PETER F. DEMBOWSKI

Whom and What Did Galïen Restore?

THE FIFTEENTH-CENTURY *chanson de geste* written in 4911 alexandrines comprising 177 monorhymed *laisses,* and recounting the adventures of Galïen, the illegitimate son of Olivier, has been well known to scholars ever since the pioneer work of Léon Gautier.[1] A summary of the scholarship concerning *Galïen* will help the reader better to understand not only the importance of this epic, but also my philological preoccupation with one of its features.

Gautier's study, consisting chiefly of a detailed analysis of the song reconstructed from prose versions (since Gautier did not know the verse text), was published originally in 1868. In 1881, Gaston Paris examined in detail the *chanson,* but again, like Gautier, he knew *Galïen* only from the de-rhymed versions.[2] Like his predecessor, he realized that some prose passages were still close enough to the verse model as to permit reconstructions of whole groups of verses. Since, as it was to be learned later, the *chanson* presents a text quite similar in content to the prose versions, Paris's analysis of the reconstructed (I do not dare to say "restored") poem remains on the whole valid and informative as to many details. It contains the first and only extended discussion of the philological problem which I treat here. Furthermore, in his article, Paris points out a most important fact. On February 6, 1861, manuscript 55 of the Savile collection was sold in London to a private party. Paris cites the opinion of Paul Meyer (who saw the manuscript for a few minutes) that ". . . il y a dans la première par-

[1] Léon Gautier, *Lex Épopées françaises,* 2e éd. rev., t. 3 (Paris. 1880), pp. 315-345.

[2] Gaston Paris, "Galien," *Histoire Littéraire de la France,* 28 (1881), pp. 221-239. (Henceforth, *HLF).*

tie de ce recueil (=Savile 55) non pas un, mais au moins deux romans, ayant ensemble 35,500 vers environ, et qui . . . sont des versions remaniées, le premier de Guerin de Montglave, le second de Roncevaux, toutes deux en vers de douze syllabes sentant fortement leur quatorzième siècle." Paris concludes his observations on this alexandrine version of the poem, which he rightly conjectured to be *Galïen,* with an expression of hope that "le manuscrit Savile, dont nous ne connaissons pas le possesseur actuel, sortira quelque jour de la retraite où il a été replongé après sa courte apparition publique."[3]

Two years later, Gaston Paris made a description of the verse part of the former Savile 55 manuscript, now known as manuscript 26092 of the Philipps-Fenwick Collection of Cheltenham (Cheltenham manuscript, for short). The description is entitled: "Le Roman de la Geste de Monglane."[4] From that moment on, the scholarly world knew that the manuscript in question contains: 1. *Hernaut de Beaulande, 2. Renier de Gennes,* 3. *Girart de Vienne,*[5] and 4. most importantly for us, *Galien.*[6] In his second article, Paris also touches upon the problem that interests us here.

In 1890, Edmund Stengel published our poem. Since the title of his edition explains the editorial philosophy followed, it must be quoted in full: *Galïens li restorés: Schlusstheil des Cheltenhamer Guerin de Monglane unter Beifügung sämtlicher Prosabearbeitungen zum ersten Mal veröffentlicht.*[7] As often happens in our profession, the very organization of Stengel's edition was profoundly influenced by the general tenor of previous scholarship. Stengel's desire was not merely to present a good text of

[3]*HLF, P.* 225.

[4]*Romania,* 12(1883), pp. 1-13.

[5]These three *chansons* were published by David M. Dougherty and Eugene B. Burnes under the collective title of *La Geste de Monglane* (Eugene, Oregon, 1966).

[6]ln addition, the Cheltenham manuscript contains a part ot the prose *Chronique de Saint-Denis* utilized by Jules Viard in his edition of *Les Grandes Chroniques de France,* 9 vols (Paris, 1920-1953).

[7]Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie, 84 (Marburg, 1890), pp. i-liv, 1-408. The long introduction dealing chiefly with the comparison between the text of the *chanson* and the prose versions was written by Stengel's student, Karl Pfeil. Pp. iii-xxxii repeat *verbatim* his inaugural dissertation, *Das Gedicht Galïen Rethoré der Cheltenhamer Handschrift und sein Verhältnis zu den bisher allein bekannten Prosabearbeitungen* (Marburg, 1883); pp. xxxiii-liv were prepared expressly for the edition.

the Cheltenham manuscript, but to give the reader a good idea of the content of all the existing versions of the story. Together with the poem,[8] he prints very large excerpts chiefly of the three prose versions (previously studied by Gautier and Paris): MS Paris, Bibl. nat. f. fr. 1470, MS Paris, Arsenal 3351, and *L'Histoire , . . de Galien Restoré,* éd. Antoine Vérard, Paris, *circa* 1500. He also makes occasional references to *La Tresplaisante hystoire . . . Guerin de Monglane,* éd. Jean Trepperel, Paris, *circa* 1500,[9] *Il Viaggio di Carlo Magno in Ispagna,* ed. Antonio Ceruti, Bologna, 1871, and other texts of the Roncesvals *geste.* Like Gautier and Paris before him, Stengel saw in the prose versions easily discernible alexandrine patterns, and he used these versions (particularly manuscript 1470 and Vérard's incunabulum) to emend many verses of the Cheltenham manuscript and to reconstitute a number of groups of verses which he deemed to be missing in that manuscript. In all this, Stengel was excruciatingly thorough and systematic. The result was an enormous critical apparatus characterized by opaque abbreviations and a rather bizarre organization. Thus, in spite of the fact that Stengel uses square and round brackets and that he prints the added passages in italics, the reader encounters real difficulty in reconstructing the text of the Cheltenham manuscript from Siengel's text.[10]

