Book Reviews

A. Richard Hartman and Dorothy L. Schrader

May Plouzeau, ed. and commentary. *Panse la Duchesse (Chanson de geste du XIIIe siècle).* Senefiance 17 and 18. 2 vols. Aix-en-Provence: Publications du CUERMA, Université de Provence, 1986. 647 pp.

Parise la Duchesse belongs to that group of later Old French epics that experienced a long drought of scholarly attention. Although the object of two editions in 1836 and 1860,[1] no philological attention had been centered on this unique manuscript until over a century later;[2] it was at this point that the late Gabriel Andrieu began to prepare an edition with accompanying translation and critical apparatus. Given the dialectal problems, peculiar to *Parise,* the poor condition of certain sections of the manuscript, the unique manuscript's lack of variants, and the absence of independent language studies, Andrieu's initial spadework represents a most demanding and crucial phase of the edition's preparation. His name deserves to figure perhaps more prominently than in a paragraph of the *avant-propos.*

The above, however, is not meant to lessen the credit that should be given to the titular editor, May Plouzeau. The 647 pages

[1] Guillaume François de Martonne, ed., *Parise la Duchesse,* Romans des Douze Pairs de France 4 (Paris: Techner, 1836); François Guessard and Lorédon Larchey, eds., *Parise la Duchesse,* Anciens Poëtes de la France 4 (Paris: Vieweg, 1860).

[2] E. B. Ham published his reading of various sections of the poem which he treated with ammonium sulphydrate ("Readings from *Parise la Duchesse," Modern Language Notes* 59 [1944]: 490-3). Other research on the B. N. f. fr. 1374 codex was done by W.P. Gerritsen and Wolfgang van Emden. To our knowledge, the results of this study have never been published, other than the brief description contained in the introduction to Professor van Emden's edition of *Girart de Vienne* ([Paris: SATF, 1977] xlviii-1).

of the edition's two volumes clearly reveal years of additional detailed and thorough personal research, supported by a network of professional contacts, together with the advantages offered by the computer in textual editing. The two volumes are printed directly from the word processor, allowing the reader to profit from much valuable information which would have surely been pruned away by cost-conscious publishers of more expensive typeset formats. Full advantage is taken of the possibilities offered by a computer-generated concordance: text, language studies, explanatory notes, footnotes, and indices are all linked by an extensive network of cross-references.

The 3106-line poem is found in volume one; the notes to the text are conveniently located in volume two so as to permit concurrent reading with the poem. Plouzeau includes, as well as normal folio indications, marginal references to the 1860 Guessard and Larchey pagination.

In the body of the text of *Parise*, we encountered the following divergences between our readings of the manuscript and those of the editor: line 95, *P:* anviron, MS.: a///ron (not enough minims for Plouzeau's reading); 117, *P: Raimont*, MS.: *ra///õt* (not enough minims); 265, *P; di*, MS.: *li*; 267, *P: pré, MS,:prez;* 438, *P: sait*, MS.: *sai;* 483, *P: pansee*, MS.: *pansce;* 566, *P: chef*, MS.: *ches* (tironian *s);* 601, *P: nöer*, MS.: *noeer*, 612, *P:* indicates initial, MS.: no initial; 799, *P: pesez*, MS.: *pesaz;* 986, *P: donrai*, MS.: *dorai;* 1031, *P: et de*, MS.: *e de;* 1124, *P: si*, MS.: *li*; 1125, *P: non*, MS.: *noj;* 1192, *P: claimons*, MS.: *claimas;* 1309, *P: est*, MS.: *et;* 1328, *P: le*, MS.: *la;* 1338, *P: dedans*, MS.: *dedanz;* 1611, *P: Que*, MS.: *Q';* 1644, *P: antant*, MS.: *antantz;* 1740, *P: veilarz*, MS.: *veillarz;* 1756, *P: Jusque*, MS.: *jusqz*, and *P: itel*, MS.: *icel;* 2048, *P; teste*, MS.: *taste;*[3] 2131, *P: mercrerez*, MS.: *mercrerei;* 2165, P: *sais*, MS.: *sai;* 2315, *P: trebucher*, MS.: *tresbucher (es* above line); 2338, *P: done*, MS.: *donei;* 2431, *P: faite, MS.: faites;* 2881, *P: charte*, MS.: *chartr*, 2929, *P: en mon Deu*, MS.: *E////o// deu (En non Deu*— not enough minims for Plouzeau's reading); 2948, *P: E mon Deu*, MS.: *E //o deu;* 3028, *P; les apellez*, MS.: *les a appelez.*

[3] This follows the scribal tendency: tonic *a + s = a*, *eschas* 966, *eschax 1199*, *pesaz* 799, *anfas* 1379; see §22, §27.

