Susan E. Farrier

A Linguistic Dating of the Oxford *Chanson de Roland* and Stylistic Analysis of the Resultant Strata

Many scholars state as a truism that the Oxford *Chanson de Roland* was written some time around 1100, although far fewer would concur that the entire poem was the creation of a single poet. For quite some time, the main obstacle to dating the Oxford *Roland* has been that traditional methods of dating have yielded minimal results. The author(s) and redactor(s) of the poem have mentioned little or nothing about themselves. For example, the name "Turoldus," which appears in the last line of the poem, has been variously attributed to the poet, the author of the poet's source, the scribe, and the jongleur.[1] Place names in the *Roland* tend to be garbled if not completely unrecognizable, and consequently there is considerable diversity of opinion about how much such names can

[1] Those who claim that Turoldus was the poet include T. A. Jenkins, *La Chanson de Roland,* rev. ed. (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1924; rpt. Watkins Glen, N. Y.: American Life Foundation, 1977), note to verse 4002; and R. T. Holbrook, "Ci falt la geste que Turoldus declinet," *Modern Philology* 21 (1923/24): 155-64. For the view that T. was the author of the poet's source, see Pio Rajna, "Contributi alla storia dell' epopea e del romanzo medievale," *Romania* 14 (1885): 398-420; W. A. Nitze, "Turoldus, the author of the *Roland?" Modern Language Notes 69* (1954):88-92; and Herbert K. Stone "Decliner," *Modern Philology* 33 (1936): 337-50. The scholars who consider T. the scribe include Paul Aebischer, "Les derniers vers de la *Chanson de Roland"* in *Studia Philologica, Homenaje ofrecido a Dámaso Alonso por sus amigos y discipulos con ocasion de su 60o aniversario,* 2 vols. (Madrid: Gredos, 1960) 1: 11-33, rpt. in *Rolandiana et Oliveriana: Recueil d'études sur les chansons de geste,* Publications Romanes et Françaises 92 (Geneva: Droz, 1967): 191-210; and David Hult, "'Ci falt la geste': Scribal closure in the Oxford *Roland," Modern Language Notes* 97 (1982): 899-904. Those asserting that T. was a jongleur include Ferdinand Lot, Etudes sur les légendes épiques françaises; V: *La Chanson de Roland;* A propos d'un livre récent [Boissonnade, *Du Nouveau...*]*," Romania* 54 (1928): 357-80; and Pierre Le Gentil, *La Chanson de Roland,* 2nd ed., Connaissance des Lettres 43 (Paris: Hatier, 1967): 32-3. A rather innovative (if not wholly persuasive) idea is offered by Jean-Jacques Salverda de Grave, *Turoldus,* Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Deel 57, Ser. A. No. 1 (Amsterdam: Uitgave der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1924) [there is a French summary at the end], who suggests that T. was the artist who designed the pattern for the Baveux Tapestry (on which the name "Turoldus" does appear) and decliner" of the final verse is an error for "deliner."

help in dating the poem.[2] Characters in the poem have been drawn from several different time periods: Charlemagne, Ganelon, and Richard of Normandy lived in three different centuries.[3] Some version of the story may well date back to just after the historical battle in 778, but the problem lies in determining when the oral tradition began to give way to the written tradition.

In 1959, Robert A. Hall, Jr. proposed a method of dating the poem linguistically, a technique that was designed to separate the more archaic material in the poem from the more recent passages.[4] Alice M. Colby-Hall made significant additions to Hall's methodology (although she did not publish her work) and I have attempted to refine the method still further and examine the stylistic consistency of the various strata deduced from this method of dating.

While many linguistic features, such as syntax and deixis, change extremely slowly, pronunciation can sometimes change so rapidly that a historical phonologist can distinguish between the pronunciation of a particular phoneme in the early and late parts of a given century. Thus the linguistic dating of a poem such as the *Chanson de Roland* depends upon deducing the pronunciation of various diphthongs and monophthongs. One can only be sure (or relatively sure) about the way a diphthong or monophthong was pronounced if it happens to be the stressed vowel sound in a word appearing at the end of a poetic line. Presumably all of the lines in a laisse (or stanza) assonate with each other, which is to say that they contain monophthongs and/or diphthongs that are pronounced in the same way.

[2] See, for example, Prosper Boissonnade, *Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland: La genèse historique, le cadre géographique, le milieu, les personnages, la date, et l'auteur du poème* (Paris: Champion, 1923); Henri Grégoire, "*La Chanson de Roland* de l'an 1085; Baligant et Califerne ou l'étymologie du mot *Californie," Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique (Classe des Lettres)* 5th ser., 25 (1939): 211-75; and Henri Grégoire and Raoul de Keyser, *"La Chanson de Roland et Byzance," Byzantion* 14 (1939): 265-316.

[3] See, for example, Joseph Bédier, *Les Légendes épiques,* 3rd ed., 5 vols., (Paris: Champion, 1926) 3: 281.

[4] Robert A. Hall, Jr., "Linguistic Strata in the *Chanson de Roland," Romance Philology* 13 (1959/60): 156-61.

After discovering the Latin word from which the Old French is derived,[5] the analyst determines the stage of development which the stressed vowel in the French word must have attained in order to assonate properly with the stressed vowels of all of the other words appearing at the assonance in the laisse. (Hence linguistic analysis of this sort reveals the dialect of the poet, not that of the scribe.) This process provides a rough date of composition for the laisse in question. One assumes, of course, that the Old French poets are competent, so all apparent irregularities of assonance provide some information about the dialects of the various poets who contributed to the poem as preserved in the Oxford text. This is not to deny the existence of error. There are, in fact, 17 laisses that must be described as somewhat sloppy (although only 5 offer serious problems), and they will be discussed on p. 18-19. However, it seems most appropriate to use the argument of poetic carelessness as a last resort rather than as a first principle. One also assumes that if the lines in a laisse assonate with each other only in the dialect of the last redactor, the laisse represents the last redactor's conception of character, theme, and plot—whether he has added the entire laisse or merely inserted several lines that create an assonance which would not be possible in the dialect of an earlier poet.

