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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ms. of Châteauroux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Ms. of Carmen de prodicione guenonis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fl</td>
<td>Lorraine Fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galiens</td>
<td>Ms. Galiens li restorés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Ms. Konrad (Ruolândes Liet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Ms. of Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTL</td>
<td>Names not found in the Table langlois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Ms. Karolusmagnussaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ms. of Oxford (Digby 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTuR</td>
<td>Common to Oxford, the Chronicle of Turpin and Ronsasvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTu</td>
<td>Common to Oxford and the Chronicle of Turpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Common to Oxford and Ronsasvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Ms. of Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>Pagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Ms. of Ronsasvals (at Apt in Provence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>Saracen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ms. of Cambridge (Trinity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Ms. Chronicle of Turpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TuR</td>
<td>Common to Turpin and Ronsasvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Ms. Venice 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>Ms. Venice 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viaggio</td>
<td>Ms. Il viaggio di Carlo Magno in Ispagna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

The problem of this study is three-fold and deals with the relationships of the Provençal epic poem, Ronsasvals, with the Oxford Roland, and the Chronicle of Turpin, the nature of the origins of Ronsasvals (and of Turpin to a limited degree) which makes these versions so divergent from the main stream of Oxford and its remaniements, and the importance of the study as it reflects on general problems in Roland research.

The main line of research has been to undertake a systematic comparison of the Oxford, Turpin and Ronsasvals, emphasizing ideas rather than phonological minutiae or metric variations, and to provide concordances of selected matières and proper names, a categorical comparison of important elements, an amplification of areas showing the greatest divergency among the three versions, a study of sources and contaminations in Ronsasvals, and a discussion of attitudes on the part of the three authors toward the principle characters.

The study reveals that Ronsasvals is based upon a
primitive Roland which stems from a pre-Oxonian form which has been contaminated by various sources resulting in the version found in the manuscript of Apt. The identification of the Ronsasvals' core story (matières common to Oxford, Turpin and Ronsasvals) with a primitive Roland concurs with the composite of findings by R. Menéndez Pidal and André Burger on the probable nature of the pre-Oxonian Roland.

Although the Ronsasvals is shown to have been contaminated by several independent sources, it is also apparent that the work developed in some sort of isolation. A part of this isolation is accounted for by the assumption of oral transmission which explains much of the peculiar nature of this version, especially the paucity of close concordances with Oxford and Turpin as well as matière survivals which are greatly distorted as to details.

Elements identifiable as being connected with the Church point to a degree of clerical influence in Ronsasvals midway between that of the Turpin and the Oxford. Strong enough evidence of poetic talent on the part of the author of Ronsasvals also suggests the probability of the monk-jongleur collaboration proposed by Joseph Bédier.

In addition to other implications of the three-fold study there is the suggestion that a foreign version, such as Ronsasvals, not tied to the Church like the Turpin, and not bound by patriotism like the Oxford, tended to reveal,
with respect to the main characters, attitudes not found in either the Oxford or Turpin traditions.

It is felt that the main, or underlying value in research as demonstrated by this study is that much Roland research has long held too closely to the investigation of those manuscripts which are all close cousins and which involve copying of written manuscripts related to 0, and that important keys to some old Roland mysteries lie in studying the versions such as Ronsasvals outside of the main stream of Roland legend.
CHAPTER I
The Problem

The Roland legend has probably received more scholarly attention during the past century and a third than any other phase of the Old French chansons de geste. But in spite of these studies and even such monumental works as those of Gaston Paris, Joseph Bédier, Léon Gautier, and Prosper Boissonnade, among others, a greater part of the initially perceived mysteries have persisted.

A publication of most of the Roland texts begun in 1940 by Raoul Mortier, has undoubtedly revived considerable interest in Roland problems and would account for the more recent wave of investigations on the subject. Along with this valuable material made available by Mortier, the publication of Ronsasvals and Roland à Saragosse by Mario Roques with subsequent commentaries by the same author, have opened new doors into Roland studies and have revitalized the matter by bringing fresh light upon the Provençal and Italian traditions. Menéndez Pidal in 1959 brought to the fore pertinent evidence concerning the Spanish role in the Old French epic; and his work, La Chanson de Roland y el neotradicionalismo, (which contains an admirable résumé of all the major and minor theories of the origins of the French epic) presents a persuasive rejuvenation of many elements in Gaston Paris' "traditionalism." The most recent major study of the Roland material is


6 Mario Roques, "Ronsasvals, poème épique provençal," Romania, LVIII (1932), 1-38, 161-189.


8 See BIBLIOGRAPHY for complete list of Roques' publications pertinent to these two manuscripts.

9 Ramón Menéndez Pidal, La Chanson de Roland y el neotradicionalismo (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1959).
that by André de Mandach.

