Gérard J. Brault. "Encore quelques notules sur le texte du *Roland* d'Oxford." *Marche Romane [Mélanges de philologie et de littératures romanes offerts à Jeanne Wathelet-Willem*] Liège, 1978, pp. 27-32.

PROFESSOR BRAULT PROPOSES, under a title appropriately reminiscent of Lecoy's in an earlier *Festschrift* (for Rita Lejeune), readings of eight vexed lines in the Oxford *Roland.* The lines treated, with review of previous interpretations, are vv. 820, 2710, 2762, 1215, 1926, 2359, 3395 and 3812. For present purposes reference will be limited to critical words.

In vv. 820, 2710, and 2762 personal pronouns are problematic in case and number: contexts seem to call for *lur.* Brault accepts all three of the *O* readings, citing *le (v.* 820) as a shortened form of *les,* confused with *lur* in Anglo-Norman—i.e., a genuine form. The *li* of vv. 2710 and 2762 could follow suit as scribal liberty (or error?) for *lur.*

Paleographical difficulties characterize lines 1215, 1926, and 3395. In v. 1215 *Dathan e Habirun* are intended, the initial letter of the textual *balbiun* being confused with *h*—which itself is superfluous (cf., *hunc* for *unc* elsewhere).[1] For v. 1926, Brault adopts Lecoy's (and others') *e vos cors* for *e mors* in *O,* albeit tracing a different path for the scribal pen's error. In v. 3395 he follows Segre by admitting *noit.,*

The remaining lines present *hapax.* In v. 2359, the word *ensumet* is unattested elsewhere and generally suppressed for that and metrical reasons. Brault proposes *ensement* and retention of the word, despite syllabic irregularity. In v. 3812, Brault glosses *gerun* as *gueredun* (two syllables through reduction of the intertonic vowel).

Five of the readings offer fresh insights into an inexhaustible manuscript; others refine or elaborate upon established interpretations and may be thought to contribute details of relatively minor significance (e.g., vv. 1926 and 3395), but what is ever insignificant in the establishment of a major text? One is inclined to accept all of Professor Brault's readings except the last. They obey the sense of their respective passages and are obviously the result of the intimate and painstaking association with the *Roland* that produced his monumental edition, translation, and commentary. One could, of course, quibble over an occasional justification: can one align the *le* of line 820 with proclitic *le (=les)* and attach it to *lur,* which seems to be an Anglo-Norman phenomenon of a later period than the Oxford manuscript?

It is only Brault's gloss of *gerun* as *gueredun* in line 3812 that gives pause, and for two reasons. The sole occurrence of *gueredun* in the poem is as object of the verb *"dei"* (v. 3409); our contested line would read, as it were, *"veeir" gueredun*—a less than natural combination. More importantly, the parallel lines 3802-03 offer the same word material as vv. 3812-13, from which a kind of proportion can be

[1]An unsettling misprint occurs in the article here: read "Abiron" for "Dathan," p. 29, line 11.

deduced:

> Morz est Rollant, ja mais nel revereiz;
> N'ert recuvret por or ne por aveir
> (vv. 3802-03)

> Ja por murir n'en ert veüd gerun,
> Ne por aveir ja nel recuvrerum
> (vv. 3812-13)

Brault would pair or equate *gerun (gueredun)* with *aveir* in both sets (lines from Gautier de Coincy cited in support appear misread: surely *avoir* functions there as infinitive and not as substantive, and at any rate there is no question of *veeir gueredun).* A true proportion may, however, be set up as follows:

> recuvret/aveir — revereiz/Rollant
> (vv. 3802-03)

> recuvrerum/aveir — veüd/ gerun
> (vv. 3812-13)

Gerun must therefore refer to Roland himself. This is further substantiated by the use of the third-person pronoun in line 3813, which has no antecedent unless *gerun* represents Roland. Indeed, some editors omit the difficult line 3812 and insert 3811a, in which the name *Rollant* figures, thus providing an antecedent; but this becomes unnecessary if *gerun* itself can be taken as a *lapsus calami* for some word invoking the hero of the poem. What that word may have been remains unfortunately, and despite Professor Brault's ingenious arguments, a mystery.