Since the method of dating described here demands that each laisse be viewed as a complete unit, one must establish certain criteria for determining where each laisse begins and ends. Obviously a new assonance signals the beginning of a new laisse, and yet the diversity of laisse division among several standard editions of the Oxford poem (e.g. those by Gerard Brault, William Calin, T. A. Jenkins, and F. Whitehead) indicates that other factors must be taken into account. The most important of these other factors is the frequent appearance of the letters AOI in the margin of the manuscript at or near the end of approximately 60% of the laisses. Whatever the meaning of these letters may be (and several

[5] Almost all Old French nouns are derived from the accusative Latin forms (minus the final *-m*); therefore a Latin nominative will only be given when it is clearly the base form—as in the Old French *nies* (nom.) < *nepos* [cf. O. F. *nevot* (acc.) < *nepote]*. Old French verb forms will be paired with the corresponding Latin verb forms, except where the French form is analogical (a situation which will be noted whenever it arises).

intriguing explanations have been put forth[6]), they seem to mark some sort of dramatic pause in the story. Such is the opinion of Grace Frank, who points out that they occur when there is a change of scene, speaker, etc.[7] Thus it seems reasonable to assume that a new laisse begins after such a pause. The editor who comes closest to numbering the laisses in this way is Frederick Whitehead, whose edition was the primary text for this study.[8]

The method of linguistic dating used in this study can provide a relative dating for about 54% of the laisses (and verses) in the Oxford *Chanson de Roland,* but it cannot accurately specify when each stratum of the poem was written. Many historical phonologists have contended that various phonetic changes took place in the late eleventh or early twelfth century. Yet they often seem to have arrived at that date by noting whether or not the change had taken place by the time of the "composition" of the Oxford *Roland.*[9] They clearly accept the traditional notion that the poem was written around 1100, and they have not always observed that the *Roland* itself is not wholly consistent. In this study the laisses of the *Roland* will be compared to other literary texts that have been dated with slightly more certainty; in this way I hope to arrive at general dates for the composition of the various strata of the poem. Even if the later two strata are distinguished more by dialect than by time of composition, the method of dating described in this paper and the

[6] Numerous articles have been written about the possible meaning of these letters. A random sampling includes Frances and Cornelius Crowley, "Le problème de l'étymologie de AOI dans la *Chanson de Roland," Cahiers de Civilisation Médéviale* 3 (1960): 12-13; Ramón Menéndez Pidal, "El AOI del manuscrito Rolandiano de Oxford," *Revista de Filologia Española* 46 (1963): 173-77; and Nathan Love, "AOI in the *Chanson de Roland:* A Divergent Hypothesis," *Olifant 10* (1984-85): 182-87.

[7] Grace Frank, "AOI in the *Chanson de Roland," PMLA* 48 (1933): 629-35.

[8] *La Chanson de Roland,* Ed. F[rederick] Whitehead (Oxford: Blackwell, 1942).

[9] E. and J. Bourciez, *Phonétique française,* Tradition de l'Humanisme 3 (Paris: Klincksieck, 1967) § 38, "Historique"; Albert Dauzat, *Histoire de la langue française* (Paris: Payot, 1930) § 82; and H. Meyer Lübke, *Historische französische Grammatik I, Laut- und Flexionslehre* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1908) § 90.

stylistic analysis of resultant portions of text should demonstrate that the various strata are linguistically and stylistically distinct.

Robert A. Hall, Jr., in his article "Linguistic Strata in the *Chanson de Roland,"* has made two particularly important observations about inconsistencies in the assonances of the Oxford *Roland:* one concerns the pronunciation of a diphthong and one involves the change in the sound of certain nasalized vowels. Hall's observations led him to believe that the Oxford text of the *Chanson de Roland* contains material written in two distinct time periods—generally speaking, the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Alice Colby-Hall has suggested that there also appear to be traces of an even earlier stratum of the poem, perhaps dating from the late tenth century.[10] I have developed several other ways of separating older from newer material, and three of them affect enough laisses to merit discussion even in this brief presentation. My findings corroborate the linguistic assertions of Hall and Colby-Hall, although my conclusions about the stylistic features of each stratum will be different since they are based on analyses of different portions of the text.

Hall has remarked that the diphthong *ai* (< A + palatal[11]) assonates with two different sounds in the Oxford *Roland.* In 18 laisses it assonates with *a (* < free or blocked stressed A) whereas in 17 other laisses it assonates with *e (* < blocked stressed short E).

[10] Prof. Hall's article is cited in note 4, above. Prof. Colby-Hall has not published her findings, but they have been briefly summarized in John Robin Allen's "Stylistic Variants in the *Roland" Olifant* 6 (1979): 351-63, and her methods will be explained in detail in this paper. Prof. Allen's paper is a computerized comparison of lexical and syntactic features in the Baligant episode and the rest of the poem. Allen admits that his results are somewhat less conclusive than he would like. It may be that any two arbitrarily defined sections of text will appear to be slightly different if the right kind of tests are run. Allen suggests running his tests on the Hall/Colby-Hall strata (p. 363), so he may be willing to test the strata determined by an extension of their method. If he does so, it will be interesting to see if philological and syntactic/lexical analyses of the strata of the Oxford *Roland* are mutually corroborative.

[11] An intervocalic nasal following the *a* can produce the same effect, as in *laine* < *lana* and *claime* < *clama* (Bourciez, § 43).

The *a/ai* assonance/rhyme can be found in several tenth and eleventh-century texts[12]:

Judeu l'acusent, el se tais, [< tacet]
ad un respondre non denat. [< de-negavit]
(Passion de Jhesu Christ, st. 54)

et sancz L[ethgiers] nes soth mesfait [< mis-factu]
cum vit les meis, a lui ralat. [< re-ambulat]
(Vie de Saint Léger, st. 15)

Alquant i chantent, li pluisour getent lairmes [< lachryma][13]
Ja le lour vuel de lui ne desevrassent [< (VL) *deseperassent
< (CL) de-separavissent]
(Vie de Saint Alexis, st. 117)

Thus laisse 60 of the *Roland* is an older laisse:

60 rereguarde < retro + (gmc) warda[14]

[12] Both tenth-century texts have been edited by Gaston Paris; the "St. Léger" appears in *Romania* 1 (1872): 303-17 and the "Passion" in *Romania 2* (1873): 295-314. The text of the "St. Léger" is preceded (pp. 273-302) by a lengthy discussion of the language of the manuscript containing both poems. Facsimiles of the two poems can be found in *Les plus anciens monuments de la langue française (IXe, Xe siècle),* "Album," ed. with commentary by G. Paris (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1875). For the eleventh-century text, see *La Vie de Saint Alexis,* ed. Christopher Storey, Textes Littéraires Français 148 (Geneva: Droz, 1968).

[13] This form shows the natural development of the vowel. The modern form "larmes" was remade in the twelfth century to conform to the Latin more closely. See Albert Dauzat, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française,* 10th ed. (Paris: Larousse, 1938) 430; A. J. Greimas, *Dictionnaire de l'ancien français jusqu'au milieu du XIVe siècle* (Paris: Larousse, 1980) 362.