In volume one, the text is preceded by a long and excellent language study which certainly more than makes up for a century's silence. While reading the literary study that follows, however, one is quickly left with the impression that philology is Plouzeau's strong suit, as she rarely abandons the traditional condescending attitude towards the later epic, while unearthing, nevertheless, some engrossing factual details, especially concerning the cult of Saint Antoine. The language study reveals only occasional weaknesses, such as a tendency to utilize examples which prove to be scribal abbreviations that have been resolved by the editor, using a system that appears somewhat rigid and mechanical. In §16, which treats *o* becoming *e*, the examples *queronez* (1094, 3067) and *querone* (3093) are in reality *qrone(z)* in the MS.; one of the examples, *queronez* (3067) even occurs in the same line with the spelled-out form *quorone* (also spelled out at line 3064). *Predome* (553) and *prevoire* (2835,2882) are also cited as examples, but in the MS. are found *as pdome and pvoire*, abbreviations which could be resolved as their classic forms *prodom(e)* and *provoire* (forms which also appear in the MS.). In §78, which treats final *t*, *sont* (1587) is cited, again relying on the editor's resolution of an abbreviation. In §87, *vou* is not at 958; in §78, *quando* has no reflex at 731; in §40, *Ferté* is *Fierté* in the text; in §68, *Girat* is not at 600 but 660 (this same error also occurs in the table of proper names—see *Buevon):* also in §68, the misreading of the MS.'s *chartr* (2881) as *charte* is cited in a discussion of non-implosive *R*. In the versification study (2.1.2. Laisses in *-é)* 15 laisses are mentioned, but only 14 are listed, laisse XI being missing.

The decision to establish a difference between laisses assonating in *-é* and *-ié* represents a break with the practice of earlier editions, which saw Bartsch's Law as being inoperative in this late text, causing the two endings to be intimately mixed. This editorial step is to be welcomed in the sense that it posits a less narrative form for the poem than was formerly thought and substitutes a more lyric structure which shows greater respect for the contours of the laisse.[4]

[4] William W. Kibler, "La 'Chanson d'aventures,"' in *Essor et fortune de la chanson de geste dans l'Europe et l'orient latin: Actes du IXe Congrès International de la Société Rencesvals, 2* vols. (Modena: Mucci, 1984) 2: 512.

The editor bases her decision on the fact that most corrections from scribal endings which do not assonate to supposedly authorial endings that do assonate are easy and natural (90); however those endings which "résistent toutefois à l'amendement" remain disconcertingly numerous. Each of these words at the assonance is either already in its classic (authorial?) form which does not assonate, or if corrected to that form, would not assonate. The issue is further complicated by a fact not mentioned by Plouzeau: at least 35 words at the assonance whose endings are subject to a *-é/-ié* variation are the result of an editorial resolution of a scribal abbreviation.[5] The impact of these two factors can be best appreciated by looking within the confines of one of Plouzeau's typically short *-ié* laisses, such as number XXIV. Of the total of 33 lines, 11 endings, or one third, do not assonate or are questionable Five endings are "classic" *(retornez, parler, assez, forsenez, tornez),* there are "non classic" forms *(encombrer, volanter, enpirez)* and three are abbreviations resolved by the editor *(chevalier*—twice; *Berangier).* This high frequency of *-é* endings effectively prevents this laisse from being differentiated from surrounding laisses in *-é.*

Another aspect of the poem's versification that does not appear to preoccupy the poet is the constant necessity to maintain alexandrines at all costs. In the Old French epic, as in Homer, the efficiency of formulaic composition takes priority over metrical considerations;[6] thus, when a grouping of correct formulas still produces one of several types of traditional scansions, the author cannot be expected to be concerned that the result is not an alexandrine. As a result, the text is peppered with 20 decasyllables, 18 of which the editor admits are "irréprochables" (87); the remaining two also appear acceptable. All 20 decasyllabic (4/6) lines are nevertheless increased to 6/6 by emendations, which in the case of a unique manuscript must be highly conjectural. To cite but one example of the procrustean nature of some of these

[5] The abbreviation *chr (chevalier/chevaler),* for example, appears a total of 19 times at the assonance.

[6] D. Gary Miller, *Improvisation, Typology, Culture, and "The New Orthodoxy": How "Oral" is Homer?* (Washington, DC: UP of America, 1982) 33.

emendations, the manuscript's 4/6 line 1043: "Ou, se ce non, bien le puez comparer" is expanded to "Ou, se ce non, mout chier bien le puez comparer." Plouzeau's emended line correctly retains a comma after the first four syllables, as this is where the original, natural cæsura in the 4/6 line occurs; but the resulting change only serves to create a hypermetric second hemistich. This effort to regularize line length contrasts sharply with the editor's attitude towards scribal morphological traits, which are conserved even when the reader's comprehension is placed in jeopardy.[7]