Mortier, in his edition of the Roland texts, has said regarding the Carmen de prodicione guenonis, the Chronicle of Turpin, and the Ronsasvals, that these versions represent another form of the Roland legend, issuing from other traditions. It is precisely the divergency of this group which beckons to the Roland researcher. As André Burger has suggested regarding studies of the Turpin: "Les passages concordants n'enseignent rien, ils sont tous suspects de n'être que des emprunts à la chanson; ce sont les passages divergents qui sont intéressants:"

What is the nature and origin of this divergency?

Mortier declares:

"Les traditions que représentent le Carmen, le Turpin ou le Ronsasvals peuvent bien s'apparenter à la Chanson de Roland ou à son prototype. Ces poèmes peuvent en être l'écho, mais un écho qui se répète avec un autre accent. Le thème littéraire que leur offrait la Chanson de Roland, des poètes, des écrivains ont pu le développer à leur guise...Quelle est la part d'imitation, quelle est la part d'invention dans ces trois œuvres?"

In the same year of Mortier's publications of the texts, Mario Roques published a study on a few of the "rare" items in the Ronsasvals, in which he pointed out some elements of "imitation" of sources outside the realm of the Oxford Roland

---

and indicated the possibility of other elements of "invention." Roques concludes that Ronsasvals seems to be
"...un maillon de la chaîne qui relie les romans de chevalerie italiens aux romans épiques français...

Indeed it should be emphasized that the Carmen, Turpin and Ronsasvals differ more sharply from the main body of metrical Roland versions than Mortier's statements indicate. The remaniements of O are, compared to the aforementioned trio, rather closely related cousins or offspring of O or its prototype. Numerous studies of the remaniements in particular and of the Roland material in general, have pointed to details of phonology, metric variations and minutiae. This has perhaps been due to the desire to establish a critical text. In any case this tendency for confinement has led to excessive consideration of those texts which resemble O more closely.

--

13 Mario Roques, "Ronsasvals, poème épique provençal," troisième article, Romania, LXVI (1941), 433-480.
14 Ibid. p. 476.
15 The relationship between O and the Remaniements plus V4, K and n needs to be clarified. Indeed, it is a particular point of this study, in order to establish some of its main arguments, to affirm the closeness of the relationship. The term Remaniements is employed by most Roland scholars to include V7, C, P, L, T, and fl. These have also been designated as the Beta group as well as the Roman de Roncevaux. Since much of the present study deals with a comparison of Tu and R to O as well as to the offspring of O, the term remaniements will refer to all metrical versions closely related to the Oxford Ms., specifically V4, V7, C, P, T, L, fl, K and n. Remaniements (capital R) will refer only to the traditional Beta group.
The following data indicate the high percentage of close line-by-line agreement between 0 and the remaniements.

1. **Venice** 4, 6011 lines. 3000 concur with 0. Of this number, nearly 2000 are identical.

2. **Châteauroux**, (nearly identical with V7) 8002 lines. 3010 concur with 0. 2033 are nearly identical.

3. **Paris**, 6831 lines. 1830 concur with 0. 1138 are almost identical. From line 4757 to the end of the poem, 74 out of 84 laisses correspond to V4.

4. **Lyon**, 2933 lines. 1400 concur with 0. 1160 agree with the Remaniements.

5. **Cambridge**, 5705 lines. 1700 concur with 0. From line 3405 to the end, there is concordance with one or all of the following: V4, C, V7, P, L, fl, with the exception of only six laisses.

6. **Lorraine Fragments**, (a) Michelant, 347 lines. It concurs with 0 between 0 3327-3554; (b) Lavergne, 108 lines. It concurs with 0 2056-2286.

7. **Konrad**, 9094 lines. 1900 concur with 0; 140 with V4 and 75 with C. Additional lines are probably Konrad's embellishment of the text.

8. **Karolusmagnussaga**, branch VII, is nearly a literal translation of 0 to line 2570. This version lacks the Baligant episode.