[14] Some of the Latin and Germanic roots are from Walter von Wartburg's *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Basel: Zbinden Druck, 1928-67); vols. 1-14 give mostly Latin roots; vols. 15-17 give Germanic roots; vol. 18 gives English roots; vol. 19 gives eastern roots (e. g. Arabic); vol. 20 gives roots from a variety of languages (Breton, Basque, Magyar, etc.) Other forms are drawn from T. A. Jenkins glossary in his edition of the *Chanson de Roland.* A few are from Charles du Fresne Du Cange's *Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis,* 10 vols., edition supplemented by D. P. Carpenter (Niort: Le Fabre, 1887); E. and J. Bourciez's *Phonétique française;* or M. K. Pope's *From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman,* Publications of the University of Manchester 229, French Series 6 (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1934;

parastre	<	patrastru
aire	<	area
place	<	plattia (VL)
Carle	<	Carolu

Since there is no reason to assume this laisse is extremely archaic, it has been considered an eleventh-century laisse. The *e/ai* assonance, on the other hand, is found in twelfth-century texts[15]:

"A!" dist G[ormund], "si vait de guerre [< (gmc) werra]
le guerredon vus en dei faire." [< facere]
(Gormond et Isembard, vv. 247-48)

Ainz qu'il l'eüst a ses amors atrete [=atraite < ad-tracta]
En ot por voir mainte paine sofferte, [< *sufferitu < (CL) sublatu]
Maint jor jeune et veille mainte vespre.[< vespera]
(La Prise d'Orange, vv. 36-38)

Thus it seems quite likely that laisse 100 was composed in the twelfth century:

100	Burdele	<	Burdigala
	resne	<	*retina (VL)
	Valterne	<	Valterra(?)
	escantelet	<	ex-canth-ell-at
	ventaille	<	ventaculu
	furceles	<	furcilla
	sele	<	sella
	perdre	<	perdere

It is also worth noting at this point that the word *ventaille* at the assonance with *e's* indicates that the last redactor had a northern or Anglo-Norman accent. Pierre Fouché asserts that in northern dialects all *ai* diphthongs, without exception, progressed from [ai]

rpt. 1952 with minor corrections). Analogical verb forms are from Pope and from Alfred Ewert's *The French Language* (London: Faber, 1943).

[15] *Gormont et Isembart,* ed. Alfonse Bayot, 3rd ed., Les Classiques Français du Moyen Age 14 (Paris: Champion, 1931); *La Prise d'Orange* [AB redaction], ed., Claude Régnier, 5th ed., Bibliothèque Française et Romane, Series B, No. 5 (Paris: Klincksieck, 1977).

to [ęi] and then to [ę].[16] In Francian, however, the word *ventaille* retained its archaic diphthong pronunciation (as current French pronunciation shows). This word does assonate with *a's* in middle-stratum laisse 255, thus distinguishing the pronunciation of the last two redactors.

Many scholars have noticed that in the assonances of the Oxford *Roland, an* and *en* are sometimes mixed indiscriminately while at other times they appear to be kept separate. Few scholars do more than describe this anomaly. Hall, however, explains it as follows: the mixing of the two sounds seems to indicate a shared pronunciation of [ãn], while separating *an* and *en,* or mixing *an* with *ain* and *en* with *ein,* suggests that *en* was pronounced [ẽn], a more archaic pronunciation.[17] Some rather long laisses do not mix *an* and *en* at the assonance whereas some very short laisses do. Therefore, it seems highly likely that laisses 268 and 266 were composed earlier than laisse 203:

268			266			
	angle	< angelu		purpenses	<	pro-pensas
	dutance	< dubit-antia		repentes	<	re-poenitas
	remembrance	< re-memor-antia		escïent[r]e	<	scienter
	France	< Francia		calenges	<	calumnia (anomalous)[18]
	reflambent	< re-flammulant				
	espandre	< expandere		rendre	<	rendere (VL) [reddere (CL)]
	blanche	< (gmc)blank + a				
	recuvrance	< recuper-antia		orïente	<	oriente
	reconuisance	< re-cognosc-antia		sembl[et]	<	simulat
	Neimes	< (gmc) Nam + o from acc. -one? (scribal *ei)*		apresentet	<	ad-præsentat
				sempres	<	semper
				omnipotente	<	[a Latinism]
	magnes	< magnu		cumences	<	cum-initias
	remainent	< remanent		ceintes	<	cincta
	demandent	< demandant				

[16] Pierre Fouché, *Phonétique historique du français.* Vol. II: *Les Voyelles* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1956) 346.

[17] Hall 157-58. On the lowering from [ẽn] to [ãn], see, for example, Pope, §§ 434 and 438. The only exception to this rule is that *e's* followed by palatalized nasals did not lower (Ewert, p. 40); such *e's* do not occur at the assonance in the Oxford *Roland.*

[18] Other romance languages preserve learned versions of this word; there may have been competing forms in the proto-language. See Frederick B. Agard, *A Course in Romance Linguistics, Vol. 2: A Diachronic View* (Washington, D. C., 1984) 26.

203	descent	<	descendit
	puignant	<	pung- + -ante
	devant	<	de-ab-ante
	escriant	<	ex-quiritant
	Franc	<	(gmc) Frank

It is impossible to determine when a laisse is so short that the failure to mix *an* and *en* is merely coincidental; therefore, all laisses that do not mix the two sounds have been considered eleventh-century laisses while those that contain both *an* and *en* at the assonance have been treated as twelfth century laisses.

Surprisingly enough, there are even laisses in which a's or *e's* followed by oral consonants appear at the assonance with a's or *e's* followed by nasal consonants. Such laisses have traditionally been emended by editors who assumed that the unexpected assonances were errors. For example, T. A. Jenkins emends certain lines in laisse 46 of his edition of the Oxford text. In a note, he explains how he has filled in the lacuna at the end of line 604, but he does not even mention that he has "repaired" line 605 so that it ends with "entresait" rather than "Rollant." Yet *a* and *en* or *e* and *en* do sometimes assonate in the tenth-century Clermont *Passion de Jhesu Christ:*

De quant il querent le forsfait [< foris-facit]
cum il Jhesum oicisesant [< ?—F. Diez reads here "occi fesant"
< (GR) *faciante]
(Passion, st. 44)

non fut partiz sos vestimenz; [< vestimentu]
zo fu granz signa tot per ver [< veru]
(Passion, st. 68)

M. K. Pope asserts that the nasalization of *a* and *e* took place in the tenth century and cites examples from the *Passion* to prove her point.[19] Since this kind of assonance is acceptable at an early stage of Old French poetry, Alice Colby-Hall has suggested that the laisses in the *Roland* which mix *a's* and *e's* followed by both oral and nasal consonants are traces of a very early version of the poem