JAMES C. ATKINSON
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Francis DuBost. «L'Emploi du mot *géant* dans les chansons de geste.» *Mélanges . . . Charles Camproux.* Montpellier, 1978, pp. 299-312.

L'AUTEUR a apporté une nuance supplémentaire à la définition reçue du mot *géant* dans l'épopée médiévale française. Les chansons de geste présentent quatre types principaux de «géants»: le champion sarrasin, le «géant» anonyme terrorisant une contrée, le chevalier hors-la-loi, et le «géant» bâtisseur de cité ou de forteresse. En examinant les occurrences du mot dans les poèmes épiques, l'auteur a aperçu que le terme recouvre simultanément deux champs sémantiques: la taille extraordinaire, avec les traits voisins de force exceptionnelle et accomplissement de prouesses physiques, et la nature maléfique, à laquelle s'ajoutent des qualités voisines—laideur, méchanceté, mécréance. Sont désignés «géants» seulement les êtres qui possèdent à la fois ces deux attributs. Par contre, on évite de nommer «géants» des êtres de taille démesurée mais de nature bienfaisante ou héroïque, le Rainouart *d'Aliscans* et de la *Chanson de Guillaume*, par exemple, réservant cette dénomination à ceux, chrétiens ou païens, qui, comme Loquifer, associent à une taille extraordinaire un caractère malfaisant. «Le gigantisme physiologique ne suffit pas, tant s'en faut, à définir le 'géant'. Il faut nécessairement lui adjoindre l'idée du mal» (p. 310).

Depuis le Moyen Âge, le terme s'est modifié considérablement, en perdant l'idée du mal et, plus tard, en prenant un sens favorable. Néanmoins, sur trente-six occurrences du mot dans les quatre premiers livres de Rabelais, aucune ne désigne directement ni Gargantua ni Pantagruel. Chez Hugo, par contre, le terme est employé avec un sens nettement laudatif et valorisant, équivalent de «héros», voire de «génie». Dans ses pièces d'inspiration médiévale, Hugo applique le mot aux personnages, les barons de France et les douze pairs, par exemple, qui, «par leur aspect comme par l'orientation de leur pensée et de leur action étaient, dans les légendes originelles, aux antipodes du 'géant'» (p. 309).

L'auteur de cet article n'a guère eu la prétention d'entreprendre une étude synchronique systématique de l'emploi du mot *géant* dans la littérature épique médiévale, encore moins d'en faire un recensement depuis le Moyen Âge jusqu'à l'époque contemporaine. Pourtant, son étude a le mérite d'attirer l'attention sur une distinction sémantique d'application plus large dans le domaine des études médiévales, distinction, d'ailleurs, qu'ignore le dictionnaire de Godefroy, qui n'a pas jugé nécessaire de fournir une définition d'un mot aussi évident, tandis que celui de Tobler et Lommatzsch s'est contenté de gloser *jaiant* et ses variantes par «Riese». En plus, M. DuBost s'est bien gardé de conjecturer sur les origines ou les raisons de l'acception particulière du terme médiéval. Pourtant, on pourrait émettre l'hypothèse qu'elle a été conditionnée par un souvenir biblique, par exemple, celui de Goliath, qu'on désigne couramment par le terme *géant* dans les textes médiévaux. Ainsi, il est question dans un poème d'Eustache Deschamps de «. . . David, qui le *jaiant* tua».[1] Ou encore dans le sermon rimé «Grant mal fist Adam»: «Li povre Davi, Qui se combati contre le *geiant* . . .»[2] Pour approfondir les conclusions de M. DuBost en les appliquant à d'autres genres médiévaux, consulter F. Wohlgemuth, *Riesen und Zwerge in der altfranzösischen erzählenden Dichtung (*Stuttgart, 1906), et E. Jeauneau, «Nains et géants,» dans *Entretiens sur la Renaissance du XII^e^ siècle* (La Haye et Paris: Mouton, 1968).

MERRITT R. BLAKESLEE
Tulane University

[1] *Oeuvres complètes,* éds. Queux de Saint-Hilaire et Gaston Raynaud, III (Paris: S.A.T.F., 1882), 43, 21.

[2] *Reimpredigt,* éd. Hermann Suchier (Halle: Niemeyer, 1879), I, 49.