Commenting upon this edition, Gaston Paris, as usual, puts his finger on the essential point: ". . . ce volume met à la portée de tous, tant pour la critique du *Roland* que pour celle du *Pèlerinage,* des matériaux qui ont en eux-mêmes moins de valeur qu'on ne l'espérait, mais qui ne sont pourtant pas dénués d'importance . . ."[11] And indeed, the edition of our poem

[8]Copied for Stengel by the indefatigable K. Pfeil in Cheltenham in 1886. *Bons fut li siecles!*

[9]For the approximate dates of the early printings of the prose versions, see Stengel's edition, pp. iv-v. All the known prose versions were composed in the late fourteenth century.

[10]To demonstrate that the difficulty in discerning what properly belongs to the text of our *chanson* does not necessarily stem from my own shortcomings, let me cite two relatively recent articles which analyse, independently of each other, the scene of a chess game between Galïen and his uncle Thiebert. They are: Louis-Fernand Flutre, "La Partie d'échecs de *Dieudonné de Hongrie," Mélanges. . . Rita Lejeune, 2* (Gembloux, 1969), pp. 757-768; and Pierre Jonin, "La Partie d'échecs dans l'épopée médiévale." *Mélanges . . . Jean Frappier,* I (Genève, 1970), pp. 483-197. Neither Flutre (p. 766) nor Jonin (pp. 488-489), excellent medievalists both, realize that what they examine is not a passage of a *chanson* of the fourteenth century (Flutre), or the end of the twelfth (Jonin), but the text restored by Stengel from prose versions. The Cheltenham manuscript does not contain any chess game.

has enabled some scholars to study the individual aspects of its content. But the general studies of this very late epic have been quite rare. I am inclined to explain this relative lack of scholarly interest by the organization of Stengel's edition, and, above all, by the absence of a succinct "factological" introduction concerning the Cheltenham text.[12]

But there is a notable exception. In 1951, the late and lamented Jules Horrent published his thesis, *La Chanson de Roland dans les littératures français et espagnole au moyen âge*.[13] Two full chapters of this magisterial work are devoted to the existing versions of *Galïen, m*uch of it to the sole extant verse redaction contained in the Cheltenham manuscript, and to their probable prehistory. Horrent's study is a model of clarity. He always distinguishes between the existing versions and conjectural reconstructions, between philological facts and historical "missing links." Here, briefly, are his findings, which *will* probably have to be somewhat modified in the light of this study. The original (lost) *Chanson de Galïen* was composed in about 1200. It was a recasting of the epic materials taken from a rhymed *Roland* (lost), and a (lost) version of the *Pèlerinage.* This *Galïen I* was incorporated, sometime in the second half of the thirteenth century, into the verse cycle of *Garin de Monglane* (lost), since Olivier was a grandson of Garin. In the fourteenth century this cycle was recast into the *"second Garin remanié"* (also lost). Only in the second half of the fifteenth century was *Le Galïen de Cheltenham* elaborated from *the* "second" *Garin de Monglane.* It represents, let me repeat, the only surviving *chanson de*

[11]*Romania,* 19 (1890), p. 376. In this brief *notice,* Paris expresses admiration mixed with reservations concerning Stengel's "monument de patience et d'abnégation," as well as a disagreement with Pfeil's views concerning the relationship of our *Galïen* with the prose versions and other texts belonging to the "légende de Roncevaux."

[12]We have seen that good scholars are confused as to the date of the actual text of *Galïen* (see above, n. 10). Likewise, Martin de Riquer, in his brief analysis of *Galïen,* speaking about this "continuation du Pèlerinage" states: "La trame et le développement de cette chanson nous sont connus grâce à des refontes en prose françaises et des adaptations étrangères, et *principalement grâce au texte, conservé dans un poème* de *la fin du XIII*[e] *siècle, intitulé Galiens li Restorés."* Martín de Riquer, *Les Chansons, de geste françaises,* 2[e] éd. (Paris : Nizet, 1957), p. 206 (emphasis mine).