[19] Pope, § 434.

composed before the nasalization of *a* and *e*. Thus a laisse such as 46 is considered extremely archaic:

46	[lacuna]	<	_____[20]
	[lacuna]	<	_____
	Rollant	<	(gmc) Hruodland[21]
	plaist	<	placuit
	Murgleis	<	? [scribal *ei;* cf. Neimes]
	forsfait	<	foris-facit

In laisse 263, *en* is found assonating with *ei*, although in most of the poem the *ei* diphthong assonates only with itself and is therefore undatable (except under the circumstances described on pp. 17-18):

263	reis	<	rege
	Daneis	<	Daniscu
	teneit	<	tenebat
	espleit	<	[postverbal noun from espleitier < explicitare]
	sei	<	se
	cadeir	<	cadere
	remaneir	<	remanere
	aperceit	<	ad-percipit
	dreit	<	directu
	•C- = cent	<	centu
	parenz	<	parente
	aidereiz	<	adjutare-habetis
	demandereiz	<	demandare-habetis

[20] The lacunae have been filled in by a later hand, a scribal revisor who apparently knew or cared very little about poetry. The insertions, "il plus" and "nest seuu,s" are rejected by almost all editors. Jenkins accepts for line 603 the emendation "mais" [< magis] without noting it.

[21] Since the name "Rollant" assonates with oral *a*'s, this laisse is assumed to be extremely early material. Under normal circumstances, names do not provide sufficient evidence for assigning a laisse to an early stratum, since they can be pronounced archaically. However, there are seventeen laisses that demonstrate that both the eleventh- and twelfth-century redactors pronounced the name with a nasalized vowel: six middle-stratum laisses (24,116, 165,180,219, and 233) and eleven late-stratum laisses (22, 30, 47, 63, 85, 111, 125, 134, 138, 184, and 229).

There are, in fact, no fewer than 12 laisses that resemble laisse 46 or laisse 263, and these laisses have been assigned to the most archaic stratum of the poem.

While *a*'s and *e's* nasalized very early in the development of Old French, *o's* nasalized quite a bit later. Yet it is clear that by some time in the twelfth century poets did not feel that *o's* followed by oral consonants could assonate with *o's* followed by nasal consonants. The *Couronnement de Louis,* like the Oxford *Roland,* contains some irregularities of assonance that may suggest the pronunciation of more than one time period or dialect; however, one of its laisses (no. 26) contains 108 lines, all of which end with a nasalized o.[22] (There are also two other laisses that assonate exclusively in nasalized *o's*—nos. 43 and 52.) The laisses of the *Chanson de Roland* are decidedly shorter, but one can clearly detect a similar attempt to isolate nasalized o's from oral *o's.* There are nine laisses that assonate exclusively in nasal *o.* There are also two laisses (66 and 112) that assonate exclusively in a phoneme derived from free stressed long O and short U.[23] On the other hand, there are many laisses that assonate in a variety of *o* sounds: *o's* followed by nasal consonants, *o's* from free stressed long O and short U, and close *o's (*< blocked stressed long O and short U). Early texts in Old French, such as the Clermont *Passion* and the *Vie de Saint Alexis,* mix these sounds indiscriminately at the assonance:

de Jhesu Christi passion [< passione]
am se paierent a ciel jorn [< diurnu]
(Passion, st. 52)

Li apostolie e li empereör [< imperatore]
Venent devant, jetent s'an ureisuns [< orationes]
(Alexis, st. 72)

Therefore, laisses such as 178, which mix the three sounds at the assonance, have been considered eleventh-century laisses, whereas

[22] *Le Couronnement de Louis, e*d. E[rnest] Langlois, 2nd ed., Les Classiques Français du Moyen Age 22 (Paris: Champion, 1925).

[23] Possibly a diphthong simplified in the northern dialect of the last redactor; this sound developed in Francian to become [œ] as in the modern pronunciation of "empereur." In tables I and II it is listed as *ou.*

those that contain exclusively nasalized *o*'s (such as 29) or only words containing the phoneme from free stressed long O or short U (such as 66) have been considered more recent laisses.

178	barun	<	(gmc) baro	29	home	<	homine
	plurt	<	ploret		cunte	<	comite
	nevolz	<	nepote[24]		dunent	<	donant
	seignurs	<	seniore		confundent	<	confundent
	plusur	<	plus + -ore (?)		hunte	<	(gmc) haunitha
	proz	<	prode		umbre	<	umbra
	empereür	<	imperatore		brunie	<	(gmc) brunnja
	nus	<	nos		Carcasonie	<	Carcas-onia (?)
	puldrus	<	pulver-osu		pume	<	poma
	paienur	<	paganoru		uncle	<	avuncula
	dulor	<	dolore		curunes	<	corona
	luinz	<	longe + s		abandunet	<	ad+ bandon
	honur	<	honore				[(gmc) bann + -onc]
	flur	<	flore		avriumes	<	habere-habamus
	Otun	<	(gmc) Otto + -one				[with anal. 1st
	Milun	<	(gmc) Milon				plur. ending]
	munz	<	monte				
	sunt	<	sunt	66	tenebrus	<	tenebrosu
	lion	<	leone		merveillus	<	meribili-osu (VL)
	garçun	<	warcione (LL)		dulur	<	dolore
			[(gmc) wrakia]		rimur	<	rumore
	hom	<	homine		majur	<	*major[e]
	revengum	<	revindicamus		seignur	<	seniore
	amur	<	amore		honurs	<	honore
	ferum	<	fer- + anal.		oixurs	<	uxore
			1st plur. ending		plurt	<	ploret
	lur	<	[il]loru		anguissus	<	angusti-osu
					nevold	<	nepote

Another significant irregularity in the Oxford text concerns the diphthong *ie (*< free stressed short E [feru > fier] or palatal + A [cane > chien]). This phoneme generally assonates only with itself in the *Roland*—and in Old French poetry as a whole—but at times it appears at the assonance with one particular kind of *e,* the one derived from free stressed A. Joseph Bédier claims to have studied all 880 poetic lines in which the apparently anomalous *ie/e* assonance does or can occur (there are actually 918 verses in such laisses); Bédier finds only 20 verses in which the "false" assonance

[24] The vocalization of preconsonantal t led to the use of the digrapheme *ol* in preconsonantal position to represent Anglo-Norman [u]. (See M. K. Pope, § 1228).

actually occurs.[25] It is true that an extremely large percentage of the irregular-looking assonances are actually errors made by the scribe, in whose dialect the two sounds were evidently indistinguishable. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to ignore the 20 exceptions. These 20 examples of the *ie/e* assonance call into question 15 separate laisses.