The **Turpin** and the **Ronsasvals**, on the other hand, are distinguished from the preceding manuscripts by their com-
parative lack of close concordance with the Oxford Ms. The Turpin, of course, cannot be profitably compared for physical resemblance of lines since it is written in prose, and, one may add, a journalistic style rather typical of medieval chronicles. The close resemblances (in varying degrees) between Ronsasvals and Oxford involve a scant twenty-seven lines from R. The following is a summary of all such comparisons which have been discovered:

**O 1059**  "Cumpainz Rollant, l'olifan car sunez: Si l'orrat Carles, ferat l'ost returner Succurat nos li reis od tut sun barnet."

**R 528**  Fe que.m deves, vostre graylle sonas: Si o aus Karle ho mans homes honratz, Socorra nos, car grans es son barnatz.

**O 1767**  Naimes li due l'oïd, si l'escultent li Franc Ce dist li reis: "Jo oi le corn Rollant! 1780  Pur un sul leve fa tute jur cornant.

**R 936**  Karle l'auzi e Nayme de Bavier. 931  Dis l'emperayre: "Yeau aus Rollan cornier. 951  Que per una lebre que mena am sos chins Sona son graylle tant fort ses gaboys."

**O 2000**  "Sire cumpain, faites le vos de gred? 2002  Par nule guise ne m'aviez desfiet!"

**R 1016**  Vos mi degras desfizar en premier; Vos estes fols, voles vos reneyer?

**O 2371**  Que jo ai fait des l'ure que nez fui

**R 1367**  Ni receuput de l'ora qu'ieu fuy natz;

---

Note that some of the lines in the following comparison are not consecutive. Their order has been purposely rearranged to demonstrate the close resemblances.
Charles' laments over Roland in R show many vague similarities with his laments in O; the following five lines show the greatest relationship with five lines of R:

O 2911 De plusurs regnes vendrunt li hume estrange;
Demanderunt: "U est li quens cataignes?"
Jo lur dirrai qu'il est morz en Espaigne.
A grant dulur tendrai puis mun reialme:
Jamais n'ert jur que ne plur ne n'en pleigne."

R 1515 Cant mi veyran las donnas ses duptansa
E diran mi per lur bona amistansa:
"On es Rollan ni.l barnage de Fransa?"
E yeu diray que mort es ses duptansa,
Partira mi lo cor, cant n'auray renembransa.

The following lines are taken from Roland's speech to Durendal in O. Somewhat similar are two lines from R, but the latter are delivered by Charles.

O 2316 "E! Durendal, cum es bele, e clere, e blanche!
Cuntre soleill si luises e reflambes!

R 1603 Karle l'esgarda, contra.l solelh resplant:
"Ay! Durendart, bona espeya trenchant,

Note these other miscellaneous pairs of comparable items:

O 2935 Ki tei ad mort France ad mis en exill.

R 1574 Cel que vos ha mort, con ho poc el anc fayre;

O 1750 Enfuerunt (nos) en aitres de musters;
N'en mangerunt ne lu ne porc ne chen."

R 1121 E totz los cors que soterrar fassan,
Que lops ni cans non los an devourant,
Corps ni voutors ni aucels cayronant.
It should be noted at this point that while Ronsasvals, Turpin and the Carmen have been grouped together, it is not to be inferred that any substantial relationships have been adequately established among them. They have been put on common ground by Mortier and others principally because of a common negative value: they are all three separated from Oxford and the remaniements by a gulf of significant extent and nature.

Until a better chart is devised, Mortier's Table proposé de filiation is a useful instrument for bringing the problem of the general relationships of all principle Roland versions into focus.

17 Raoul Mortier, op. cit., I, viii.
The following is an incomplete summary of this table, including probable dating.

The *Carmen de prodicione guenonis* (highly disputed dating: end of the 11th to the middle of the 13th Century), the *Chronicle of Turpin* (1150) and its French translation (early part of the 13th Century), and the *Ronsasvals* (14th Century) are shown as a group stemming from a version previous to the prototype of the *Oxford*.

*Venice 4* (14th Century) and the *Karolus magnussaga* (beginning of the 13th Century) stem from the prototype of *O*. The *Konrad* (1130) and its direct offspring, *Karl der Grosse* and *Karl Meinet* (both beginning of the 13th Century) also stem from the prototype of *O*.

The so-called *Beta group* (*V7, C, P, T, L and fl*) are shown in another cluster also stemming from the prototype of *O*. *Venice 7* (end of the 13th Century) and *Châteauroux* (beginning of the 14th Century) are grouped together and are related laterally to *P, T, L and fl*. *Paris* (end of the 13th Century), *Lyon* (beginning of the 14th Century), *Cambridge* (14th Century) and the *Lorraine Fragments* (end of the 13th to the 15th Century) are grouped together and are related laterally to *V7* and *C*.