[13]Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 120 (Paris, 1951). See especially: "Les Aventures de Galien," pp. 63-78 and "Galien le Restore," pp. 377-412. Horrent refers often to Eduard Koschwitz, *Sechs Bearbeitungen des altfranzösischen Gedichts von Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem und Constantinopel* (Heilbronn, 1879), Koschwitz edited MS Arsenal, MS 1470 and a printed edition similar to Vérard (as well as a Welsh version, its English translation, and an Old Norse poem). All six edited passages deal with the story up to the conception of Galïen.

geste treating the story of Galïen son of Olivier. Horrent's work has recently been continued by our colleague Hans-Erich Keller in "Les Aventures du fils d'Olivier à Roncevaux."[14]

The detailed study by Horrent which in effect separated once for all, so to say, the Cheltenham poem from other parallel versions of the story, and the purchase, in 1956, of the manuscript by the University of Oregon[15] made possible the modern edition of the real, not reconstituted (I am tempted to say not "deconstructed"), text of the C*hanson de Galïen.* David M. Dougherty and Eugene B. Barnes (henceforth: D. and B.) published *Le Galien de Cheltenham* in 1981.[16] The editors profited from the scholarship outlined above. After analyzing briefly Stengel's emendations and additions to the the Cheltenham manuscript (pp. xiii-xv), they stated succinctly their editorial aim: "Nous nous proposons de présenter ce texte *tel qu'il paraît dans le MS. de Cheltenham,* sans faire appel aux versions en prose et sans arranger les vers afin de les doter d'une perfection absolue" (p. xv, emphasis theirs). Having decided upon this sound editorial policy, D. and B. expressed the "hope that they could "montrer que ce manuscrit, certes non parfait, est néanmoins loin d'être aussi défectueux que l'ont affirmé certains érudits qui l'ont jugé uniquement d'après l'édition de Stengel" (ibid). I am convinced that their hope was justified. The edition is a welcome development in the studies of the myth of Charlemagne in general and of *Galïen* in particular.[17] After some 120 years of considering either a totally hypothetical U*r-Galïen,* or a partly hypothetical text reconstructed from de-rhymed versions, or, since Stengel's edition, dealing with a highly reconstituted text, we have at our disposal the real fifteenth-century redaction of an oft recast *chanson* preserved in a manuscript copied in about 1490.[18]

[14]*Actas del VIII Congreso de la Société Rencesvals* (Pamplona, 1981), pp. 239-245. Unlike Horrent, Keller does not discuss the problem of the literary genealogy of the G*alïen.* He concentrates his attention on some aspects of historical *realia* underlying the story, as well as on Italian versions of it.

[15]Until 1956, the manuscript remained in the collection of W.-H. Robinson of London, and as such practically inaccessible to scholars. T*he U*niversity of Oregon Catalog number of our manuscript is "Special Collection, C.B B 54."

[16]Purdue University Monographs in Romance Languages, 7 (Amsterdam 1981).

[17]I prepared, for *Romance Philology,* a review of D. and B.'s edition. While welcoming the publication of an authentic text, I criticize many philological details of the edition.

The importance of this text cannot be overestimated. First, it belongs to these later *remaniements* of the Roland and the *Pèlerinage matière* which, through its subsequent printed versions[19] kept alive the myth of Roncesvals in the minds of the French-speaking public. This fact in itself justifies fully the publication of the poem.[20] Secondly and more importantly for our purpose, this *chanson* recast in the fifteenth century is a precious document testifying not only to the survival of the epic genre, but also to its new vitality during the "chivalric reaction" of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries which I have, speaking elsewhere and of other genres, called the "first medieval revival."[21]

Much remains to be done in order that we may better understand this late medieval chivalric reaction in romance and epic literature. Much depends on the availability of those late texts in good modern editions. To work on those texts with equanimity we should abandon certain attitudes of our predecessors. We should not talk about the dull, lengthy, repetitive, decadent, etc. works, whose only redeeming virtue seems to lie in the fact that, like a rich archeological search site, their close examination can reveal fragments of former splendor. We should *also* see in them authentic products of their own times. We should see in them the necessarily idealized vision held by the late medieval writers not only of early medieval history, but also of early medieval literary reflections on that history. In short, we should try to ascertain how the fifteenth-century poet-recaster of G*alïen* saw the Rolandian world and its literary representation.

Having thus at our disposal an authentic text of *Galïen de Cheltenham,* we can examine here one specific philological problem which, I am sure, will throw some light on the questions mentioned above. The prob-

[18]D. and B., p.x.

[19]The Trepperel, and especially the Vérard printed versions have been republished innumerable times from the sixteenth until the nineteenth century (see Horrent, p.75).

[20]Because of their rôle in the history of the myth of Roncesvals, it would be very desirable to have a good edition of the four extant prose versions of *Galïen* (printed in parallel columns to facilitate their comparison).

[21]See "La Position de Froissart-poète dans l'histoire littéraire: bilan provisoire," *Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature,* 16, 1, *Mélanges ... Jean Rychner* (Strasbourg, 1978), pp. 131-147. Recently, I published a study on the last French verse romance stressing its fundamentally restoratory nature: *Jean Froissart and his Meliador. Context, Craft, and Sense,* The Edward C. Armstrong Monographs on Medieval Literature, 2 (Lexington, Kentucky, 1983).

lem is that of the very name of Galïen.