The careful editing job leaves little room for comment, aside from the few modest suggestions which follow: the second hemistich of 180: "Qui or saroit consoil qu'il la puist destorber," could perhaps read *qui lla puist d.;* 227: the MS.'s *Je li ///,* instead of Plouzeau's *J'oï,* could read *J'ui,* where the open initial *o* of AUDIVI combines with *yod* to yield *ui* (Plouzeau §41, Bourciez §104); 454: the *MS.'s fa* (<FACIT), instead of being changed to *fait,* could remain *fa*[t], just as on 1675, where FACTUM> *fat* (the result is the same in *Francien);* 1042: the MS.'s *9vient* is resolved as *covient,* but very likely the scribe saw *co//,* and interpreted as *con* what was really *cou.* Thus we prefer *couvient* (cf. MS. *couvence* 1754); 493: the MS.'s *Ma* instead of following Guessard and Larchey's *Mais,* could remain *Mas,* the MS. form at 981 and 1067; 1072: the MS.'s *mout .iii. biaux dez* is emended by Plouzeau. to *.iii. mout biaux dez.* It is very possible that the scribe saw *tres* (<TRANS), which he misunderstood.[8] From time to time, the scribe appear to use a double *i (ii),* which still only counts as one syllable for the scansion: *estriier* 1374, *comparroiis* 1656, *maiis* 2138, *seiignor* 2288, *araiis* 2869. These groups are read by the editor as either *n* or *u;* 1640: *for* in *for mon desfoi* need not be changed to *sor—for* meaning "rejecting, excluding (my objections)" is logical and adequate; 1904: *ceu est Herdrez* is preferable to *cen;* 1955: should read *ses .xiiii. fiz*

[7] The following are some examples of scribal forms which the editor leaves unchanged: *des* for *dis, jé for ja, on* for *ont, et* for *het,* and *ill* for *elle* (1943).

[8] This placement of *tres* (<TRANS) is very common of OF; Greimas cites "la plus tres belle riens" *(Dictionnaire de l'ancien français* [Paris: Larousse, 1968] 641).

instead of *ses .iiii. fiz.* Andrieu was correct in pointing out that lines 735-41 make it clear that Clarembaut, although accompanied by all his fourteen sons, only knows well the four who stayed with him, and that the poem's meaning should not have to yield to considerations of line length; 1966: the MS.'s *Antoines ses trestorne* should not be changed to *se trestorne,* as the verb here is not reflexive but transitive, *ses* representing the enclitic form *se + les* (cf. 1977 *Antoine les trestorne*)*;* 2489: Plouzeau gives *Et sin ont de vos homes bien .xl. mené;* here *vos* should probably be *nos,* as only two lines earlier the same speakers had said *Il nos corrurent sore, si nos ont desrobé.* The phenomenon common to Old French texts of a plural subject with a singular verb should be taken more into account;[9] for example, the MS.'s 2494: *Huguez et Clarembauz se ll'an ot apellé* would not need to be emended to *ont apellé;* 3021: for the MS.'s *Dame, qui vos fi ci,* the change of *ci* to *ce* creates an epic caesura, but also a hypometric line; 3079: in Plouzeau's *Et desor fu la tresce, desor* should be changed to *desoz.* The context makes this clear, as the medieval portrait of the head proceeds in descending order,[10] in this case starting with the bejeweled diadem (3077), moving to the hair (3079), then down to the forehead (3080). As Plouzeau's long note to line 1401 points out, the scribal confusion *desor/desoz* is not infrequent in the manuscript.

The use of dieresis is very judicious and leaves little need for comment. We offer only a few suggestions: at three points in the text (396, 1283) an archaic disyllabic pronunciation of *fait* (<FACTUM) would eliminate the need for the present emendation;[11] 136: *Pechëor* may not need dieresis, as *eo* is always

[9] William W. Kibler, *An Introduction to Old French* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1984) §5.2.

[10] Alice M. Colby-Hall, *The Portrait in Twelfth-Century French Literature: An example of the stylistic originality of Chrétien de Troyes* (Geneva: Droz, 1965) 6, 20.

[11] See Mildred K. Pope, *From Latin to Modern French* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1934), §404 (4), and esp. Raynaud de Lage, *Manuel pratique d'ancien français* (Paris: Picard, 1964) 167.

disyllabic in Old French;[12] 168: in Plouzeau's *Quant il orent Boevon . . .*," the addition of dieresis to make a trisyllabic *Böevon* is perhaps better than adding the conjectural *il*. This spelling is different from any of the other disyllabic forms mentioned by Andrieu.

The addition of dieresis to the group ö*é* at the assonance is not often chosen by editors due to the fact that the second letter will always represent /e/. Line 778: Plouzeau's *tornë arier* at the assonance in *-é* could read *torne arïer* and create an assonance which would correspond to the rest of the laisse (cf. *crïer* 780); 965: in Plouzeau's *Premiers aprist a letres,* the adoption *of premïers* would eliminate the need for the editor's added *a;* 1107: in Plouzeau's *tuit li .iii., li larron,* the introduction of a disyllabic *tuit* would remove the both awkward and conjectural second *li*;[13] 2001: where Plouzeau has *Ez vos les traïtors,* the elimination of the dieresis would produce a disyllabic *traitor* (cf. MS.: 90, 2641) and permit the use of the MS.'s *Atant ez les traitors;* 90: the MS.'s disyllabic *traitor* at the assonance in *-on* should not be replaced *by felon.* As the MS.'s unique *-o:-on* assonance, *traitor* constitutes an interesting combination of a younger reduction with an older type of assonance, a mixture which may well be the result of poetic license. Finally, the use of *lïez* at the assonance in *-ié* probably only further demonstrates the poet's lack of concern with absolute metrical regularity.

