

Article Abstracts and Reviews

P. E. Bennett. "Encore Turoid dans la Tapisserie de Bayeux." *Annales de Normandie* 30, No. 1 (mars 1980), pp. 3-13.

OF INTEREST TO *Olifant* readers is P.E. Bennett's article on the Bayeux tapestry scene where Guillaume le Bâtard's two messengers confer with Guy de Ponthieu and in which the name of Turoid appears¹. B. analyses the inconographical language of this scene to suggest that the name refers to the small person holding the horse's reins. Showing that size is not representational of reality in the tapestry, B. posits that the small size of the figure (garbed in what is now generally accepted as the attire of the jongleur), in relation to the size of the other figures, indicates that two different scenes separated from each other in time and space are being simultaneously represented. From the logical viewpoint the jongleur does not belong in this scene between the Count and Guillaume's envoys. However, as guardian of the horses, he is assigned a most unnecessary function in the economy of the tapestry. Therefore, B. concludes that he is a person whose presence in the narrative must have been judged indispensable at the time the tapestry was designed, although we do not know why. B. then examines the positioning of the name Turoid and sees in it the creation of a false margin to indicate that the one to whom the name refers, the jongleur as B. thinks, does not belong to the principal picture but exists on a second plane. The organisation of lines and blocks of color supports B.'s thesis.

The jongleur, isolated from the main scene because his feet are not touching the ground, is framed in a double structure as is also done in other instances where the artist presents the persons he names in an architectural frame. This is a cogent argument for identifying the jongleur as Turoid. B. notes that the artist, had he so wished, could have avoided ambiguity by naming the messengers in scene 12 (Thorpe) instead of simply alluding to them as "Nuntii Willelmi." That he did not do so possibly indicates, according to B., that Turoid is the jongleur. B.'s identification is tentative. He argues against some of the points made by R. Lejeune when she contends that the messenger nearest the horses is Turoid, yet he does not clearly address the matter of her attribution. His conclusion, somewhat unconvincing to this reader, suggests that the artist's failure to name the messengers in scene 12 was deliberately intended to create ambiguity. Accepting Lejeune's description of the two figures as a couple, that of a knight and his jongleur, B. speculates in closing that perhaps the artist was playfully presenting a scene in which both the persons depicted were named Turoid.

JOAN B WILLIAMSON

New York City



¹ Scene 11 in *The Bayeux Tapestry and the Norman Invasion with an Introduction and a translation from the contemporary account of William of Poitiers* by Lewis Thorpe (London: The Folio Society, 1973).

J. D. Burnley. "The *Roman de Horn*: Its Hero and its Ethos." *French Studies*, 32, No. 4 (October 1978), pp. 385-397.

THIS ARTICLE is concerned with the accusation of pride with which editors of the *Roman de Horn* have seen fit to besmirch the character of Horn as he develops from a powerful young warrior into a merciless tyrant in later life. This broad accusation consists of five allegations, all of which Burnley rejects.

First, he defends Horn's alleged imperious conduct toward Rigmel, his intended bride; for Burnley, such conduct is completely in consonance with the psychology of male-dominated medieval society. He also argues that it is unwarranted to ascribe to pride Horn's failure to pray before battle, since the poet himself makes no such observation. On the contrary, it is Horn's humility and modesty which Thomas continues to stress.

Next, Burnley analyzes Horn's initial rejection of Rigmel's (and then Lenbruck's) advances and his refusal to take the oath of innocence demanded by Hunaf. These are more serious charges and require somewhat more argumentation and textual interpretation. If one is to follow Thomas's psychology and the code of knightly ethics, the interpretation that pride is the underlying motive in both cases destroys the moral values of the poem and ignores the hero's obligation to be responsive to his personal integrity and to his chivalric duties. Burnley thus adroitly shifts the blame to Rigmel, who does not properly evaluate Horn's attitude toward her while in the throes of love, and to Hunlaf, who must be censured for attempting to force Horn to betray his ideals.