Galïen, we know, is an ideal knight. The illegitimate son of Jacqueline, the daughter of the emperor of Constantinople, and of Olivier (conceived in consequence of the famous *gab* of the *Pèlerinage),* Galïen finds his father in the last moments of the disaster of Roncesvals. He is present at his father's death, he helps Roland against the pagans and, later, contributes greatly to their defeat at the hands of Charlemagne. In the meanwhile, Galïen fights also against the treachery of his maternal uncles, Thiebert and Henry, and having defeated their champion Burgualant, he becomes emperor of Constantinople. During his numerous adventures, he wins and marries the beauteous Guimarde (niece of Baligant), who becomes a Christian and a perfect spouse for love of Galïen. Our song is thus an idealized and romanticized *remaniement* of (a) *remaniement(s)* of both the *Roland* and the *Pèlerinage* (in which the former represents a frame for the latter).

And now, the name. Galïen, like a great many other personal names of the poem, belongs exclusively to this epic.[22] Naming practically everybody, even quite secondary heroes, endowing the chivalric world with the sonorous names is a specialty of late romances and epics. It is a simple, but efficient device of poeticizing this world. In our song, Galïen (sometimes Gualïen) is always trisyllabic. It would be, therefore, preferable to write Galïen (as Stengel and I do), rather than Galien (as do D. and B.).[23] This is not a mere graphic chicanery. It is an important point in prosody, and prosody is, ultimately, involved with meaning.

The name of the hero is very often accompanied by an epithet *restoré,* so much so that Stengel entitled the poem, as we have seen, *Galïens li restorés,* and this title became the standard one in all the scholarly literature.

[22]D. and B. mark with an asterisk in their Table of Proper Names, the heroes who according to Ernest Langlois, *Table des noms . . ., dans les chansons de geste* (Paris, 1904), appear exclusively in *Galïen.* The majority of names bear an asterisk. The name Galien appears, however, in several romances. See Louis-Fernand Flutre, *Table des noms . , . dans les romans .. .,* (Poitiers, 1962), p. 84.

[23]*We.* now have at our disposal an excellent manual of editorial practices. Alfred Foulet and Mary B. Speer in their *On Editing Old French Texts,* The Edward C. Armstrong Monographs on Medieval Literature, 1 (Lawrence, Kansas, 1979), p.72, specifically advise to use a tréma in u bisyllabic *ie* when followed by an *n.*

But, as far as I can ascertain, *Galïen le restoré* never occurs in the poem.[24] The reason for this is prosody. The hero's name plus an epic epithet is very often used as a formula. However. *Galïen le restoré* has seven syllables, and the epic formula-hemistich has to have six syllables, our alexandrine text being metrically quite regular. Thus we find quite often the hemistich *G(u)alien Restor(r)é* (vv. 357, 369, 570, 3523, 4246, 4338, etc.), but never with a definite article. This article which singles out and emphasizes the epic epithet, lending to it an additional semantic force, must surely have been created in the de-rhymed and "de-metered" versions, that is to say, in prose.[25] Its penetration into the verse redaction, albeit in an "externat," artificial form of a title, is yet another example of the pitfalls of reconstruction in textual criticism.

But the main point which concerns me here is the meaning of *restoré* in our poem. The problem is not new. It was noticed by Gaston Paris who studied it in some detail in his articles (see above, n. 2 and n. 4). It was also noticed by Stengel, who summed up Paris's findings and criticized one aspect of them (the "'two Galïens theory"). Neither Horrent nor D. and B. mention this problem, which obviously requires further attention.

We read in the poem that the poor Jacqueline, chased by her cruel father from the imperial palace, gave birth to a son in the house of a poor woman. Two fairies, Galïenne and Esglentine, are present at the birth. The first one predicts a brilliant future for the child:

> "Roy de Costentinnoble sera et duc de renom,
> Ja n'en tendront ses oncles la valeur d'un bouton.
> Et afin que sa mere que orendroit voyon
> Lui souviengne de nous quant nous departiron,
> *Ara nom Galien et portera mon nom."*
> (vv. 337-341, emphasis mine)[26]

[24]But D. and B. list "Galien (le Restoré)" in their Table of Names.

[25]Where indeed we find this formula, but, if we discard the *explicit* of MS 1470 (see Stengel, p. 380), only once: *Galien le restoré* appears thus in Arsenal and in 1470 (Stengel p. 15 and p. 391), in the important scene of naming our hero. This scene corresponds to vv. 324-357 of D. and B. As far as I could ascertain from Stengel's edition, the printed versions do not use the formula with the article. On the other hand, all the prose versions employ the articleless formula (see Stengel pp. 15, 198, 226, 250, *251*, 263, 264, 272, 274, 318, 327, 352). Vérard alone prints *Galyen Rethoré*. See n. 27 and n. 39 below.