In the section devoted to the presentation of the text and the critical apparatus, on p. 166, line 2 should read *nº 6,* not *nº5*; p. 168, §20: *Nueron,* not *Neron:* p. 170: *Stimming,* not *Stimning.* For the otherwise precise footnotes, it would have been more useful to readers to have had a Plouzeau correction distinguished from that of Andrieu, and to have replaced the Guessard and Larchey readings by those done by E. B. Ham. Under the editor's system, it is difficult to discern when there is a Ham reading to be consulted.

[12] Alfred Foulet and Mary Blakely Speer, *On Editing Old French Texts* (Lawrence: Regents Press of Kansas, 1979) 71.

[13] See Pope, §254.

The text is followed in volume 2 by, among other sections, a table of proper names, copious and detailed notes to the text, and a very complete glossary. An outstanding feature of the table of proper names is the very precise treatment of how abbreviations have been developed, and separate entries are made accordingly. We found three line errors in this section: *Berangers* is at 375, not 373; *Buevon* is at 600, not 660 (this same line error occurred with *Giraz);* a reference is omitted for *Herdrez* at line 661. We suggest an entry be added for *Erdrez (see Herdré)*. The glossary is a welcome feature, as it offers valuable information for both the beginning student and the experienced medievalist.

Plouzeau's edition represents an important contribution to the study of the Old French epic and would constitute a worthwhile addition to any library. We will consult its linguistic studies and notes with profit for years to come.

A. Richard Hartman
Dorothy L. Schrader
Oklahoma State University

-o-oOo-o-

Edward A. Heinemann

Henry Chanteux. *Recherches sur la "Chanson de Roland."* Mémoires de l'Académie nationale des sciences, arts et belles-lettres, de Caen, nouvelle série 22. Caen: Académie nationale des sciences, arts et belles-lettres, and Conseil régional de Basse-Normandie, 1985.

Henry Chanteux sketches loosely the origin of the Roland legend and its gradual evolution through a series of accretions in the tenth and eleventh centuries in a kind of updating and syntheses of Bédier and of the *cantilena* theory, making extensive use of Boissonnade. A legend of Charlemagne developed in Rome after the treaty of Verdun and breakup of the Empire in 843 and acquired theocratic overtones among the Normans in southern Italy in the eleventh century. Early in the twelfth century this legend blended with another one, about the impetuous nephew of a king, which had

been current in the Roucy branch of the Welf family since the tenth century and had acquired accretions from Anjou, Aquitaine, and Burgundy.

Chanteux considers the story common to the *Carmen de Prodicione Guenonis* and to the Oxford manuscript of the *Chanson de Roland* to be the earliest kernel of the Roland story. Chapter 1, "Le récit d'Eginhard et la légende," relates Charlemagne's Spanish expedition as found in Eginhard and then summarizes the story told in the *Carmen.* Chapter 2, "Le poème d'Oxford," tells the story as found in the Oxford version of the *Chanson de Roland* and points out differences between the two versions. From the death of Roland on, the story in Oxford is not found in the *Carmen.*

In Chapter 3, "Les contradictions de l'histoire et de la légende," Chanteux notes that there is virtually no evidence of the legend before 1100 whereas after that date suddenly evidence abounds along the pilgrimage routes. Continuous local legends seem ruled out; something must have provoked the creation of the story toward 1100 (further on he identifies the event as the wedding of Constance of France to Bohemond of Antioch in 1106: pp. 112, 131). The differences between the historical event and the poetic version of it (16-9) indicate that the emperor of the poetic version is a tenth-century sovereign, bearded like Otto the Great, and residing at Laon. These traits and the emperor's particular preference for his Bavarian vassals (vv. 3028-32) reveal him to be a member of the Welf family, and more precisely the son of Louis le Pieux and Judith of Bavaria. Chanteux finds in the family tradition of the Welfs and Vermandois in the second half of the tenth century a poem recounting the victory of the Sénonais over the Saxons in 959 and in which may be discerned the kernel of the Roland legend (19).

Chapter 4, "Le prototype de la *Chanson* et sa mise en œuvre," examines this poem and distinguishes two stages in its elaboration.[1]

[1] The text of the poem is lost, but it was summarized twice in the early eleventh century, shortly after 1015 by the author of the *Historia Francorum Senonensis,* and at about the same time, although indirectly, by Dudon de Saint-Quentin for the story of a supposed siege of Rouen in 954. The latter version was abridged toward 1042 by the author of the *Gesta Episcoporum Camera Censium* for his telling of the siege of Cambrai in 954 by the Huns (21).