Tony Hunt. "L'Inspiration idéologique du *Charroi de Nîmes." Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 56 (1978), pp, 580-606.

TONY HUNT SEEKS to support and define further the long-recognized kinship between the *Charroi de Nîmes* and the *Couronnement de Louis* by attributing to the two poems a common ideological inspiration based on the transition of power from Louis VI to Louis VII in the years 1135-1137.

According to Suger's *Vita Ludovici grossi regis* (1136-1137), which shows many parallels with the *Couronnement*, the ailing Louis VI relinquished his royal authority in 1135 to his son, who was then approaching fifteen years, the age

attributed to the Louis of the poem. Van Waard's dating of the *Couronnement* between 1131 (coronation of Louis VII) and 1137 (death of Louis VI) should thus be narrowed to 1135-1137.

Hunt sees the *Charroi* as inspired by the same events, reflecting in the characters of Louis and Guillaume respectively the fears and uncertainties aroused by the weak, young king and the ideal of the promonarchial policies of Suger. Taking from the *Couronnement* the theme of loyalty to the crown, the *Charroi* refines this ideal and carries it further by examining the limits it places on the baron's freedom to manoeuvre.

Despite the comic elements which have received so much attention, the first episode of the *Charroi* is built around a paradox: the recompense which Guillaume requests is both indispensable and unacceptable, since it would mean redressing an injustice by another injustice. Guillaume's solution is to create his own recompense by the conquest of new lands from the Saracens. The expedition is distinguished by its cohesive function, satisfying the interests of diverse social groups in the feudal hierarchy: God, the king, his great vassal Guillaume, the landless knights and squires who will share in the booty, and the oppressed Christians who will be liberated.

The exemplary nature of the poem is shown in the stress laid upon Guillaume's scrupulous conduct, rather than on the king's manifest weakness. The poet rejects two other possible solutions: deposition of a *rex inutilis* and "defiance" *(diffidatio),* thus underlining the constructive rôle of the vassal who is called on to remedy the faults of the king. Guillaume's qualms about homicide and his concern for the oppressed and for those fallen in battle imply a notion of chivalry founded on *publica utilitas,* in contrast to the violent military realities of the period`. Influenced by the Church but not by courtly love, intended especially for the edification of the turbulent poor squires, this notion of the vassal's duty complements the *Couronnement* in promoting a promonarchial ideology reminiscent of Suger and the events of 1135-1137.

Without really attempting to stake out new territory, this article sheds considerable light on a number of points concerning the earliest poems of the *Cycle de Guillaume* and their relationship to the feudal society of twelfth-century France. It lends strong support to the now widely held thesis which sees the inspiration of these poems as much (or more) in contemporary events as in reminiscences of the Carolingian past. However, the argument is flawed somewhat by the failure to face directly the problem of chronology, which is crucial to any attempt to link poems with historical events. There is no objective criterion for dating the *Charroi* more precisely than "mid-twelfth century." It is generally thought to be later than the *Couronnement,* whose influence it reflects, but how much later? One or two years? Three or four decades? Hunt does not claim that the *Charroi* dates from 1135-1137, only that it was inspired by the events of that period. But could not such inspiration be due to the influence of the *Couronnement,* rather than any direct relation to those events? On the other hand, the ideology of the *Charroi* is not the same as that of the *Couronnement,* as Hunt's analysis makes clear, but rather a development from it. Is this development implicit in the *Couronnement,* as the article seems to imply? Or is it due to other causes: literary causes, such as the "bridge theory" rehabilitated by Frappier; historical causes, such as the changes in feudal

society in the second half of the twelfth century recently studied by Professor Mancini? This article does not resolve such questions, but it does make a solid contribution to the debate.

DON A. MONSON
College of William and Mary

Jean Subrenat. "Moines mesquins et saint Chevalier: à propos du 'Moniage' de Guillaume." *Marche romane [Mélanges de philologie et de littératures romanes offerts à Jeanne Wathelet-Willem]* 28 (1978), pp. 643-664.