[26]Essentially the same text is given by Stengel, p. 14. Substantially the same idea

So far everything seems perfectly clear. Galïen is named after his kind fairy godmother, which would strongly suggest that he has become a *Galïen(ne) restoré(e).* The complications arise, however, in the ensuing conversation between the fairies:

> "Dame," dist [Esg]lentine, "par saincte trinité, (r. Trinité)
> A cest enfant cy avez beau don donné.
> Donner lui doint *(r.* doi) ung don par la vostre amistié
> Que ja tant comme il vive ne puist estre maté;
> N'en joustés (r. joustes) n'en tournois n'en estour ordonné,
> N'en soit ja reculé demy pie *(r.* pié) ordonné.
> Tant occira payens a son branc asseré
> Qu'en repoz en sera mise crestienté, (r. crestïenté)
> D'Espaigne ainçois XX ans sera roy courroné.
> Et quant les XII pers seront a mort finé,
> Tant fera cest enfant a son branc aceré,
> Que [Charles] l'emperiere et tout l'autre barné.
> Sera par cest enfant de la mort respité."
> "Ma seur, " dist Galienne, "vous avez bien parlé,
> *Puisque restor[er]a a Charles et son barné,*
> *Des gens sera nommé Galien Restoré."*
> (vv. 342-357, emphasis mine)[27]

is expressed in the prose versions. 1470: "Et si vueil, auant qu'il meure, qu'il soit roy de Constantinnoble et de toute la terre et n'en auront ses oncles ung pié de terre. Et affin qu'il soueigne a sa mere de nous, je vueil, qu'il ait nom Galïen et qu'il porte mon nom." Arsenal: "Et puisque je ne le puis de paine garandir, jl sera nommé Galïen en signe de mon nom, puisqu'a lui ay premier atouchié et si luj octroie, qu'il soit en tous lieux hardis . . . qu'il soit roy de Constantinople comme celluj auquel l'eritage doit apertenir." Vérard: "Après ie te destine a estre roy vne fois qui viendra de Constantinoble. Et affinque ta mere qui cy est ai souuenance de nous, quant nous departirons d'icy, tu porteras le nom de Galyen, pource que j'ay nom Galyenne" (Stengel, p. 390).

[27]Likewise, Stengel's text is practically the same, except that he emends *doint* (v. 344) into *vueil,* while D. and B. suggest dois in the note. Our prose versions offer reading analogous to the last verses which interest us here: 1470: ". . . et puisqu'il fera secours a Charlemaigne et a son bernaige en deffendant chrestïenté, il ara nom Galïen le restoré." Vérard: ". .. en après sera nommé Galyen et son surnom Rethoré, comme qui vouldroit dire: c'est cellui qui a restauré cheualerïe en lieu des douze pers qui furent presque tous mors a la iournee de Ronceuaulx; car en ce temps la fut surnommé Galyen rethoré" (Stengel, p. 15). Arsenal lacks a corresponding passage. It offers instead a more "cautious" version without any explanation of the name: "Puisque grace lui auez donnee d'estre le plus hardi du monde, qu'il ne reculle pour homme nul viuant et qu'il ne soit mort ne maté jusques atant, qu'il ait Charlemaine visitez et conforté contre les sarasins, quant jl aura ses XII pers perdus. Et si sera roy portant couronne en Espaigne qu'il aidera a conquerir après la mort de Rolant et de son pere Oliuier" (Stengel, p. 390).

According to the last two lines of our text *restoré* must mean nothing else but *'celui qui restaur[er]a',* in other words, 'the Restorer'. And thus correctly interpreting these lines, Pierre Jonin is right in calling our hero "Galien le Restaurateur."[28] But such acceptation goes against the Old and Middle French usage. Gaston Paris observed: "L'épithète de 'restoré', fréquente dans la poésie chevaleresque du XIV[e] siècle, y est toujours précédé du nom illustre, que le personnage dont il s'agit est censé faire revivre par ses vertus ou ses aventures."[29] The French scholar was essentially right. In support of his interpretation, he cited the three following examples, in which the passive value of *restoré* is self-evident.[30] Thus Brun is called *li Restorés Tristrans* = 'Tristan *redivivus',* because of his qualities as a great lover.[31] In *Florence de Rome,* Milan, in a moment of anguish, cries

[28] *Mélanges ... Jean Frappier* (above, n. 10), p. 487.

[29] HLF (above, n. 2), p. 226.

[30] *Restore* presented semantic difficulties for scholars even before the verse *Galïen* was available to them. Thus, Auguste Scheler in his edition of Jean de le Mote, *Li Regret Guillaume* . . . (Louvain, 1882), explains the epithet in: "C'estoit. . . / Salemons li drois restorés" (vv. 1441-1442) as being a "… participe passif à sens actif, restaurateur" (p. 177). Gaston Paris in *Romania* (above, n. 4) criticizes Scheler's interpretation and declares that: "le poète a voulu dire: 'C'était exactement un nouveau Salomon, un Salomon *redivivus'* et il [=le poète] a pris *restoré* dans le sens qu'il a toujours" (p. 12). Stengel (p. 15) fully concurs with Paris on this point. Scheler further complicates the problem by insisting that *restoriés* in the following lines where the Souffisance addresses Guillaume Count of Hainaut: "Hé, gentieus fius, vous estiés tels: / Li boins restoriés Godefrois / Estiés …" (vv. 2813-2815), is an equivalent of *restoré* in v. 1442 as to the meaning, but not as to the form. For Scheler *restoriés* is *restorie(r)s,* a verbal substantive with a final *r* missing. Its meaning, like that of *restor (v.* 2058) is 'restorer' (p. 192). I read *restoriés* as a Picard variant of *restorés.* The allegorical Suffisance says that Guillaume is a "new Godefrois de Bouillon," Unfortunately, Scheler's interpretation of both *restorés* and *restoriés* found its way into Godefroy's dictionary (see *Gdf, 7,* p. 127). *FEW,* 10, p. 322 observes with reason that "Les formes *restorié* et *restoré* données *Gdf* paraissent mal assurées." Indeed, *Gdf* mentions *Galïen restoré* with the reference to *"Voy. de Charl. à Jerusalem,* p. 73, Koschwitz." A. J. Greimas, *Dictionnaire* (which we always consult, but seldom quote) makes the following erroneous entry: *"restoré,* adj. (déb. XII[e] s., Voy. Charl.). Qui est mis à la place de quelqu'un" (p. 561). But Godefroy did not refer to Koschwitz's edition of the *Pèlerinage* (where the epithet *restoré* does not occur), but to his *Sechs Bearbeitungen* (see above, n. 13). On p. 73 of this edition, *Galien restoré* is given in Koschwitz's own title of the passage taken from MS 1470. Ditto for *Galien rethoré* on p. 98.