> Anseis, bishop of Troyes, quarrelling with count Robert, son of Herbert II of Vermandois, and driven out of the city, seeks help from Otto I, who comes to besiege the city with a Saxon army. After some time Anseis suggests to [Otto] that he move against Sens, where Archembaud, son of Robert, has taken the archbishop's seat. Otto moves against Sens, but the city does not yield. Anseis suggests attacking the city and letting an advance guard take the worst of the fight. A duke from the Ardennes, Helpon, nephew of the king, boasts he can capture the city. Otto is obliged by his barons to accept, and Helpon and his force are wiped out. His mother has him carried back to Ardennes; two enemy cousins, count Renard of Sens and Archembaud, pronounce a funeral oration. (21-2)

Roland is, of course, Helpon, in whose name Chanteux sees a misspelling of *Wuelpho* or *Gelpho* (22). Both Roland and Helpon are nephews of the king. Both have the same impetuous youthful courage. In both texts the initial circumstances are the same, a city just captured. The nephew in both boasts he will exterminate the king's enemies (23).

A poet conflated the story with Eginhard's telling of the mountain ambush of 778. He added a traitor and, following Eginhard, he converted the vanguard into a rearguard. In order to bring witnesses to the scene, he had Roland sound the olifant and created Oliver to set off the moral dilemma inherent in the story (24-7).[2]

The *Carmen* gives a largely faithful reflection of this now lost earliest version of the Roland story. In Chapter 5, "Le collège des pairs et la toponymie dans le *Carmen de Proditione Guenonis* et dans la *Chanson de Roland"* Chanteux argues that this poem had a "college of peers" numbering seven, as in the *Carmen.* The poem

[2] Chanteux speculates, too, that Bavarian Welfs who settled at Troyes and Sens in 859 may have impinged on archbishop Wanilo's possessions, disposing him thus to listen favorably to the approaches of Louis le Germanique. This hypothetical conflict would explain the antagonism between Welfs (Roland) and Ganelon ("Roland me forfist en or et en aveir," v. 3758; pp. 28-9).

situated the battle in a region vaguely called Syria as in the *Carmen.* Like Eginhard and the *Carmen,* the pilgrims of the early eleventh century made no association of the battle with Roncevaux, but, passing through the region, they took Syria to be Cize *(Sizer, vv.* 583, 719). Thus the battle came to be located at Roncevaux by the end of the eleventh century, by which time religious foundations were exploiting the legend.

Chapter 6, "La *Chanson* et la croisade d'Espagne de 1064," argues that this campaign, led into Spain by Gui-Geoffroy, duke of Aquitaine, revived memories of Charlemagne's 778 expedition and marked the beginning of a new flourishing of the legend of Charlemagne. Chanteux sees in Engelier, "li Gascuin de Burdele" and seventh in the original list of peers, and in the deposition of the olifant at Saint-Seurin de Bordeaux, an indication that the house of Aquitaine contributed to the legend. Agnès of Aquitaine, daughter of Otte-Guillaume, count of Burgundy, and mother of Gui-Geoffroy, married Geoffroy-Martel of Anjou after the death of her first husband. Through her the Roland legend passed from the house of Anjou into the families of Burgundy and Aquitaine (47).

Chapter 7, "Les laisses trinaires," claims that the clusters of similar laisses are interpolations due to the creator of the five new peers and which accompany a religious fervor or crusading spirit (as in Roland's prayers, his death as a martyr, the relics encrusted in the pommel of Durendal, [51-2]) new to the story.

These features are Burgundian elements added to the Aquitano-Saintongeais text (Chap. 8, "La légende dans la maison des comtes de bourgogne"). The wedding of Guillaume Tête-Hardie to Stéphanie in 1050, daughter of Gerold I of Genevois and Vienne, is at the origin of the Burgundian accretions to the legend (55). It is their son Guy, archbishop of Vienne in 1088 and pope in 1119 under the name of Calixtus II, under whose auspices the pseudo-Turpin published his chronicle. The owner of Durendal must be the protector of the abbey of Vézelay, and Girart de Roussillon, the founder and protector of the abbey of Vézelay, is precisely the fifth of the new peers (54). Guiun de Seint Antonie, who dies in verse 1581 (v. 1624 in Bédier's edition) is Guigues Didier, creator of the hospital of Saint-Antoine at the end of the tenth century (58). Otton and Bérenger are ascendants of Otte-Guillaume of Burgundy (58-9). The long episodes of the escape of Ganelon

and the death of Aude, found in the manuscripts other than Oxford, derive likewise from Burgundian influence (59-64).

