

To support his case, Régnier presents a closely analysed comparison of a few *laissez* from MSS A and D. The first comparison, between *laissez* A4 and D2, demonstrates by the logical irregularities of the latter the likelihood of faulty memory on the part of the scribe; the second demonstrates the way in which a new and illogically placed *laisse* in D has been formed by taking the first eight lines of A11 and inserting them into the middle of A14; and the third example is a form of homeoteleuton, where the scribe has confused two scenes beginning with similar phrases.

As a final argument, Régnier quotes examples of the use of formulaic expressions in various episodes of similar content, which reinforce his preference for a form of oral composition rather than the written type of transmission preferred by McMillan. The arguments he has presented add, however, only slightly to the opinions he has already expressed in his *Les Rédactions en vers de la "Prise d'Orange"* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1966).

His concluding paragraphs concern whether or not D was written before the compilation of the epic cycle. Against McMillan's argument that the *Prise* was written directly after the *Charroi* because the first two *laissez* of the former would fit neatly into the manuscript space left blank after the conclusion of the latter, Régnier points to the existence of an "M" at the top of the relevant folio page, which indicates that the space was left blank by the scribe for the completion of a miniature, and that therefore the scribe may not have been aware that the three epics formed a coherent progression. Régnier finishes his argument by a neat synthesis of the issues he has raised: version D is *populaire*, destined for public recitation, whereas the other versions are *aristocratiques*, intended more for reading.

Margaret Burrell
University of Canterbury, New Zealand