[31] Brun *de la Montaigne,* éd. Paul Meyer, Société des anciens textes français (Paris. 1875), v. 1063; see also the in*cipit,* p. 1, where the hero is named "le petit Tristran le restoré." It is worth noting that Brun, like Galïen, received the name "le restor de Tristram" (v. 983) from a good fairy. *Restor* 'restoration' and by extension, 'thing, quality, person restored' was used throughout the chivalric literature as a synonym of *restoré.* A good example is Jean le Court, dit Brisebare, *Le Restor du Paon, e*d. Richard J. Carey, Textes littéraires

out: "Qui bien congnisteroit mon coer et mon penssé. / Appieller me devroit Judas le restoré: / J'é traÿ mon signeur, honny et verghondé."[32] Similarly, Tancrède, remorseful and desperate, exclaims: "Or me puet-on nommer Judas le restoré, / Quant j'ay souffiert tel mal et tel aviersité!".[33]

As I said before, Gaston Paris was, up to this point, essentially right. It should be noted, however, that the epithet *restore* was used, in its technical, chivalric acceptation, before the fourteenth century. *Florence de Rome* dates, in fact, from the beginning of the thirteenth. We also know that *restoré* does not necessarily have to modify a proper name. Thus, e.g., the young Guillaume, in Jean Renart's *L'Escoufle* (first half of the thirteenth century) is described as ". . . ses peres tous restorés."[34] Two facts are thus absolutely evident: 1. the epithet *restoré* was used since the beginning of the thirteenth century meaning *'redivivus'. 2.* In our poem and in the surviving prose texts, *restoré* means, however, 'the restorer'.

Gaston Paris tried to explain this semantic shift by the fact that in a continuation of *Galïen, Lohier et Mallart,* lost in French, but extant in German *(Loher und Maller),* our Galïen had a son also Galïen: "D'autres allusions dans le récit prouvent qu'il avait existé un roman sur ce Galien fils de Galien . . . et sur son fils Mallart. C'est lui qui avait reçu le nom de Galien le restoré, parce que son père semblait revivre en lui. Plus tard, le nom de Galien le restoré continua à être célèbre, mais le roman qui l'expliquait s'était perdu; l'auteur de la première de nos rédactions en prose l'appliqua à Galien fils d'Olivier, auquel il ne pouvait convenir, et il essaya

français (Genève, 1966), where *restor* means concretely 'remaking in precious metals of a peacock' (see vv. 1160-1163). But figuratively *restor* of the title stands also for: 1. 'restoration of the virtues associated with the vows of the Peacock', and 2., in a more literary sense, 'the continuation of Les *Voeux du paon'.*

[32]Ed. A. Wallensköld, Société des anciens textes français, I (Paris, 1909), vv. 1930-1932. Elsewhere in the poem, Florence in speaking to Milan explains the epithet *restoré:* " A Judas le felon vous[=Milon] doit on comparer" (v. 2415).

[33]*Chevalier au Cygne : . .,* éd. F. de Reiffenberg et M.A. Borgnet, 3 (Bruxelles, 1854), vv. 28097-28098.

[34] Ed. Franklin Sweetser, Textes littéraires français (Genève, 1974), v. 8325. See vv. 8140-8145 for the use of *li restors* in the same acceptation as *restorés.* In Gui *de Nanteuil* we find another example of the epithet used with a common noun: "Il a dreit s'il est fel car ce fu filz Ardré - / D'un encresimé (r. encrisrné) felon est li nons restoré" (éd. James R. McCormack, Textes littéraires français [Genève-Paris, 1970], vv. *V* 725-726). This lection is offered solely by manuscript *V (circa* 1350).

de l'expliquer de la façon maladroite que nous avons vue."[35] Whether the solution of the two Galïens proposed here by Paris is totally correct or not, he rightly insists on two points: 1. Outside of *Galïen, restoré* has always had a passive meaning of *'redivivus'.* 2. At the time of the recasting of *Galïen* the redactors of the verse, and before it, of at least least two prose versions (see above, n. 27) no longer understood the traditional acceptation of the epithet *restoré.* By then (middle of the fourteenth century) this term must have acquired a "learned," or a specialized meaning, or both. It was this fact which *permitted* the introduction of the *"explication maladroite,"* and the creation of a *"falsche Bedeutung,"* to use Stengel's term (p. 15).