The Blancandrin and the Baligant episodes, not found in the *Carmen*, are transparent allusions to the Spanish crusade of 1087 (Chap. 9, "Le poème d'Oxford. Les sources littéraires de ses parties nouvelles: les épisodes de Blancandrin et de Baligant"). Blancandrin may be discovered in the *Annales de Fulda*, which were bound with the *Annales* of Flodoard under the name of the *Gesta Francorum* (70). The Saracen debarcation in Spain in 1086 led to the campaign of 1087 and inspired the Baligant episode (74-6). That Geoffroy d'Anjou carries the oriflamme indicates that this accretion is based on an epic text composed in honor of Geoffroy Grisegonelle at the time of the siege of Paris in 978 (77-80).

Chapter 10, "Chanson de geste: Chanson de famille," attributes to Welf families around Sens and in the Vermandois of the middle of the tenth century no less than four legends of hotheaded nephews of a king, *Gormond et Isembard*, *Renaud de Montauban*, *Raoul de Cambrai*, and *Roland* (84-5). In particular the Roucy family, allied to the first bearded emperor, Otto I, by the marriage of the emperor's niece Aubérée to Renaud de Roucy, picked up and carried on the Roland legend (88). Rotrou II, count of Perche, leader of seven expeditions into Spain, encountered so much treachery among his Spanish "allies" during his expedition of 1105 that he was obliged to return home without accomplishing anything, and this frustration due to treason revived Roucy family memories of the treachery of Ganelon, and the Rotrou of 1105 became the new Roland. This identification explains why some hairs of St. Denis are encrusted in the pommel of Durendal: Rotrou was lord and protector of St.-Denis de Nogent-le-Rotrou "au bourg duquel, avant le combat, Margariz de Sibilie s'était vanté de coucher avant un an (v. 973)." Further, Juliane, the name given to Bramimonde on her conversion, is the name of Rotrou's sister (90-1).

The list of conquests in verses 2326-30 can only admit of the emperor's being Henry II, who died in 1024 (93-4). Chanteux therefore looks for events of Henry's reign in Chapter 11, "Les légendes de la croisade de 1016 et l'avouerie apostolique." He finds them in the house of Nevers, protectors of the abbey of Ste-Madeleine de Vézelay. In 1016 Saracens invaded Lombardy, and the pope appealed for help. Among those who responded were the

count of Mâcon and his father, Otte-Guillaume, count of Burgundy, vassals of the Holy See in their quality of protectors of monasteries directly dependent on Rome. In the following year at the coronation of the son of Robert le Pieux a charter issued by the two French kings to Guillaume de Volpiano and assuring the abbey of Fruttuaria its independence from the foreign king (102) contributed the atmosphere of devotion to the Holy See necessary to the development, by 1045, of a poem celebrating the exploits of the protector of an abbey responsible directly to Rome.

Chapter 12, "Le poème d'Oxford: Les sources légendaires de ses parties nouvelles: Leurs origines normandes et michaéliennes," finds the following Norman interpolations: the lists of Charles's conquests told by Ganelon to Blancandrin (vv. 370-4) and recited by Roland in his farewell to Durendal (vv. 2331-2), Gautier de l'Hum, the references to Saint Michael, and the relic of the Virgin's garment in the pommel of Durendal. The wedding of Bohemond, prince of Antioch, to Constance, daughter of Philippe I of France, in 1106 would have been the occasion of the new version of the poem, and Bohemond's appearance at the cathedral of Chartres, where he recited his adventures and called for help against the emperor Commenus, inspired the Roland window in the cathedral.

Chapter 13, "La théocratie dans l'histoire et dans la légende de Charlemagne," argues that political theory of the second half of the eleventh century, treating kings as the arm of the Church, marks a new crusading spirit seen in the Oxford poem in the utter condemnation of the pagans and in the concept of battle as battle between the true and false religions. By the time of the emperors Henry II and Conrad II, the Empire was much reduced from its former extent, and the protection of the papacy against Islam fell to the Normans in Sicily. Freed from dependency on the Empire in 1059, the papacy took the lead in the fight in Spain and in Sicily, In order to meet this new expense, the papacy multiplied the number of religious establishments directly responsible to Rome, and this new atmosphere of the loyalty of a vassal to the Holy See was attributed to the customs of the time of Charlemagne. In 1059 the Normans in Italy separated definitively from the duchy in France; Robert Guiscard did hommage to the Church for his fiefs. The legend of Charlemagne as vassal of the Holy See passed from his wife to their granddaughter Sybille, wife of Ebles II, count of Roucy, where it

joined to the Roucy family legend of Roland to produce the Oxford poem in 1106 at Chartres at the court of Adèle (daughter of William the Conqueror) on the occasion of the marriage of Bohemond, son of Robert Guiscard and brother of Sybille de Roucy, to Constance, daughter of Philippe I of France (131).

A conclusion sums up (133-9), and an appendix, "La tendance poitevino-angevine de *l'Origo et Historia Brevis Nivernensium Comitum"* traces further genealogical relations between the house of the counts of Nevers and the houses of Poitou and Anjou.

