Book Reviews

PETER R. GRILLO

La Chanson d'Antioche, ed. Suzanne Duparc-Quioc. I. *Édition du texte d'après la version ancienne.* II. *Étude critique.* Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades publiés par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 11. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1977, 1978. Pp. 581, 282, 5 plates, 1 map.

FOR WELL OVER A CENTURY, the outmoded patchwork edition of the *Chanson d'Antioche (Ant)* conceived by Paulin Paris remained virtually the sole access for the majority of scholars to this important yet relatively overlooked epic. A modern edition of this and of the other branches of the so-called First Crusade Cycle has indeed long counted among the desiderata of Old French scholarship, and one is pleased to see that progress is being made on several fronts.[1] Taking its place in the prestigious collection of "Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades," Madame Duparc-Quioc's keenly opportune edition is undoubtedly destined to enjoy a well-deserved authoritativeness, founded on her wide experience with the texts and problems associated with the First (and Second) Cycles. Her invaluable, if somewhat diffuse, *Cycle de la Croisade*, containing a partial edition of the *Chanson de Jérusalem,* was published in 1955, to be followed by contributions to the *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises.* Anticipating some twenty years ago the work here under review, a lengthy article in *Romania* already explored in no little detail most of the major source problems raised by *Ant.*[2]

Within the First Cycle arrangement as we know it—traditionally attributed to a rather shadowy *remanieur* of the late twelfth century, one Graindor de Douai—*Ant* opens the central "historical" segment that is comprised as well of two other branches: *Les Chétifs* and *Jérusalem.* In their extant form, the three poems are narratively conjoined to a large extent, presumably thanks to Graindor's designs as a rewriter. The Cycle is rounded out by branches drawn from the legends of the Swan Knight or traditions connected with the house of Bouillon, and, then, at least in four

[1]Two volumes have appeared of the collaborative edition of the *Old French Crusade Cycle* (University of Alabama Press): I: *La Naissance du Chevalier au Cygne,* eds. E. J. Mickel, Jr., and J. A. Nelson (1977); and V: *Les Chétifs.* ed. G. M. Myers (1981). Note that Vol. I also features a highly informative essay on the manuscripts of the Cycle by G. M. Myers.

2"La Composition de la *Chanson d'Antioche," Romania,* 83 (1962), pp. 1-29, 210-247.

MSS, it concludes with "semi-historical" material centered on events in the Latin Kingdom from the time of Godefroy de Bouillon's short rule down to the eve of the Third Crusade. During the fourteenth century this same *matière* continued to inspire writers of *gestes* who produced works distinctive enough to be seen as forming a new Cycle.

Despite the impressions one may glean from many standard accounts of the *chanson de geste,* the Crusade Cycle can hardly be reckoned a secondary or marginal phenomenon in the life of this narrative form: witness the number of full First Cycle MSS that have survived (eight in verse, one in prose), the evidence for others lost, and the rich assortment of purported references and allusions, in other sources, to episodes or incidents highlighted in the "Quatrième Geste."

More than any of its Cycle counterparts, *Ant* has always attracted the attention of modern scholars of the First Crusade, but its precise status as a record or document is still a source of debate. Starting with Paulin Paris, a good deal of energy has been spent on excavating an earlier stratum of the poem's life from the preserved narrative imputed to Graindor. The author of the precious *Urtext* is commonly identified as the *Ricars li pelerins* named in the MSS (v. 9014). Literary and other historians (notably H. Pigeonneau, G. Paris, A. Hatem, C. Cahen, L. Sumberg, in addition to Madame Duparc) have undertaken comparisons between the Richard-Graindor text and the chronicles in an effort to uncover and behold what one would like to see as the "original" poem, endowed with an irresistible aura of epic purity, as well as, for some, historical authority. Was Richard an eyewitness or, at least, a contemporary of the Crusade? Was his account guided by the Latin chroniclers, or did it in fact aid them? Did Richard end his composition with the fall of Antioch to the Christians, or did he possibly go on to depict the main objective of the expedition, the taking of the Holy City? Madame Duparc is apparently less inclined now to see Richard as having accompanied the Crusaders, but she continues to maintain that it is Albert of Aachen who drew upon the vernacular work, and not vice-versa,[1] and that "lorsqu'il y a concordance entre Albert et la chan-