We can elicit further evidence perhaps capable of explaining if not *the* cause, at least the circumstances in which the shift in meaning of *restore* could have taken place. First of all, I would like to propose "the two Richards theory." One, if not two, quite popular fourteenth-century *chanson(s)* belonging to the Second Crusade Cycle has (or have) a Richard the Restored. In *Baudouin de Sebourc,* we find a knight called *Ricars li restorés.* The context does not allow us to identify this person with any degree of certainty.[36] But in the continuation of *Baudouin,* i.e., in *Le Bâtard de Bouillon,* the often used appellation *Richars li Restoré(s)* is, thanks to an excellent modern critical edition, clearly explained. Here is the editor's definition of that hero: "Richard 'le restauré', frère de Richard de Chaumont, qui après la mort de celui-ci prend sa place dans les rangs des Croisés."[37] Although it is not immediately clear from the text, the knight who was to be called Richard the Restored was named Richard for the first time in v. 426,[38] *before* he officially received the sobriquet *le restoré* from

[35]*HLF* (above, n. 2). pp. 227-228. Stengel (p.15) criticized Paris's hypothesis.

[36]Li *Romans de Bauduin de Sebourc,* éd. [L.N. Boca], 2 (Valencienne, 1841), p. 415. This edition uses two manuscripts: one from the early fourteenth century, the other from the middle of the fifteenth. The epithet *li restorés* appears only in the latter. It is possible, therefore, that it is a late addition and that it refers to the original Richard, rather than to his "replacement," I hope that the new edition which is being readied by our *confrère,* Larry S. Crist, will clarify this point.

[37]Robert Francis Cook, Textes littéraires français (Genève-Paris, 1972), p. 320. See also pp. xv-xvi.

[38]The brother of Richard de Chaumont laments the death of the latter:

> "Ahi, Richart biau frere, con pour toi sui marris!
> Veschi le restorét, puis que tu es ochis."

King Baudouin de Bouillon. This formal naming takes place some twenty lines later, and, incidentally, it can serve as an outstanding example of the fourteenth-century use of this term:

> Dist li roys de Surie: "Corbarant, or vaés
> De chestui chevalier comment il ch'est portés:
> Richars estoit perdus, mais il est retrouvés.
> Chius chi doit avoir non Richars li Restorés."
> (vv.440-443)

And the poet comments: "Pour icheste achoison l'en fu li nons remés, / Richars li Restorés fu toudis apellés . . . (vv. 444-445). What is interesting for us here is that Richard No. 2 becomes Richard No. 1 *Restorés* (No. 1 being his deceased brother Richard de Chaumont). The homonymity of the *restored* and the *restorer* in this well-known story could have contributed to the general confusion between the active and passive sense of the dimly understood chivalric term *restoré.*[39] This confusion could have influenced, in turn, the explicit spelling out of the new "false meaning," the new definition of *restoré,* which is an exclusive characteristic of the surviving texts of *Galïen.*

The establishment of this new meaning could also have been influenced by analogy (in the linguistic sense) to the chivalric term *restorier* (noun), used by, e.g., Froissart in a clearly active sense: 'celui qui rétablit quelque chose', 'celui qui rétablit le droit', 'vengeur'.[40]

> Quant Bauduins l'entent, s'en geta .ij. souspirs,
> Aprés *Richart* s'en va …
> (vv. 423-426, emphasis mine)

The editor explains in the n. 10 v. 426 the use of the name Richart in that verse: "Il s'agit, bien entendu, de Richard le Restoré, et non de Richard de Chaumont." The editor furnishes other reasons to believe that in the traditional story, Richard le Restoré was called Richard even before the death of his brother: In the Turin redaction of *Le Bâtard de Bouillon* both brothers were baptized with the same name (see Cook's ed- pp. xxxvii-xxxviii).

[39]Such spellings as *rethoré* (in the Vérard text) or *Restoiré* (in *Le Bâtard de Bouillon, vv*. 877, 1668, 2047, 3000, 3345, 3543, 4215) suggest perhaps a semantic instability of the term.

[40]*Restoriers* is used by the widowed Countess Jeanne de Montfort in addressing her vassals: "Ha! seigneur, ne vous desconfortés mies, ne esbahissiés point. Messires que nous avons perdut [=her husband Jean de Montfort], ce n'estoit que ungs seuls homs. Veschi mon petit enfant, son fil, qui sera, s'il plaist à Dieu, ses restoriers, et qui vous fera encorres des biens assés . . ." *(Chroniques . . .,* éd. Kervyn de Lettenhove, 3 [Bruxelles, 1867], p. 422). This