Bédier essentially explains how the various "false" assonances can be emended by the editor, generally either by transposing words in the line or by using a line from one of the other manuscripts containing versions of the poem. It should be noted, though, that not all scholars agree on the relationship between the Oxford text and the other texts, all of which employ rhyme rather than assonance (except for the Venice IV manuscript, which is only partially rhymed). Bédier's "corrections" do solve an editorial problem, but there seems to be a simpler explanation, one that accounts for all 20 lines. That explanation is simply that the last redactor does, in fact, consider the *ie/e* assonance acceptable.

Specialists in diachronic romance linguistics, such as Kristoffer Nyrop and Mildred K. Pope, point out that before the twelfth century, *ie* was a descending diphthong, that is, it was stressed on the first element [iẹ].[26] Therefore, the diphthong *ie* does not assonate or rhyme with the monophthong *e* in eleventh-century texts. A stanza from the Clermont *Passion de Jhesu Christ* (which appears to rhyme ABAB, as do several stanzas) confirms that such diphthongs had initial stress:

Anz que la noit lo jalz cantes, [< cantat]
terce vez Petre lo neiet [< negat]
Jhesus li bons lo reswardet [< (gmc) ra-wardo + at]
lui recognostr[e] et semper fit. [< fecit] *(Passion,* st. 49)

This descending diphthong ought, in theory, to assonate (as well as rhyme) with *i* and appears to do so in laisse 64 of the ***Roland:***

[25] Joseph Bédier. "Les Assonances en *-e* et *-ie* dans la *Chanson de Roland: Romania* 47 (1921): 465-80.

[26] Kristoffer Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française,* Vol. I. Rev. Pierre Laurent, 4th éd. (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1935), § 166, "Remarque"; Pope, § 510.

64	destrer	<	destrariu (VL)
	Oliver	<	Olivariu
	Gerers	<	(gmc) Garhari
	Berenger	<	(gmc) Beringari
	fiers	<	feru (VL)
	veillz	<	veclu (VL) < vetulu (CL)
	Gaifiers	<	(gmc) Waifari
	chef	<	capu (VL)
	Gualters	<	(gmc) Walthari
—>	faillir	<	fallire
	chevalers	<	caballariu[27]

Some of the laisses that assonate exclusively in *ie* may contain the earlier, descending form of the diphthong—[iẹ]—but there is no reason to assume that they do. Therefore, such laisses have been considered undatable.

At some point in the twelfth century, the stress on this diphthong appears to have shifted to the second element, thus producing [iẹ] and then [jẹ]. This sound ultimately went on to become a more open sound, [jẹ]. In the *Roland,* however, *ie* is never mixed with *e's* that come from Latin blocked stressed short E, long E, or short I; the diphthong *ie* only assonates with the *e's* derived from Latin free stressed A—those *e's* which, in the twelfth century, are distinguished from other *e's* by closure during articulation, and possibly by length as well.[28] Therefore the pronunciation of this diphthong has not passed from [jẹ] to [jẹ] in the dialect of the last redactor.

Some diphthongs quite commonly assonate with monophthongs that are the same as the stressed element of the diphthong; for example *ai,* as mentioned above, often assonates with *a's* in eleventh century texts. Laisse 160 demonstrates the last redactor's occasional use of the *ie/e* assonance:

[27] This laisse is the *only* example of such an assonance in the *Roland* itself, but the *ie/i* pairing is certainly not unique in Old French poetry. For this reason laisse 64 has been considered a normal eleventh century laisse; there is no reason to suppose that it is part of the tenth-century stratum.

[28] Pope, § 233.

160	nez	<	natu
	ajumét	<	ad-diurnatu
	pers	<	pare
	ber	<	(gmc) baro
	clers	<	claru
	escrier	<	ex-quiritare
	fiertét	<	feritate (VL)
	carnel	<	carnale
	ester	<	stare [N.B. not CL esse > VL essere > OF estre]
	asez	<	ad satis
	enpennez	<	*in-pinnatu (?)
	estroët	<	[verb from OF tro < VL traugu]
—>	desmailét	<	dis-macul-atu [Francien desmaillét]
	adesét	<	addensatu
	nafrét	<	naufragatu (?)
—>	laissét	<	laxatu [Francien laissiét]
—>	pied	<	pede

It may be objected that the poet cannot be responsible for the *ie/e* assonances since they are never mixed as thoroughly as other pairs, such as *an/en*. However, if the Anglo-Norman and western dialects were the only ones in which such as assonance would be considered acceptable, then the redactor may merely have been attempting to preserve an overall distinction between *e* and *ie* in order to conform to standard, and hence high-register, speech patterns.

There is one more peculiarity of assonance that deserves to be mentioned in this paper; it has both a phonological and a morphological component. There are several verbs that seem to have two different endings for the second person plural future, an archaic form and a modern analogical form. The verbs in this category are as follows:

avreiz [6, 43, 256]	vs.	avrez [36, 54]
ireiz [6]	vs.	irez [5]
portereiz [6, 197]	vs.	porterez [5]
verreiz [43, 278, 282 (revereiz)]	vs.	verrez [54]

According to M. K. Pope, the etymologically normal *-eiz* forms (the natural reduction of Latin -HABETIS with its long E) were all analogically remade to conform to what had become the more common pattern of *-ez* in the second person plural (from the more common Latin -ATIS ending). She contends that the change takes place early in the twelfth century. Her source for the remade forms is the *Chanson de Roland* itself.[29] Both laisses 9 and 36 contain these remade forms *(ferez* and *avrez,* respectively) and also contain *ie/e* assonances. Thus these two somewhat unusual methods of dating laisses seem to be mutually corroborative. Furthermore, the older *-eiz* form is found in laisse 263, which has been considered archaic because both *ei* and *en* are found at the assonance. For these phonological and morphological reasons, all laisses containing *-eiz* futures have been assigned to the eleventh-century stratum (except for laisse 263, assigned to the tenth); all laisses containing *-ez* futures have been assigned to the twelfth-century stratum. Table I shows the laisses assigned to various strata, while Table II categorizes the laisses by assonance.