[1]Cf. "Il est 'insoutenable' comme l'affirmait Gaston Paris que l'auteur *d'Antioche* ait copié Albert; il y a trop de différences de détails, trop d'épisodes de la chronique qui auraient pu tenter Richard s'il les avait connus et dont il n'a rien dit, trop de faits rapportés de manière entièrement différente de celle d'Albert, trop d'erreurs que le trouvère aurait évitées en consultant la chronique" (I, p. 170). The historian Claude Cahen has expressed on several occasions his support of Madame Duparc's point of view; cf. his remarks in *Revue historique*, 94^{e} année, t. 243 (1970), p. 434; ibid., 104^{e} année, t. 263 (1980), p. 199 (where he writes that the

son il est probable que Graindor est en train de reproduire l'ancienne chanson de Richard."[1] Pursuing G. Paris's lead, she believes that the popular chronicle by Robert the Monk must have been under Graindor's eyes constantly by the time *Ant* turns to Corbaran (Kerbôgha, emir of Mosul) and to his attempt to oust the Crusaders from Antioch (vv. 6566ff.).[2] However, in the face of an elaborate nexus of author / chroniclers / oral and popular traditions / editorializing scribes / reviser, the more skeptical-minded may remain quite unconvinced of any obvious or straightforward reply to the question(s): who actually read or heard or in fact used whom or what? When all the evidence is laid before us, Richard and Graindor strike us perhaps as no more (but, no less) "real" than such other illustrious unknowns as Turoldus or Bertolai de Laon.[3]

The manuscript tradition of *Ant* is discussed in admirable detail on pp. 43-83 of the first part of the *Étude critique,* and this information is recast in summary form in the Introduction to the edition proper.[4] Madame Duparc has followed a reasonable course in choosing to edit a generally recognized good copy of *Ant*—B.N. fr. 12558 (her *A*)[5]—which, together with B.N. fr. 795 (B) and 1621 (C), constitutes what she designates as the *version ancienne* of the Cycle. The descriptions given of the other exemplars, as well as the inclusion from them of many relevant "interpolated" passages and key sections useful for comparison (enumerations, for example), readily enable us to grasp the principal narrative features of the other Cycle *versions: intermédiaire* (B.N. fr, 786), *mixte* (Bern 320), and *récente* (B. Arsenal 3139, B.N. fr. 12569, and British Library Add. 36615). From the standpoint of distribution of branches from MS to MS, and even judged on the kinds of text each one transmits, such a scheme, by no means a stemmatic one, is by and large coherent and operable. One is

chronicle "est sûrement la traduction," essentially, of the poem by Richard "à l'usage du public rhénan," although Madame Duparc prefers to speak of Albert's "emprunts limités" [cf. II, p. 323]).

[1] II. p. 170.

[2] II. pp. 106ff.

[3] In his *"Chanson d'Antioche," Chanson de geste: le Cycle de la Croisade est-il épique?* Purdue University Monographs in Romance Languages, 2 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. N., 1980), Robert Francis Cook examines the background—highly conjectural, in his view—against which *Ant* and the Cycle have generally been studied; cf. " . . . le texte d'*Antioche,* celui qu'il s'agit de décrire et de classer, est un texte tardif sans antécédent connu" (pp. 44-45).

[4] I, pp. 9-17.