The "two Galïens" and the "two Richards" theories, the semantic proximity of *restorier* (and, for that matter, the contamination with any other member of a semantically very rich family, such as *restorer* 'to restore', *restor* 'restoration', 'retorer', *restoremement* 'retoration', *restoreor* 'retorer'), and other still unknown circumstances could have caused, or could have been contributing factors in establishing our new meaning of *restoré.* The whole history of this semantic shift will probably never be known, chiefly because of the lack of intermediary texts between the *Roland* and the *Pèlerinage* on the one hand, and the *Galïen* in prose and in verse on the other. But our examination of the "false meaning" of *restoré* throws some light on the prehistory of our *chanson.* We have seen that Jules Horrent studied this prehistory in detail. According to the stemma that he proposes,[41] the common source for the *Galïen de Cheltenham* and the prose version contained in MS 1470 and in Vérard must go back to the hypothetical *Garin de Monglane rimé,* that is to say, to the second half of the thirteenth century. If we apply a purely textual critical approach and consider the lection "he shall be named Galïen *Restoré,* because he (will) restore(d) Charlemagne and his host," present in these three texts (see above, n. 27) as a common error, then the validity of Horrent's stemma becomes quite doubtful. It would push the confusion between the active and passive acceptation of *restore* back to the 1250-1300 epoch. This is most unlikely. That confusion, as I understand it, must have developed at least a hundred years later. We must, therefore, postulate a common ancestor of Cheltenham, 1470 and Vérard dating sometime *after* 1350. There are no traces of any confusion in the meaning of *restoré* before that period.[42]

To sum up: Before this hypothetical 1350 ancestor text, the name of

is the text of the First Redaction; the text of the Second (p. 423) is essentially the same. But in the Third Redaction, *ses restoriers* is replaced by *son hiretier et vostre signeur (Chroniques . . .*, éd. George T. Diller, Textes littéraires français [Genève, 1972], p. 502).

[41]La *Chanson de Roland* (see above, n. 13), p. 392.

[42]This might be the reason that Horrent, who refers to our hero at least once as *restaurateur* (p. 387), and who says that our "poème devient la geste du jeune homme qui 'restaure' toute sa famille" (pp. 404-405} does not really discuss the meaning of *restoré.* Neither do D. and B. Inadvertently, they introduce in their edition a slight onomastic confusion concerning two other protagonists. On p. xiv, they refer to Galïen's maternal uncle as Thierry. His name in the text is Thiebert (or Tibert). They also "converted" to Islam a Christian knight Burgualant, the champion of Thiebert and Henry, by referring to him as *émir* (p. xx), *sarrasin* (p.117) *and païen* (p. 162). Neither our text nor the prose versions permit such an attribution, which would go against the very concept of chivalric justice. Can a pagan be a champion in *the jugement de Dieu?*

Galïen *restoré* could very well have existed in its original meaning of 'Galïenne restored', 'the new Galïenne', 'Galïenne *rediviva'.* As we have seen, this meaning has left its clear, but sole, trace in v. 341, where the good fairy declares: "He shall be called Galïen and shall bear my name" (see above, n. 26). Sometime after 1350, during the times of chivalric reaction, during this "first medieval revival," such romance acceptation, such mingling of the fairy and heroic-epic-historical elements in a consciously *restored* world of Roncesvals as *Galïen* is, became untenable and a new explanation, a new meaning had to be invented. And what is of capital importance to us is this; Whatever the contributing factors of the loss of sharp semantic contours of the epithet, of homonymic heroes, or of the influence of analogy to *restorier,* the basic reason for interpreting *restoré* as *'celui qui retor(er)a'* lies in the overwhelmingly important fact that such a new, "false" meaning was consonant with the fundamental tenet of chivalric ideology of the Late Middle Ages.

The importance of the new meaning, which, of course, is the true meaning in *Galïen,* thus goes beyond the purely philological problem of this particular work. It is a clear testimony to the strong restoratory tendencies of chivalric civilization of the fourteenth and fifteenth century. The literary ideal was sought largely in the "re-creation," in the restoration of the great stories in the past. Is not our *Galïen* a pure expression of the conscious desire to re-create the "real" saga of Roncesvals in a new, but consciously restored, i.e. archaistic form? The matter appears even more important if we realize that so much of the post-1350 chivalric literature is not merely "literary." It expresses the aspirations of a class in search of a coherent ideology, which could hardly be found in the social and political realities of the epoch. It had to be sought in the mythic past, the past restored in the new literature. For the chivalric civilization of the Late Middle Ages, the restoration, or return to the pristine state of the past is the fundamental object of social and political *desires.* In this sense, that civilization was profoundly orthodox. For the orthodox, always and anywhere, for the recaster(s) and for the restorer(s) of *Galïen* — revolution is restora-

[43]This expression, which so aptly resumes the central tenet of the Late Medieval chivalric ideology, comes from G.K. Chesterton: "For the orthodox there can always be a revolution; for revolution is restoration. At any instant you may strike a blow for the perfection which no man has since Adam." *Orthodoxy* (New York and London, 1908), p. 203. For our text, instead of "Adam" read "Charlemagne," "Roland," or "Olivier."

tion.[43] And this is the most profound and the truest sense of the *falsche Bedeutung* of *Galïen Restoré.*

PETER F. DEMBOWSKI
University of Chicago