There are 17 laisses that pose unusual problems and, for that reason, have not been dated, despite their use of a datable assonance. Five of them [42, 76, 91, 243, and 297] fit the same pattern: they assonate in *an/en,* but also contain one *ain* (and four times out of five the anomalous word is "cumpainz;" laisse 297 actually contains *ain* three times but two are place names, which I have not generally used as a basis for dating). These laisses appear to be twelfth-century redactions of eleventh-century laisses:

76	Esturganz	<	Astorga + -ns (?)
	cumpainz	<	companione (VL)
	suduiant	<	subtus-duc-ante
	avant	<	ab-ante
	passant	<	passante [postnominal verb from CL
	gent	<	gente
	comandement	<	command-amentu
	Rollant	<	(gmc) Hruodland
	guarant	<	(gmc) warjand
	trenchant	<	truncante
	sanc	<	sangue (VL) < sanguine (CL)

[29] Pope, § 967.

dolent	<	dolente (VL)
veirement	<	vera-mente

Another six laisses [86, 168, 199, 202, 228, and 285] can be interpreted as twelfth-century redactions of tenth-century laisses (assonating, for example, in *ain/ai/e,* as 168 does). Laisse 281 assonates in *en,* but contains the word "calunge." The problem may be merely scribal, since laisse 266 also assonates in *en* and contains the word "calenge," which is also in line with the modern form of the word. It should be noted, however, that Latin "calumnia" should not generate a French word with an e as the stressed vowel. Laisses 172, 205, 217, 274, and 288 pose unique problems that require long explanations better left for a discussion in greater depth. Here it will suffice to say that there is no way to avoid describing their irregularities of assonance as errors.

Now that various methods for dating laisses have been examined, all that remains is to summarize the stylistic distinctions among the strata themselves. The first observation that must be made is that all major characters and events appear in all three strata.[30] Therefore the so-called Baligant episode, while clearly added to the story later (since Charlemagne did not, in fact, take revenge for the ambush of the rear-guard), was nevertheless a part of the *Chanson de Roland* as early as the late tenth century. The emir Baligant is mentioned by name in the archaic laisse 263. On the other hand, the scene that some scholars call the Blancandrin episode, the Saracen plan to deceive Charlemagne, cannot be shown to have existed so early. Two middle stratum laisses speak of Marsile's council [2 and 6] and two of the last redactor's laisses

[30] In tenth-century laisses, Ganelon swears to the treason on the relics of his sword [46]; Charles tells Naimon about a dream foreshadowing Ganelon's treason [67]; the odd-looking Saracen Chernuble makes his boast [78]; Oliver berates Roland for refusing to call for reinforcements and Roland responds that he curses cowardly hearts [87]; the French peer Gerier impales a Saracen in battle and Oliver remarks that things are going well for the French [97]; the tide of battle turns and Charles tries in vain to arrive in time to help the rearguard [139]; Marsile sends envoys to Baligant [198]; Charlemagne eulogizes his dead nephew [209]; Charles and Naimon put together an army to fight the emir [221]; Charles sees the emir and the Saracen army, and encourages his own men by scorning the pagan gods [245]; Charles, Naimon, Ogier, and Geoffrey fight so furiously that Baligant begins to wonder if he is wrong and Charlemagne is right [263]; and Thierry defeats Pinabel in the trial by combat, thus ensuring that Ganelon and all of his relatives will be executed [294].

elaborate on Blancandrin's advice to Marsile and offer to Charlemagne [4 and 5]. The other laisses in the so-called Blancandrin episode cannot be dated.

The earliest stratum is too fragmentary to yield much stylistic information—with one remarkable exception that will be discussed below. The twelfth-century redactor was clearly more interested in character portrayal than were his predecessors, and he handled religious issues and dream imagery in a novel manner. Both Ganelon and Roland are rather simply motivated in the middle stratum, while in the twelfth-century material they become much more complex characters.

The eleventh-century redactor's Ganelon stubbornly pursues revenge in his taciturn way. When Marsile warns him not to renege on his promise, Ganelon merely responds that he has lingered too long and must be on his way [52]. Similarly, when Charlemagne claims that he has heard Roland's horn, Ganelon retorts that he would call it a lie if anyone else had said it [133]. When Duke Naimon suggests that Ganelon is a traitor, the accused makes no response at all [135]. Ganelon does not appear to be particularly clever; he is merely an agent of Fate. His step-son is equally uncomplicated in the eleventh-century stratum. Roland shows little or no concern for the feelings of others. He ridicules his step-father Ganelon rather tactlessly [60]. Sometimes he even treats his friend Oliver quite rudely, as when he derides him for having killed three men with a spearshaft and Oliver has to explain the fairly obvious fact that he has not had time to draw his sword [106]. Roland is a man of war and has little respect for anyone who does not relish a fierce battle. He is instinctively correct in mistrusting Marsile and in assuming that his own French rearguard can defeat a Saracen force five times its size; nevertheless, he shows poor judgment in presuming that his men will be able to withstand a second onslaught. In short, Roland does not understand anyone who does not possess the qualities he himself has (love of battle, inexhaustible energy, etc.).

The twelfth-century redactor embellishes both of these characters. Ganelon acquires certain humane characteristics. He concerns himself with his family and retainers before leaving for Saragossa. He refuses to allow loyal followers to accompany him on a dangerous mission and he encourages his men to accept his son

Baldwin as their leader [27]. The last redactor's Ganelon is also an excellent manipulator. He knows how to play on the emotions of others and he is rarely at a loss for words. He carefully hints to Blancandrin, on the way to Saragossa, that he is willing to strike a bargain [28]. He later enrages Marsile and directs that anger towards Roland [33]. The narrator states in both cases that Ganelon had planned his words in advance. The last redactor's Ganelon also tells Charlemagne an elaborate story to explain the absence of Marsile's uncle among the hostages, and the narrator states that the traitor speaks with great cunning [54]. Only once is Ganelon unable to say the right thing, and his failure is understandable since Roland's sounding of the olifant has threatened to destroy a carefully laid plan. Ganelon does not yet realize that Charlemagne will arrive too late to help the French rearguard, so he begins to say anything that comes into his head—that Charlemagne is senile, that Roland disobeys orders, that Roland would blow his olifant for a hare, and that Roland is showing off for his peers [134]. The pressure of the moment seems to have robbed Ganelon of his ability to weave a reasonable, connected narrative. Needless to say, no one is convinced this time.

Roland, too, acquires a greater depth of character at the hands of the redactor of the twelfth-century version of the poem. The last poet emphasizes Roland's invincibility, but also endows the hero with a sensitivity that may seem a bit surprising in such a bloodthirsty fighter. Roland ministers to the dying archbishop with great tenderness [161]; and when Turpin dies, Roland feels the loss not only of a fellow warrior (as in the eleventh-century material), but also of a great spiritual leader and winner of souls [167]. Roland also acquires a greater religious significance in the twelfth-century material. This change is part of a larger issue—the two redactors' treatment of religious issues.