The *Oxford* (1130-1132) is shown to be a copy of a lost prototype of the end of the 11th Century.

The present study concurs with the above general lines of Mortier's table, but as subsequent findings and statements will show, the area of the *Carmen*, *Turpin* and *Ronsasvals* needs
certain fundamental modifications both as to statements on "common sources" as well as on lateral relationships. Moreover, some additional sources and contaminations must be added and clearer relationships established between the Oxford, Turpin and Ronsasvals. Indeed, Mortier's contention that Turpin and Ronsasvals stem from a common point will be challenged vigorously by the evidence presented. In connection with this matter a Revised table of affiliation of OTuR will be offered as a part of the CONCLUSION.

It should be noted that the dates presented by Mortier are, in many cases, subject to discussion. The Konrad, for instance, has been revised by Martín de Riquer to 1170, and the same author has placed the Oxford at the same date. The present study, however, will concern itself specifically as to dating, only to the Ronsasvals.

The three versions with which this study will be particularly concerned are the Oxford, the Chronicle of Turpin and Ronsasvals. The precise editions employed in the study are the following:


19 Ibid. p. 53.
Although the present study centers principally upon the above three versions, the following have been consulted extensively, especially in those passages which Mortier designates as lacking concordance with Oxford:


The following have been consulted in reference to the Galien element in Ronsasvals:

**Il viaggio di Carlo Magno in Ispagna**, Galien li restorés, and the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*.

Works especially observed through critical studies are: Karl der Grosse, Karl Meinet, Karolusmagnussaga, and the *Carmen de prodicione Guenonis*.

While a great many details of the action as well as of static elements in the Oxford, Turpin and Ronsasvals will be taken up and discussed in subsequent concordances and categorical analyses, narrative summaries of the three versions would provide the reader with a better picture of the problem of investigation and make these analyses more meaningful.

---

A hitherto unknown Roland fragment called manuscript (B) should be noted here, even though it has not been included in the comparisons of this study. See Fanni Bogdanow, "Un fragment méconnu de la Chanson de Roland," *Romania*, LXXI (1960), 500-520.
It is not, however, intended to provide summaries of all three, but only that of Ronsasvals, undoubtedly the least well-known of these. The Oxford is probably quite familiar to most; however, an excellent and rather detailed account of it is given by Jenkins in his edition of the Roland. Jules Horrent has provided an adequate summary of the Turpin.

As far as is known at this writing, only two prose accounts of Ronsasvals have been published; one by Mario Roques as an introduction to his edition of the text, and a short, sketchy summary by Jesse Crosland.

The following summary of Ronsasvals will interest all Roland students who are not familiar with the unique and at times odd aspects of this version:

It is the month of May. Juzian, a nephew of Marsile, approaches his uncle beseeching him to grant him Chartres, the city of Roland, which city, he declares, belonged at one time to his (Juzian's) family. Marsile tries to discourage his impetuous nephew from facing the valor and

23 "Ronsasvals, poème épique provençal," Romania, LVIII (1932), 1-7.
might of Roland and the Twelve Peers. Marsile finally succumbs to Juzian's pleas, offers his nephew the glove. Juzian vows that he will bring back Roland's head or forsake Mohammed.

Juzian's men dress him in fine armor and a green helmet. His sword is a mate to Roland's, both having been made at the forge of Galan, then thrown into the sea by giants, and later recovered by magic. Marsile had captured one of these swords from Aygolant and had given it to Juzian.

Juzian and the Saracens charge into battle. Estout de Lingres kills Juzian by striking through the latter's shield and a gap in his coat of mail. Estout takes the arms and armor from the dead Juzian and equips his nephew, Jauceran.

Saracens and Persians battle "Alemans" and Bavarians on the cursed day that Ganelon sold out the French because of the "erguelh" of Roland. By Ganelon's ruse, the Twelve Peers were betrayed. There follows a list of famous swords figuring in the battle. Fifteen thousand Saracens are killed, but the French lose not a buckle or a piece of harness. Night falls.

A Saracen "mot ergulhos e fier," and leading 20,000 men, approaches and taunts the French for some thirteen lines beginning:

"Fuges, Frances, Dieu vos don encombriers.
Gayne vos ha vendut trastotz los .XIJ. biers;

---
25 Ronsasvals, 83.
26 Ibid., 85-95.
27 Ibid., 110.
28 Ibid., 123-135.
Roland spurs his horse Malmatin, splits the Saracen's green helmet with Durendal. Roland cries: "Fires, Frances, lurs es le colps premier. Aysso dura, non ho poyran durier."