[5] The various *sigla* proposed for the Cycle MSS are conveniently listed in Volume I of the *Old French Crusade Cycle* (cited above, p. 391, note 1), p. xiv.

not so sure, however, that the use Madame Duparc makes here of *versions* avoids altogether the troublesome implication that the reported oldest state of Graindor's *remaniement* reflects necessarily and most faithfully the "lost" poem by Richard, and so forth. In any case, our editor would be the first to acknowledge that the primary reality of the texts she describes so minutely resides in their essential *mouvance:* for instance, she entertains the possibility that a detail about Raimbaut Creton and his horse found in the manuscript representatives of the *versions intermédiaire* and *récente (*or *la plus récente)* could well hark back to the pre-Graindor poem.[1]

One cannot overestimate the importance of Madame Duparc's utilization of the much damaged MS Turin L-III-25 *(T)* that, before 1968, was left undisturbed by modern scholars for more than half a century, and otherwise ignored by most of the early students of the Crusade Cycle. While the *Ant* it gives is convincingly shown to be akin to that in *ABC,* although in a shortened and modernized form, we are informed of its "originality" in several episodes, especially in the account of the siege at Nicaea.[2] In the Appendix[3] the editor describes all the identifiable fragments of *Ant* in T, frequently meagre bits and pieces, and includes transcriptions of the passages she has succeeded in reading.

Two minor points are perhaps worth raising before we leave the section on MSS. The note comparing the contents of the later Cycle branches in *L* (British Library Add. 36615) and *T* is not uniformly accurate.[4] Furthermore, one fails to see how the curious variant for v. 78 in B.N. fr. 795 (fol. 99c)--*Que repuis i estait en un bel engleçon*—can possibly be construed as a reference to a "version ancienne anglo-normande."[5]

The chapter on "Autres Formes de Tradition"[6] might usefully be supplemented by the following observations. The Dominican Humbert of Romans urged (ca. 1273-74) those fainthearted about the Crusading

[1]See note for v. 3798 and the discussion for Interpolation VI in I, p. 525.

[2]II, pp. 77-78; 153.

[3]I. pp. 485-506.

[4]II, p. 68, note 94; cf. Robert Francis Cook and Peter R. Grillo, "Un Manuscrit composite de cycle épique: le Cycle de la Croisade dans le manuscrit de Londres," *Revue d'Histoire des Textes,* 8 (1978), pp. 223-246.

[5]II, p. 79, note 28.

[6]II, pp. 84-95.

endeavors to read a *historiam Antiochenam,* along with the account of Charlemagne's victories in Spain (obviously the *Pseudo-Turpin)* and a *historiam transmarinam* (William of Tyre?).[1] There is no absolute proof of course that Humbert was thinking of the *Chanson d'Antioche*—in its cyclic or any other form—but there are reasonable chances that he was. One should also note that towards the middle of the thirteenth century the library at Glastonbury Abbey possessed a *Liber de capcione civitatis Antiochenae. Gallice. legibilis.*[2] The title seems to preclude reference to a Cycle MS as such, and perhaps invites renewed speculation about *Ant* in a form antedating the one we have.

It is impossible within the confines of this review to do full justice to the range of Madame Duparc's interests, or produce a summary of all her conclusions. Among other things, she attempts to situate rather precisely the period of Graindor's activity in creating, in effect, the Cycle: that is, between 1177 and 1181. The first date is taken as the "terminus a quo des *Proverbes au vilain.* "[3] Graindor possibly echoes that text in *Ant* on two or three occasions (but surely material of this sort circulated freely beyond any specific collection). The second date proposed would correspond to the last phase of the rivalry between the houses of Flanders and Blois-Champagne, which could serve to explain the recurrent unflattering references to Stephen of Blois's cowardice.[4] Generally speaking. *Ant* emphasizes the prowess of Crusaders from northern and northeastern France; the editor speculates that Richard might well have written his "ancienne chanson" in honor of the Saint-Pol family since he seems to draw particular attention to the exploits of the father-and-son team of Hugh and Enguerrand.[5]

The chapter devoted to the Old Occitan *Canso d'Antioca*[6] should spark heightened interest in this intriguing little text. The work, pub-

[1] Humbert of Romans, *Opus tripartitum,* ed. P. Crabbe *in Concilia omnia . . .* II (Cologne, 1551), Pars aut Liber I, p. 984.

[2]See Madeleine Blaess, "Les Manuscrits français dans les monastères anglais au moyen âge," *Romania,* 94 (1973), pp. 324, 327.