The two redactors concur in suggesting that the pagans are in league with devils. In the middle stratum, the Saracen Abisme fights with a shield given to him by a devil [115], and Marsile yields his soul to the demons when he dies [270]. In the latest stratum, Turpin fights a pagan sorcerer named Siglorel who was led to hell by Jupiter [108]. Judging by the datable laisses, however, the eleventh-century poet was somewhat more interested in portraying the pagan faith. About two-thirds of the references to the "pagan trinity"—Mohammed, Apollin, and Tervagant—are from the middle stratum.

This poet describes the Saracens as both idolatrous and fickle. They hoist up the idol of Mohammed and worship it before they leave to attack the French rearguard [68], but they just as readily smash and defile all of their idols when the battle has gone badly for them [187], and then lament the loss of the very gods they have so recently forsaken [194].

The eleventh-century redactor writes also of pagan clerics and canons who are not in holy orders and have not even received the tonsure [270]. This poet clearly wishes to convey some idea of the Moslem faith, but his ignorance of its actual nature prevents him from doing anything but parodying Christianity. Nevertheless, the eleventh-century poet accords the pagans a certain amount of grudging admiration and appears to present them as worthy opponents.

The twelfth-century redactor adds a few finishing touches to his predecessor's depiction of the Saracens, but his contributions are minimal. In the later laisses, the Saracens use their own version of the Christian greeting "salvez seiez de Deu" in their salutation, "salvez seiez de Mahum" [32], but they are not above using the Christian formula to deceive the French court [9]. Perhaps as a touch of realism, the narrator explains that after Ganelon swears to treason on the relics of his sword, Marsile takes an oath on the scriptures of Mohammed and Tervagant [47]. One slightly more dramatic contribution is the remark that the heinous pagan Valdebrun murdered the patriarch at the font in the temple of Solomon [199].

As one turns to the poets' treatment of Christianity, the situation becomes somewhat different. The eleventh-century redactor's Christian imagery is all centered on Charlemagne. The emperor has prophetic visions [57 and 186] and he receives assistance and protection from God and the archangel Gabriel [180, 204, and 268]. The twelfth-century poet does not diminish Charlemagne's religious importance [see, for example, laisses 40, 185, and 224], but he allows Roland to share in it. The twelfth-century redactor adds two highly significant details to the account of Roland's death. The narrator assures the reader that Roland has gone to heaven [177] and, more importantly, the narrator describes at great length several meteorological disturbances that forecast the hero's death [111]. These phenomena—lightning, torrential rains, earthquakes, etc.—strongly resemble those which are recounted in

the Bible in connection with the death of Christ. Thus while the earlier material does not necessarily present Roland as much more than a fierce warrior who is betrayed by a kinsman, the latest material openly invites a comparison between Roland and Christ.

The last redactor further strengthens this association by repeating the account of the terrifying storms in Charlemagne's third dream [185]. This dream is markedly different from those created by the earlier poets,[31] but in the case of dream imagery, one can even distinguish between the work of the tenth- and eleventh-century writers. When one looks at the dreams from the three strata concurrently, several patterns emerge. As the poem develops over time, the dreams become increasingly vague as prophecy, but increasingly rich in imagery. In addition, Ganelon plays less of a role as Roland becomes more important.

The first dream is of tenth-century composition. This laisse, number 56, could not be dated by its assonance since it assonates in *i*; however, this particular dream is mentioned in a tenth-century laisse. Laisse 67 assonates in *a/an/ain* (indicating, as noted above, that the nasal consonants did not yet affect the vowel) and it recounts a dialogue between Charlemagne and Naimon in which the king complains of having had a bad dream—only one—and then describes the first of the four dreams found in the Oxford poem.[32]

[31]D. D. R. Owen asserts that the last redactor of the poem created a dream that was stylistically different from the others (he does not mention that the first dream is equally distinctive) and then moved what was originally the third dream to a position much later in the poem. Owen points out quite rightly that both the first and second dreams end with the remark that Charles sleeps and does not wake. The fourth dream begins with the comment that Charles had yet another dream and then slept until morning. Thus Owen contends that the first, second, and fourth dreams appear to form a complete sequence. (D. D. R. Owen, "Charlemagne's Dreams, Baligant and Turoldus," *Zeitschnft für romanische Philologie* 87 (1971): 197-208.] Linguistic analysis of the laisses containing dreams and those immediately surrounding the dreams bears out Owen's extremely perceptive deductions about the sequence of dreams.

[32] Similar deductive dating can be used in the case of laisse 155, which assonates in *u (*< Latin long U) and therefore cannot be dated linguistically. In this laisse, the narrator slates that Turpin fought so furiously that when Charles came he found 400 Saracen corpses around his body. Yet in both the eleventh- and twelfth-century material the reader is told that he did not die surrounded by pagans. The last redactor states explicitly that Roland picked up Turpin and earned him to a meadow [161]. The eleventh-century redactor states that Roland went and found the peers and brought them to the archbishop (who was evidently in a place where

The first and oldest of Charlemagne's prophetic dreams shows quite clearly that Ganelon will betray Charles. The only metaphor in the dream is the spear that Ganelon breaks, which seems to represent the French rearguard. The dream is a simple vehicle of foreshadowing; the poet does not exploit the full potential of the dream motif.

The second and fourth dreams, written by the eleventh-century redactor, do not make it quite as clear who the traitor is, since he is depicted as a bear. In the second dream [57], the bear bites Charles' right arm. This may warn the astute reader that Roland will be attacked, since Ganelon told the pagans that Roland was like Charles' right arm [45—an undatable laisse]. The poet of the middle stratum later describes Ganelon as being chained like a bear by the cooks [137]. The fourth dream [186] prophesies that the traitor will be defended by thirty relatives—thirty other bears demand the release of the bear in chains; then the largest bear is attacked by a greyhound. The dream makes complete sense only at the end of the poem, when Ganelon's thirty kinsmen pledge themselves on his behalf and his intimidating relative Pinabel is challenged by Thierry. These dreams are far richer in imagery than the first dream, and they provide more details about the course of events—if only in retrospect. As one reads these dreams, one is not sure who is represented by all of the animals. These visions are actually more dream-like than the first vision—they are colorful but somewhat disjointed.

The third dream [185], which is the work of the last redactor,[33] may be the most confusing of all; it is certainly the richest in imagery. It describes terrifying storms (a clear echo of the omens foretelling Roland's death), animals devouring the French soldiers, and a lion's attack on the emperor. This dream appears at

would have room to lay them all out) [162]; then when Roland swooned, Turpin ran to get him water and died in the attempt [165]. Therefore, laisse 155 must be a part of the tenth-century stratum.