-o-oOo-o-

Chanteux argues by assumption or assertion rather than by demonstration. He identifies, for example, verses 1853ff as an interpolation in the following manner: "Roland, qui n'a jamais prié au cours du combat, sauf une fois (v. 1853 sqq. passage visiblement interpolé) [...]" (51). The signs of interpolation are rather less than evident, but Chanteux is arguing that in the early version the character was a "démesuré" and that the character acquired Christian overtones in later versions, and to suit his argument the prayer has to be a later interpolation. Similarly he identifies the Saint Sylvester in verse 3746 as Saint Sylvestre de Besançon "à n'en pas douter" (57, see also 62) with no further demonstration and without acknowledging that Bedier identifies this saint as the pope whose feast is December 31 *(Commentaires* 520).

Chanteux finds resemblances in rather minimal similarities between texts. Roland's boast, "Sempres ferrai de Durendal granz colps" (v. 1055) in the horn scene and Helpon's "si forte ingruerint contra me bella, ego conteram gladio eorum milia" are apparently the similarity which leads Chanteux to assert that Roland uses Helpon's very words (25 and 151, n. 30), but the wording is not particularly similar. A trivial identity of phrases is an important part of his argument that the abbey Saint-Michel-de-Cluze (near the route between Mont-Saint-Michel and Mont-Gargan) is the source of important parts of the Baligant episode: Saint Michael said "Jean, que fais-tu?" to the hermit Jean Vincent one night when he was asleep on the site of the future abbey, the very words which St. Gabriel addresses to Charlemagne when the latter has been stunned by a blow from Baligant's sword (v. 3611; p. 109). Or consider

verse 2457, "A icel mot est l'emperere muntet," which Chanteux sees as a translation of "His dictis . . . processerunt" in the *Gesta Consulum Andegavorum* (78).

A fair number of typos mar the book, and a number of them interfere with intelligibility. On page 111, "le comté de Chartres" appears to have no function in its sentence; after considerable reflection I decided that Gautier Œil de Chien, and not the county of Chartres, founded the priory in question; the sentence ends, presumably, at the comma after note 33 *(sic*, should be 22). Footnote numbers are missing or misplaced in the text: n. 2 on p. 55 follows n. 5; no n. 40 occurs between nn. 39 and 41 on pp. 28-9. Missing quotation marks make for confusion (surely the long paragraph in the middle of page 26 is a quotation of Pauphilet, but there are no quotation marks), especially in a book which quotes extensively (all but the last sentence of Chap. 1 [1-6] is a single, long quotation, and large parts of pp. 8-11 are likewise). Nor are the quotations rigorously accurate: alterations slip, unmarked, into the quotation of Boissonnade on pp. 124-5, as they do into the marked and unmarked quotations from Fawtier on page 9 and into the first paragraph on page 121 which, although it has no quotation marks, comes from Boissonnade, page 218.

Similar carelessness may be discerned in his specifying that he is using Bédier's edition *of Roland* (146, n. 18) when his verse references show him to have been consulting an edition which follows the order of the other manuscripts for vv. 280-336 and 1467-1670.

The filiations of legends and families becomes complicated, and Chanteux's syntax tends to grow complicated along with the filiations. Throw in a typo, and the line of thought becomes close to indecipherable, as in the following paragraph from pp. 88-9:

> Allié en 999 avec les comtes de Sens, par le mariage d'une sœur de Gilbert et de Brunon au fils de Renaud le Vieux, le comte Fromond II, et héritière par lui du patrimoine littéraire des Guelfes auxquels il était allié, la famille de Roucy l'était déjà alors aux comtes de Maçon (d'où viennent les traditions narbonnaises auxquelles se rattachent le personnage de Naimes et l'épisode du siège de Narbonne spécial au ms. de Venise IV), par une autre fille de Renaud, Ermentrude, devenue veuve, vers

> 982, du comte Aubri II, puis remariée au comte de Bourgogne Otto-Guillaume.

Presumably *allié* is parallel to *héritière* and modifies *la famille de Roucy*.

Chanteux draws extensively on two areas: genealogy, in which this reviewer makes no claims to expertise, and, in the area of *chanson de geste* scholarship, the publications of Paris, Bédier, Boissonnade, Lot, Pauphilet, and Fawtier.[3] The reader will find no mention of the fashion for naming sons Roland and Oliver. Except for Ramón Menéndez Pidal's *La "Chanson de Roland" et la tradition épique des Francs*, trans. Irénée M. Cluzel (Paris: Picard, 1960), the list of scholars of the last forty years absent from Chanteux's notes reads like a Who's Who in the Société Rencesvals. The following list is just a small selection. Paul Aebischer, *Préhistoire et protohistoire du "Roland" d'Oxford* (Bern: Francke, 1972). Jules Horrent, *La "Chanson de Roland" dans les littératures française et espagnole au moyen âge* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951); "La bataille des Pyrénées de 778," *Le Moyen Age* 78 (1972): 197-227. Hans-Erich Keller, "La conversion de Bramimonde," *Actes* of the VIe Congrès International de la Société Rencesvals (Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence, 1974): 175-203; "The *Song of Roland:* a Mid-Twelfth Century Song of Propaganda for the Capetian Kingdom," *Olifant* 3 (1975): 242-58; "La *Chanson de Roland*, Poème de propagande pour le royaume capétien du milieu du XIIe siècle," *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* 14 (1976): 229-41. Rita Lejeune, *Recherches sur le thème: Chansons de geste et l'histoire* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1948); "La naissance du couple littéraire 'Roland et Olivier,'" *Mélanges Henri Grégoire*, II, (Brussels: Secrétariat des éditions de l'Institut, 1950) 371-401;