[3]II, p. 137.

[4]Pp. 135-137.

[5]II, pp. 230-234, 254. The death of Enguerrand de Saint-Pol occurs towards the end of the *Chanson* (or *Conquête] de Jérusalem,* which suggests to Madame Duparc that the episode might have been transposed by Graindor from the "original" *Ant.*

[6]II, pp. 171-205.

lished by Paul Meyer in 1883, has often been identified—if not by Meyer—as all that remains of an otherwise unpreserved epic composition by Gregory Bechada, *professione miles* and castellan of Lastours (Haute Vienne), written ca. 1125-40. Ever since Gaston Paris first tackled the matter, determining its relationship to our medieval French poem has usually involved, as here, a necessarily circuitous (when not frankly speculative) demonstration to ascertain its missing parts via that late thirteenth-century Spanish farrago *La Gran Conquista de Ultramar*. It has recently been argued elsewhere, however, that the *Canso* text does not belong to a much larger narrative and is thus not a fragment at all.[1] Obviously, if such a viewpoint can be adopted, the *Ant-Antioca* question must be approached in a different light.

The famous "twelve couplets," largely in assonance and preserved most fully in the *version ancienne* of Graindor's rhymed *rifacimento* (they number fourteen in MS C), are printed as 235 verses following v. 9583, after Bohemond takes possession of the citadel at Antîoch. The parallels with Albert of Aachen in textual detail are quite striking, as evidenced by the accompanying notes. Madame Duparc prefers to attribute the laisses, as did A. Hatem, to one of Graindor's predecessors, but not Richard. "Ces couplets ne doivent pas être étudiés isolément, mais replacées dans la perspective du développement du Cycle"[2]: their somewhat accelerated narrative rhythm may stem, as our editor proposes, from their being a condensation *(téléscopage)* of more developed material, and one may also note the relatively large number of words repeated at the rhyme. The laisses serve, in any case, to link *Ant* with the opening section of the *Chanson de Jérusalem* to the extent that they depict the Crusaders' march towards the Holy City, and thus set up the reunion of the *ost* with Corbaran's former prisoners whose adventures are the subject of the intervening branch of *Les Chétifs.*

-o-oOo-o-

[1]This is the opinion of E. J. Greenan, expressed on pp. 42ff. of the edition of the *Canso d'Antioca* he prepared as a doctoral dissertation (see *DAI*, 37, No. 3 [1976], p. 1591A). The new edition is a vast improvement over Meyer's. The text contains 714 verses in contrast to the 707 in the earlier edition; in 1972 I saw the MS at the Academia de la Historia in Madrid (now catalogued as cod. 117) and noted that Meyer—or rather Baist who made the transcription for him—had overlooked a number of lines.

[2]II, p. 236.

FEW EDITIONS, if any, of Old French texts nowadays can approach the monumental quality of Madame Duparc's wholly outstanding contribution to medieval studies. We are very much in her debt for providing us with an "authentic" edited text and for having assembled so impressive an arsenal of commentary. Needless to say, *Ant* still solicits the attention of contemporary scholars and critics who are better placed now to broaden our understanding of language in epic and chronicle, medieval *textualités*, the place of the *"fonction fabulatrice"* in historiographical discourse, and Crusade ideology. To be sure, thanks to this major addition to Crusade Cycle studies, these fields of exploration have never been on firmer ground.