Finally, the "rehabilitation" of Horn cannot be effected without refuting the accusation that the hero was motivated by *ruiste fierté*. This is the main thrust of Burnley's argument, to which he devotes more than half of his discussion. His prime target is the pejorative meaning which editors have ascribed to *ruiste fierté*. He attacks the problem from two standpoints. First, from the literary context in which the phrase is used in the *Roman de Horn* he shows that Thomas himself intended the meaning to be laudatory; Burnley holds that the opposite view is based on "negative evidence of the flimsiest kind." Then, by analyzing *ruiste fierté* in its wider employment in other medieval epics, he concludes that the term suggests a virtuous "sense of dedication" to the ideals of chivalry, certainly a praiseworthy rather than a reprehensible characteristic in an epic hero.

Burnley's article has the strong merit of exposing what he considers to be serious textual misinterpretations by previous editors. Horn, in his opinion, is a suitable prototype of a hero within the epic framework. Although he might have given his deductive material a somewhat broader treatment, his suggestive reassessment of Horn's character will, it is hoped, now generate additional research. It will, no doubt, also give rise to contention since the *Roman de Horn* overlaps both epic and romance literatures. In any case, through J. D. Burnley's study, this long-neglected poem finally receives some of the scholarly consideration it deserves.

CLAUDE J. FOUILLADE
University of Texas, Austin

Bernard Guidot. "Figures féminines et chanson de geste: l'exemple de *Guibert d'Andrenas*." *Marche romane [Mélanges de philologie et de littératures romanes offerts à Jeanne Wathelet-Willem]* 28 (1978), pp. 189-205.

GUIDOT'S STUDY of the late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century *Guibert d'Andrenas* shows that the poet made a sharp distinction between Christian and Saracen women, seen in their respective personalities, their formulaic physical descriptions and ascriptions of social status, and their psychological and political rôles.

The two Christian women, Guibourc and Hermenjart, wives of the protagonists Guillaume and Aymeri de Narbonne, exercise significant psychological and political powers. In addition, "[elles] . . . procurent aux protagonistes masculins la vertu apaisante de leur maturité et de leur équilibre" (p. 197).

In sharp contrast are the five Saracen women, only one of whom has a strongly portrayed personality: Augaiete, who is to become Guibert's wife. She is distinguished by formulaic descriptions of her beauty which, however, fall far short of the earlier twelfth-century detailed feminine portraits, indicating that the later audience preferred the narrative to the descriptive mode. She is, nonetheless, endowed with a high degree of finesse in character development, as she is at once spontaneous and authoritarian, as well as charmingly perfidious, forsaking and even betraying her Saracen father for her Christian future husband.

The Christian women, then, exemplify strongly traditional epic moral values, fulfilling the female rôle as "l'incarnation souriante mais énergique d'une société qui se veut solide, préoccupée de l'avenir et du bien-être des individus" (p. 204). But it is the portrayal of the Saracen woman that gives to the poem the new spirit of the early thirteenth century, denoting not the decadence but rather the revitalization of the genre of the *chanson de geste*.

SANDRA C. OBERGFELL
Mars Hill College

Wilhelm Kellermann. "Le Texte et la matière du roman *Berte ans grans piés* d'Adenet le Roi: A propos d'une nouvelle édition." *Marche romane [Mélanges de philologie et de littératures romanes offerts à Jeanne Wathelet-Willem]* 28 (1978), pp. 287-300.

IN THIS ARTICLE¹ Professor Wilhelm Kellermann discusses tome IV¹ of Albert Henry's five-tome edition of the works of Adenet le Roi, completed in 1971 with

¹First published in the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 85 (1969), pp. 45-55, "Zu Text und Stoff des Berta-Romans von Adenet le Roi, Aus Anlass einer neuen Edition. "

² First published in 1963. The footnote on p. 287 (p. 1 of the article) inadvertently refers to *Berte* as "Tome V." There are two other corrections to be made in this article: p. 289, l. 27, for "*esprit*" read "*esprist*"; and p. 296, l. 23, for "p. 15, note 21 " read "p. 150, note 21."

the two-tome edition of *Cleomadés*.²

This edition by the Belgian philologist Albert Henry definitively replaces its predecessors. Any serious student of philology and textual criticism should read the notes to his editions as though they were a textbook.³

Kellermann characterizes Henry's approach in the following way: "On peut dire qu'un nouveau genre d'édition est né, où la rivalité de la linguistique historique et de l'histoire littéraire se trouve heureusement résolue" (p. 287).