THE *MONIAGE GUILLAUME* HAS RECEIVED much less critical attention than it deserves, despite its considerable material for the study of epic humor, irony, and thematic variation and complexity. This situation is being remedied somewhat by a volume of essays on the *Moniage* now under preparation by Jean-Charles Payen as well as by the present article. Subrenat argues that (1) Guillaume shows himself willing and able to learn the rule of St. Benedict, even though he recognizes that he must do so as a hermit and not as a cenobite while the monks at Aniane fail to follow the rule at all, and that (2) the *Moniage* poet manages skillfully to synthesize in the character of Guillaume the "vie de clerc" with the "vie de chevalier" without any real conflict between these normally divergent realms.

The first point is based upon the fact that "lâcheté, avarice, envie, hypocrisie, tentative d'homicide, haine" are the dominant characteristics of Aniane—"assurément bien éloignés de la règle de Saint Benoît"—and that Guillaume tries, even though he may indeed need time to adjust to his new life and to the abbot's often intentionally harmful demands, which follow the letter if not the spirit of the rule. Moreover, Guillaume gives evidence of his new-found humility to the rule in refusing to follow Louis back to Paris after the Synagon episode and in refusing to name himself during the Ysoré episode. As for the synthesis of the lives of knight and cleric, Subrenat notes that even though Guillaume has now become a monk and no longer actively seeks out knightly exploits, he cannot refuse to play the rôle of a knight if called upon lest he be guilty of cowardice and treason. Guillaume enters a new life without totally abandoning his old one, and this combination offers considerable depth to his character.

This well-substantiated article offers new insight into a work often seen, I suspect, as confusing (confused?) or simply parodic of the *chanson de geste.*

DAVID P. SCHENCK
University of South Florida

Gaston Tuaillon. «L'Emploi de la déclinaison dans la *Prise d'Orange.» Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* [Strasbourg], 16, No. 1 (1979), pp. 501-518.

PUISQUE LA *PRISE D'ORANGE* CONTIENT un grand nombre d'erreurs de déclinaison, M. Tuaillon l'a choisie pour en examiner un large échantillon (390 vers dans les laisses 3, 6, 9, 14, 26, 27 et 30) afin de découvrir si ces négligences grammaticales ont des conséquences pour la transmission du sens.

Les fautes sont classées selon leur contexte syntaxique (apposition ou qualification du sujet, attribut du sujet, sujet) et ensuite analysées. Après examen, l'auteur conclut que de toutes ces fautes aucune n'est vraiment grave, car la construction de la phrase impose toujours le bon substantif comme sujet.

Deux lieux privilégiés, la fin du vers et le nom propre de quatre personnages masculins, sont ensuite examinés dans la totalité de la geste. Le résultat de cet examen est sensiblement le même que celui de l'analyse des 390 vers cités dans le paragraphe. Ici aussi les erreurs ne sont, pour la plupart, que des fautes

«d'accord» c'est-à-dire des négligences causées par la redondance des marques flexionnelles. Dans les autres cas, ces erreurs, neutralisées soit par des trails grammaticaux, soit par le contexte, imposent toujours la fonction de sujet au substantif correct. On ne trouve que cinq amphibologies (des verbes transitifs entourés de deux substantifs) dans toutes ces fautes. On peut aussi remarquer que l's flexionnel est plus fragile au singulier qu'au pluriel et que la perte de la déclinaison ne peut pas s'expliquer par la phonétique.

Si l'on enlevait, dit M. Tuaillon, les marques flexionnelles de la geste, il en résulterait tout au plus des vers «faux», car cela ne gênerait pas beaucoup la transmission du sens. On ne peut, ajoute-t-il, généraliser après l'analyse d'un texte unique et dire que l'ancien français abandonne la déclinaison parce qu'elle ne sert plus à rien. Toutefois, on peut remarquer que la flexion ne devait pas garder une grande vitalité à l'époque puisque l'auteur ne risque jamais une phrase dont le sens aurait reposé uniquement sur les marques flexionnelles. On ne peut non plus imputer les erreurs à la désinvolture pure et simple du scribe, car les fautes sont plus nombreuses dans les contextes marqués par d'autres traits grammaticaux que la flexion, et elles sont plus fréquentes au singulier qu'au pluriel. Il faut aussi noter que le cas sujet supporte 95% des fautes et que dans les quelques erreurs du cas-régime il se trouve des mots comme «filz» qui ont retenu leur forme unique dans la langue actuelle. Enfin, les fautes graves, celles de la grammaire amphibologique, apparaissent toujours dans des propositions qui suivent l'ordre «sujet + verbe + complément.» Ces différences s'inscrivent donc dans l'évolution générale de la langue.