[3] Gaston Paris, "Le *Carmen de prodicione Guenonis," Romania* 11 (1882): 465-518. Joseph Bédier, *Les Légendes épiques*, 3rd ed., 4 vols. (Paris: Champion, 1926-9). P. Boissonnade, *Du nouveau sur la "Chanson de Roland"* (Paris: Champion, 1923). Ferdinand Lot, *Les derniers carolingiens: Lothaire, Louis V, Charles de Lorraine (954-991),* Bibl. de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes 87 (Paris, 1891); *Etudes sur le règne de Hugues Capet et la fin du Xe siècle*, Bibl. de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes 147 (Paris: Bouillon, 1903); "Geoffroy Grisegonelle dans l'épopée," *Romania* 19 (1890): 377-93. A. Pauphilet, "Sur la *Chanson de Roland," Romania* 59 (1933): 161-98. Robert Fawtier, *La "Chanson de Roland," étude historique* (Paris: Boccard, 1933).

"Localisation de la défaite de Charlemagne aux Pyrénées en 778, d'après les chroniquers carolingiens," *Coloquios de Roncesvalles, agosto 1955* (Saragossa: Diputación Forai de Navarra, 1956) 73-103; "La composition du personnage de Gautier del Hum dans la *Chanson de Roland" La technique littéraire des chansons de geste* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1959) 237-70. D. J. A. Ross, "Before *Roland:* What Happened 1200 Years Ago Next August 15?" *Olifant* 5 (1987): 171-90. Kerstin Schlyter, *Les enumerations des personnages dans la "Chanson de Roland"* (Lund: Gleerup, 1974).

The elaborate web of genealogies and events, of which this summary gives only the barest idea, accumulates, as such research often does, a vast range of tantalizing coincidences, but, based as it is on fortuitous similarities, largely outdated authorities, and unsupported assertion, it does not inspire confidence.

Edward A. Heinemann
University of Toronto

-o-oOo-o-

Charlemagne Legend Bibliography

Susan E. Farrier is preparing on a bibliography of works dealing with the Charlemagne legend in its various forms and would be grateful for information on texts or criticism that might not be found in an examination of the standard journals and bibliographies. Please send any information to:

Susan Farrier
2121 West Main Rd., # 804
Portsmounth, RI 02871

-o-oOo-o-

Personalia

Patricia Black (Cal State, Chico), in addition to reading a paper at Kalamazoo 1988 in a medieval lyric session and preparing one for the Société Rencesvals session at the New Orleans MLA meeting, has received released time from CSU-Chico for work on her study of the *Chanson de Guillaume*, which is intended to define the place of the chanson de geste in the development of the romance.

William Calin of our editorial board has been appointed to a graduate research professorship at the University of Florida, commencing in January 1989. He is currently at work on another major book, *The French Literary Tradition and Medieval England.*

The University of California Press has recently published **Jeanette Beer's** *Master Richard's Bestiary of Love and Response* (with illustrations by Barry Moser), and a volume she edited, *Medieval Translators and their Craft*, is scheduled for publication this year by Medieval Institute Publications.

In addition to his essay in Hans Keller's *Romance Epic* (see *Olifant* 12, 3-4), **Edward A. Heinemann** (Toronto) recently published "Silence in the Interstices: Epic Cliché and the Editorial Poetics of the *Chanson de geste"* in *L'Esprit créateur* 27, 1 (Spring 1987), *The Poetics of Textual Criticism: The Old French Example*, 24-33. His much awaited book, *La chanson de geste, Essai sur l'art métrique des jongleurs*, is nearing completion just as he launches into another major undertaking, a database on echo (disjunctive, consecutive, and traditional) in the chanson de geste.

Carleton Carroll (Oregon State) has just published a translation of Chrétien de Troyes's *Erec et Enide* in the Garland Library of Medieval Literature (New York, 1987) and is working with a team headed by Norris Lacy (Washington University) on a complete translation of the *Lancelot-Grail* cycle.

William L. Hendrickson (Arizona State) is working on a complete critical editon of *Garin de Monglane*. He received a Quebec Delegation scholarship in the summer of 1987, and attended the NEH Institute on the Medieval Lyric in the summer of 1988.