Berte is preserved in nine manuscripts, three of which date from the lifetime of the author (end of the thirteenth century). Henry uses MS A as a base and presents, as Kellermann points out, all the variants, even the orthographic ones (p. 288). Henry's method exists, says Kellermann: ". . . entre la prétendue certitude de Lachmann et la résignation de Bédier" (p. 288). Kellermann indicates that, contrary to Henry's modest disclaimer, he has evolved a method of dealing with texts that has a general import. To illustrate how Henry deals with textual problems (the establishment of variants and the correction or change of the base text), Kellermann presents several examples (pp. 289-293), including one with which he disagrees (p. 291). As Kellermann points out, Henry approaches each problem posed by the text without "automatic reflex," and it is possible for the lesson of A to be retained in the face of opposition of all other manuscripts.

Henry develops at length in his forty-page introduction the superiority of Adenet as poet, psychologist, and story-teller. His *récit* varies in important ways from the versions of his predecessors (in the *Chronique rimée* of Philippe Mousket, ca. 1250, and in the *Chronique saintongeaise*, ca. 1225, for example) and from later and foreign versions (pp. 294-96). As *remanieur*, however, Adenet improves upon his material. He invents names for previously unnamed characters, a new villain for the betrayal episode, and a prelude that includes the famous combat of Pépin and the lion.

Kellermann characterizes some of Albert Henry's interpretation of theme as brilliant (p. 298). Masterly handling of problems of narrative, style, psychology, and philology by a single scholar is rare indeed and places Albert Henry in the company of the greatest philologists and text editors, past and present. I repeat, with the *Speculum* reviewer of *Cleomadés*, that we hope Professor Henry will fulfill his promise of an *étude d'ensemble* of Adenet le Roi.⁴

LENORA D. WOLFGANG
University of Pennsylvania

²The first three tomes are: I: *Biographie d'Adenet: La tradition manuscrite* (Bruges, 1951); II: *Buevon de Conmarchis* (Bruges, 1953); and III: *Les Enfances Ogier* (Bruges, 1956).

³In *Berte* there is no Glossary as such. A list of words discussed in the Textual Notes is given. One should consult Henry's edition of *Le Jeu de Saint Nicolas de Jehan Bodel* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962) for an example of a *complete* Glossary: every word and every form in the work is analyzed. Henry says he was inspired in this by the lexicon of Lucien Foulet for the *Chanson de Roland*.

⁴Richard O'Gorman in *Speculum*, 48 (1973), pp. 756-57.



Duncan McMillan. "Notes d'ecdologie: fantômes et mirages dans la *Chevalerie Vivien*." *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* [Strasbourg], 16, No. 1 (1978), pp. 353-362.

THE AUTHOR treats the problem of textual variants in an exemplary case of the Guillaume cycle, the ten manuscripts of the *Chevalerie Vivien*. Given the difficulty one encounters when attempting to reconstruct a coherent text out of the extant versions of a manuscript tradition which has evolved from successive alterations, McMillan feels that the only way a conscientious editor can present the complexity of the manuscript tradition is to publish, side by side, a representative of each of the principal branches.

Even in passages where the collation of various manuscripts reveals scribal methods for arriving at the immediate lessons, an editor is not necessarily able to reconstruct the lessons of the original manuscript, or even sometimes to make a scientific choice among the divergent lessons. We are in a different world from the one which allowed Bédier to publish without reservation the integral text of manuscript *A* of the *Lai de l'Ombre*.