Proofreading the two volumes was certainly no easy task, judging from the number of *coquilles* that linger on throughout the pages. Readers should be alerted to such mishaps in the following lines of the edition: 538, 867, 977, 3537, 3552, 6015, 6047, 6090, 6969, 8492, 9074. In certain verses, the title used in the case of address (Baron, Dex, Sire, etc.) is not set off by a comma: 121, 282, 1430, 1911, 2502, 3426, 3551, 7450, 8448, 9070, 9192, 9194, 9230, 9580. Moreover, a comma should be added after *foi* in v. 2408, but removed in v. 6092, and it should replace the full stop in v. 7307. Madame Duparc accepts evidence, mainly on the basis of decorative details, that B.N. fr. 12558 was written in the Artois no later than the mid-thirteenth century.[1] Regrettably—doubtless because of prevailing economic conditions—no part of the language study she had prepared has been incorporated into the edition.[2] But it is also true that the conventional Franco-Picard literary language exemplified by *A* (and by most of the other MSS) hardly makes for uncharted linguistic territory. On the other hand, a fair number of inaccurate readings have crept into the edition, with the unfortunate result that the copyist occasionally appears to be more of a blunderer than he really is. This reviewer has been able to collate at random sections of the printed text and *A*, and, in the interest of getting closer to the actual orthography of the latter, readers may wish to note the following MS readings (most of which, by the way, could have been retained): v. 60, *Bethanie* (why not keep this spelling, as well as *estorie*, v. 266? Cf. *glorie*, v. 27); v. 87, *fais;* v. 412, *arain;* v. 987, *L'emperere;* v. 1416, *li cors; v.* 1907, *brant* (also in v. 3073); v. 1930, *perdus;* v. 1983, *Dex;* v. 2002, *cuverte* (similarly, in vv. 3686, 8687); v. 2005, *Atot* (and forms in vv. 3120,

[1]II, p. 44.

[2]Cf. II, p. 17, note 1.

3609); v. 2447, *fremetés;* v. 2479, *avoir;* v. 2484, *corurent;* v. 2539, *dels* (also in v. 2584); v. 3036, *no;* v. 3070, *Turc;* v. 3082, *decolpés;* v. 3102, *as;* v. 3506, *avoec* (also in v. 6202); v. 3535, *lait;* v. 3581, *laisent;* v. 3607, *resvigourés;* v. 3629, *peüssiés;* v. 4059: despite the note on p. 219, the verse found after this line in *BC* also appears in *A;* v. 6100, *resuscitastes;* v. 6119, *aposteles;* v. 6214, *kenbel;* v. 6684, *armes;* v. 6692, *laidir; v.* 6684, *Berneville* (why not retain this form here and elsewhere?); v. 6764 *laisier* (correct to *laisié);* v. 6751, *pri;* v. 6781, *vif;* v. 6801, *Surie;* v. 7278, *Li v.;* v. 7289, *nos;* v. 7323, *latimier;* v. 7799, segnour; v. 7807, n^{o}; v. 7823, *Ainfer* (also in v. 7847); v. 7861, *maillente;* v. 8408, *ni alairont;* v. 8413 *Amesdelis* (also in vv. 8417, 8420); v. 8490, *nomer;* v. 9040, *tor* (?); v. 9063, *sains* (and in next line); v. 9066, *euscent;* v. 9099, *coupe;* v. 9577, tors. In the text printed on pp. 471-483: v. 16, *crestiien;* v. 70, *Lanbare* (cf. v. 74); v. 85, *paien.*

Other sundry comments: v. 239 is not hypometric; vv. 2866-3028 introduced from *B* are not bracketed; v. 6557 reads *esmovoie*[n]*t* making the note superfluous; v. 6768 *faç* or *fac*? v. 8287 (and elsewhere) *manjüent?* v. 8533 *iés* or *ies?* v. 8847 *Françor* or *Francor?* On pp. 476-481, v. 103, li or *Li Mare* (see also vv. 107, 119); v. 176 *sejornera*[i]*?;* v. 177, comma after *Deu;* v. 194, why change *Male* to *Mare?*

In the "Index des noms propres du texte"[1] *Elie,* v. 1501, and *Garnier,* v. 7614 (from the *Loherains* Cycle?)—admittedly, *chevilles*—are not included, and what is apparently referred to as a Church of St. Mary at Antioch in v. 7115 might have been identified as such. The "Glossaire" is highly selective, even though one is not sure what criteria were employed in setting it up; it should prove useful for all categories of readers—obviously extending beyond specialists in medieval French—who have a sound working knowledge of the language.

PETER R. GRILLO
University of Toronto

[1]I, pp. 547-571.