[33] The assonance is in *ie/e*. The stylistic distinctiveness of the dream, as well as its repeating of material assigned to the twelfth-century stratum by a less controversial method (laisse 111, "the earth's mourning for Roland," assonates in *an/en)* is further evidence that the *ie/e* assonance is an appropriate indicator that the laisses in which it is used are of twelfth-century composition.

first to be quite haphazard, but in fact it imposes dream-like juxtapositions of images onto a precise framework in a very sophisticated way. The dream is actually a microcosm of the poem as a whole: Charles is forced to be passive in the first part of the story and he cannot help his men, but in the second half of the poem he must grapple with his enemy directly. Furthermore, he faces his enemy single-handedly; he receives no help in the dream, despite the fact that in two other dreams animals come to his rescue.

In summary, linguistic evidence demonstrates that at least three different poets played a role in the production of the Oxford version of the *Chanson de Roland,* and these poets had different conceptions of character and structure. However, the scholar who accepts the evidence of multiple authorship offered in this paper need not abandon any ideas about the poem's unity. The last redactor left much intact and while some contradictions result from his insertions, much of his work merely colors that of his predecessors. He does not diminish the religious importance of Charlemagne; instead he magnifies the religious importance of Roland. Similarly, he does not make Ganelon more or less of a traitor; rather, he makes him a more articulate traitor.

Susan E. Farrier
Portsmouth, Rhode Island

TABLE I: LAISSE NUMBERS BY STRATUM

Earliest stratum (tenth century) [4.7%]:

a(i)/a(i)n, e/ei/ein/i, e/ein/i, ei/en

46, [56]*, 67, 78, 87, 97, 139, [155], 198, 209, 221, 245, 263, and 294.

Middle stratum (eleventh century) [27.5%]:

a/ai, an alone, *an/ain, en* alone, *en/ein,* nasal o/close oral *o*/phoneme < free stressed long O and short U, *-eiz* futures

1,2, 6, 15, 20, 24. 28, 43, 50, 52, 57, 60, 61, 64, 68, 69, 73, 74, 80, 94, 99, l6l, 105, 106, 109, 115, 116, 117, 124, 130, 133, 135, 137, 144, 148, 150, 156, 162, 165, 166, 178, 180, 186, 187, 191, 192, 194, 196, 197, 204, 206, 208, 215, 219, 222, 226, 227, 230, 232, 233, 240, 242, 246, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 262, 265, 266, 268, 270, 273, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 286, 292, and 296.

Latest stratum (twelfth century) [21.8%]:

ai/e, an/en, e/ie, all nasal *o,* all oral *o (*< free stressed long O or short U), *-ez* futures

4, 5, 9, 17, 19, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 36, 40, 47, 48, 53, 54, 63, 65, 66, 70, 75, 85, 92, 100, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 119, 125/125a, 127, 128, 129, 134, 138, 142, 157, 160, 161, 167, 174, 177, 182, 184, 185, 190, 203, 210, 218, 223, 224, 229, 239, 241, 243, 249, 250, 251, 260, 276, 277, and 287.

*Laisses in brackets have been dated deductively rather than phonologically. See p. 23 and footnote 31.

TABLE II: LAISSES CATEGORIZED BY ASSONANCE

a/ai (middle): 20, 28, 52, 57, 58, 60, 105, 115, 130, 148, 156, 204, 215, 230, 254, 255, 258, and 286.

a(i)/a(i)n (early): 46, 67, 87, 97, 139, 209, 221, 245, and 294.

an (middle): 69, 101, 116, 165, 180, 192, 196, 222, 233, and 246.

an/ain (middle): 1, 24, 73, 219, 227, 257, 268, and 296.

an/en (late): 19, 22, 30, 47, 63, 85, 110, 111, 125/125a, 129, 134, 138, 174, 184, 203, 218, 229, 249, and 260.

ai/e (late): 4, 53, 65, 75, 100, 108, 128, 157, 167, 182, 190, 210, 224, 239, 243, 251, 276, and 277.

e/ei/ein/i (early): 78.

e/ein/i (early): 198.

ei/en (early): 263*.

en (middle): 124, 144, 280, and 292.

en/ein (middle): 109, 135, and 266.

e/ie (late): 9**, 27**, 33, 36**, 40, 107, 127, 160, 161, 177, 185, 250, and 287.

ie/i (middle): 64.

o/(ou)/on (middle): 2, 15, 50, 61, 68, 74, 80, 94, 99, 106, 117, 133, 137, 150, 162, 166, 178, 186, 187, 191, 194, 206, 208, 226, 232, 240, 262, 265, 270, 273, 279, and 283.

ou (late): 66 and 112.

oe/ie (late): 23.

on (late): 17, 29, 32, 48, 70, 119, 142, 223, and 241.

* This laisse also contains archaic *-eiz* futures, as do 6, 43, 197, 242, 256, 278, and 282.

**These three laisses also contain analogically remade *-ez* futures, as do 5 and 54.

Personalia

Erich Von Richthofen, a member of our editorial board and Emeritus Professor of the University of Toronto, was awarded the Chauveau Medal of the Royal Society of Canada in 1985. Even in retirement he continues his brisk publishing activity, with three recent articles to bring to our attention:
"Algunos rasgos orientales de la épica románica y la novela caballeresca," in *Homenaje A. Galmés de Fuentes* (1985) 2: 631-41; "Los crímenes del rey Tared' histórico y el origen del nombre de su redentor 'Cifar'," in *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 10 (1986): 423-31; and "La dimensión atlàntica del Ulises y del Alejandro medievales en el contexto del mito heráclеo gaditano," in *Homenaje M. Alvar* (1986) 3: 423-34.

-o-oOo-o-

Jan A. Nelson (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa), another member of our Editorial Board, is completing work on an annotated bibliography of the Swan Knight materials as well as a series of articles on the Swan Knight branches of the Old French Crusade Cycle.

-o-oOo-o-

Marianne Cramer Vos (Alabama State University, Montgomery) asks us to share her sadness in the untimely death of her son, René-Carlos Louis Robert Vos, in a private plane crash on November 19, 1987. She is working on a paper for the Barcelona conference on "L'Episode de l'arrêt du soleil dans la *Chanson de Roland"* and has recently completed another on "La Mort soudaine d'Aude dans le *Roland* d'Oxford."

-o-oOo-o-

Emanuel J. Mickel's article, "The Question of Guilt in *Ami et Amile,"* appeared in *Romania* 106 (1985): 19-35. He doubles as the chair of the Department of French and Italian and the Director of the Medieval Studies Institute at the University of Indiana, Bloomington, and is currently pursuing research on images of treason in Old French chanson de geste and romance.