McMillan proceeds to examine variant lessons in the manuscript tradition of the *Chevalerie Vivien*. His first case deals with variant assonance in the same *laisse*. Next he examines the case of a phantom line in a particular manuscript, a line which appears a few verses lower in the manuscript tradition but which the scribe carelessly introduced earlier in the text at hand. McMillan points out a similar sort of scribal error in a different manuscript. He feels that the editor's problem is not to impose a rationalistic explanation upon the relative incoherence of these texts, but that any editor concerned with presenting a reliable text must take a stand on the authenticity of a line such as *D* 802 in this particular manuscript tradition. The editor's solution will be, to some extent, subjective and arbitrary.

In another problematic line, an omission supposedly committed by the arranger turns out to be a "philologist's mirage." The editor's decision on such a line will depend partly on his base manuscript. Elsewhere, McMillan finds a correct lesson in a given manuscript; he concludes by asking how many primitive lessons are hidden in manuscripts and in how many others they have vanished because of alterations and transcriptions.

McMillan's arguments are convincing and his examples well chosen. How very difficult it is indeed in the *chanson de geste*, as opposed to some other medieval genres, to reconstruct the original lesson of a particular manuscript tradition.

GENETTE ASHBY-BEACH
University of Maryland, College Park



Kenneth Adams. "*Pensar de*: Another Old French Influence on the *Poema de mio Cid* and Other Mediaeval Spanish Poems." *La Corónica*, 7, No. 1 (Fall 1978), pp. 8-17.

THIS ARTICLE is a further elaboration and a correction of Colin Smith's views on the periphrastic *pensar de* + infinitive in French and Spanish epic poetry. According to Smith, the phrase is a possible borrowing from the French, occurring "apparently only in the *Poema de Mio Cid*." Adams builds a case for a derivative origin of the Spanish périphrase from the French *penser de*. He cites fifteen French epics where it occurs, in many, more than once. He then refutes Smith's assumption that the Spanish counterpart occurs only in the *Poema*, citing three examples from the *Mocedades de Rodrigo* and one from the *Infantes de Salas* fragment. The phrase recurs more frequently in the *mester de clerecía*: there are sixteen instances in the *Libro de Alexandre*, six in the *Libro de Apolonio*, three or four in *Fernán González*, and twelve in Berceo's works. The verbs of action introduced by the *pensar de* / *penser de* parallel each other closely in the Spanish and French *gestes*: *cavalgar-chevalchier*; *aguijar-esperonier* / *exploitier*; a wider variety of verbs, all suggesting a hasty activity about to begin, abound in both literatures: *entrar* / *andar* / *adobar*, *naveyar* in the Spanish, and *cheminer* / *esrer* / *vangier* / *chanter* / *garir* / in the French. In the *Alexandre*, *pensar de* introduces verbs of yet a broader spectrum: *guardar*, *folgar*, *livar*, *ferir*, *dir*, *tornar*. Berceo contributes *presear*, *servir*, *orar*, *rogar*, *almorzar*, *guardar*, *ir*. From this, Adams postulates "a strong link between French and Spanish epic and between epic and *clerecía* poetry." He has little doubt "that the ultimate origin is in the *Chansons de Geste*." Contrary to Smith, he does not believe in considerable "line for line borrowing" by the *Poema*; he views the Spanish períphrase as "a cultured intervention," a "late layer on an earlier formulaic model."

Kenneth Adams offers sufficient proof for the double linkage between French and Spanish epic language and between the *mester de clerecía* and *mester de juglaría*. It seems, however, that a more or less adequate chronology needs to be established between the alleged French models of the *Poema*, like *Raoul*, *Orson de Beauvais*, *Doon de la Roche*, etc., and the *Poema* itself (1140?), before a definite trend from the French to the Spanish epic poetry can be established, in order to preclude the possibility of something like "two way street" or a shared linguistic climate between the two literatures.

M. J. HANAK
East Texas State University