Cet article clair et concis s'inscrit dans la lignée des études sur l'emploi de la déclinaison à deux cas, qu'il faudrait peut-être rappeler ici: MM. Laubscher, *The Syntactical Causes of Case Reduction in Old French*, Eliott Monograph 7 (1921); Guiraud, «L'Expression du virtuel dans le *Roland* d'Oxford,» *Romania*, 83 (1962); Spence, «Existait-il en ancien français une opposition actuel / virtuel?» *Revue de Linguistique romane*, 30 (1966); et B. Woledge, «La Déclinaison des substantifs dans la *Chanson de Roland*, recherches mécanographiques,» *Romania*, 88 (1967) et 90 (1969). M. Tuaillon continue l'analyse de textes littéraires et apporte des informations additionnelles aux conclusions du dernier article de M. Woledge. La technique d'analyse employée par l'auteur est intéressante et mérite d'être étudiée. Il serait utile de voir ce genre de travail répété sur des textes entiers plutôt que sur des échantillons.

JOSETTE BRITTE-ASHFORD
Brigham Young University

Juan Victorio. "La Chanson de geste comme moyen de propagande." *Les Lettres romanes*, 33 (1979), pp. 304-328.

ALTHOUGH HE STARTS with a brief reference to Bédier and his theories and comments on the perceptible difference between Old French and Castilian epics in respect of their relationships to possible clerical and monastic involvement in their production, Victorio actually concentrates his attention wholly on the Spanish material, analysing the *Poema de Fernán González, Cantar de mio Cid, Mocedades de Rodrigo,* and, to a lesser extent, the *Leyenda de Montemayor.* He tries to avoid

entering the "origins controversy" by abstaining from reference to the "author," but as he states himself (p. 309) it is impossible to be wholly neutral, and, indeed, many of his conclusions presuppose authorial intention, as when he writes, à propos of the invasion of France episode of the *Mocedades de Rodrigo,* "Nous ne connaissons aucun essai plus clair de manipulation de l'histoire et de la légende à des fins particulières" (p. 327), in this case partisan support of Pedro el Cruel.

It is, however, clear that Victorio envisages a development of the epic which presupposes several layers of interference in a poem, or legend, by different hands adapting existing material for their own ends. He also adopts the system established by Menéndez Pidal to exhume the earliest states of epic texts from chronicles. Thus, the *Mocedades de Rodrigo* presents, in its last section, a clear statement of anti-Trastamara politics, yet it also contains (embedded in earlier material innocent of such manipulation) an element of monastic polemics in a debate over relics. This is reflected in a constant depreciation of Fernán González and Arlanza, in favor of Rodrigo and Palencia, to the extent that the author feels empowered to state that the *Mocedades* were written "sans aucun doute .. . pour faire de la propagande au bénéfice de la diocèse de Palencia" (p. 315). Later, however, he slightly modifies this stance and refers to a complex interplay between the promotion of a "new" hero and a religious site in need of a "heroic relic" to boost its own popularity.

Victorio adds the example of the *Leyenda de Montemayor* to illustrate how monastic hands were capable of manipulating traditional forms to produce poems entirely for their own profit in imitation of true epics. In this respect he quite consciously takes an opposing view of *Montemayor* from Menéndez Pidal. Also, in an interesting postscript, he suggests that the collapse of the epic as a form in Spain, and its replacement by the products of the *romancero,* might in part be attributable to the discredit into which the epic fell as a result of such manipulations.

The article presents an interesting viewpoint on the use of epic texts and the relationship of the literature to its society. The one weakness in the argument, of which the writer is fully aware, is the gap perceptible between the apparent reflections of a society in crisis portrayed in, say, the last episode of the *Mocedades,* and the assumption that an identifiable hand used the poem as polemic in a given conflict. In a sense the epic poem with its layers of accretions of messages is too complex to act as effective propaganda. This, however, is not to deny the possibility that popular literature, even when adopted and promulgated by learned communities such as monasteries and courts, does not instinctively assume a partisan spirit to suit its immediate audience.

P. E. BENNETT
Edinburgh