One sees there the twelve swords whirling on the battlefield. There are many blows with much breaking of lances and shedding of blood. They battle all day until late afternoon. Night falls and not one of the 20,000 has returned. The French eat and drink. Turpin admonishes them all to confess and to die in such a way as to receive God's pardon. They sleep all night and in the morning, Turpin chants the mass.

It is in May on a Tuesday morning before the Pentecost. Roland and others offer gifts to the sanctuary. The army assembles and Roland calls for Durendal which is brought to him wrapped in costly cloth.

Turpin asks Roland what he has seen outside, to which Roland replies that he has seen such a great army as never before witnessed, and that it will be a harsh battle. Turpin tells Roland to shut up and that they, the French, will fight furiously.

Roland, on hearing Turpin's fighting words, praises the latter saying there never has been a priest who knew better

---

29 Ronsasvals, 148-149.
30 This appears to be an error in time by the poet or copyist. The passing of night has never been indicated.
31 There is ambiguity here. Both Saracens and French have 20,000 at this point. To which does it refer?
32 Note that this marks the third day of battle, a radical departure from all other Rolands.
33 Note Turpin's apparent command of the French.
how to preach and to fight.

Turpin continues to harangue the men telling them they will all perish in a battle such as never was seen before. He preaches on the sacrifice of Christ and how they must die valiantly so that God will pardon them on Judgement Day.

Turpin declares that he wants to have his banner bloody:

"Yeu que suy preyres e evesque eyssament,
En vuelh aver mon goffaron sagnent."

Turpin preaches further to the men telling them about meeting Jesus on Judgement Day. Christ died for them; now they must die for Him.

Gast Navalier asks Turpin for the first blow of the battle. Turpin tells him to shut up, that Roland will have the first blow. Navalier replies that if any lesser than Roland were involved, he would cut off that person's head.

Turpin asks Angelier whether he has a girl-friend. He answers, yes, Madame Sainte-Marie. Turpin compliments him for it.

The Twelve Peers arm in their tents. There are 20,000 men in all. Naymon, a relative of Marsile, comes forth with 25,000 men. At this point, there is a detailed description of Naymon, his horse and his armor. Naymon taunts the French saying that Ganelon has betrayed them. Roland charges forth and kills the pagan.

The French kill all the Saracens in this wave, and lose four hundred Frenchmen.

---

34 Ronsasvals 263-264.
The Emir de Frontals leads 30,000 Saracens. The French lose 1500 men and 500 horses. A description of Turpin follows. Turpin rides forth and slays the Emir, Frontals.

Bossiran, another Saracen Emir, now taunts the French. He has 25,000 men. He tells the French that they are betrayed. Angelier slays Bossiran.

The Saracen Amalroc attacks. A description of the horse and costly arms of Amalroc follows. Turpin holds confession for the men again. Roland attacks, killing Amalroc. A great skirmish ensues. Twelve thousand are killed on both sides, i.e. 10,000 Saracens and 2,000 French.

Olivier asks Roland to blow the horn. Roland refuses saying he will not blow it for pagans as a hunter blows for the wild boar (senglar). Cauligon charges. Gandelbuon kills him. They fight until nightfall.

Roland is in his tent, on a Tuesday evening. Only thirty Frenchmen remain alive. Turpin improvises a chapel. The next morning he gives them confession. Roland decides to send Gandelbuon to reconnoitre to determine how strong the Saracen army is. Gandelbuon estimates that there are 60,000 pagans and that each Frenchmen, therefore, will have to give battle to 2,000 of the enemy.

---

35 Ronsasvals 533. In 0, Roland's three refusals each contains the remark that his sword will be "sanglant"? (0 1056, 1079, 1067, ensanglentet). It is tempting to speculate that "sanglant" might have been distorted by faulty transmission into "senglar."

36 This is the eve of the fourth and final day of battle.
In the Saracen camp, Marsile asks Gilan (Angelan?) why the Saracens with their superior numbers haven't killed all the French. Gilan tells him that there is a devil there called Roland who is doing them great damage. Marsile gives Falsabron, another of his nephews, sixty thousand men and orders him to destroy the remaining Frenchmen. When Falsabron sees Jauceran wearing Juzian's armor, he kills the former in a rage. Estout de Lingres tries to avenge the death of his nephew, Jauceran, but he, too, is killed by Falsabron. Roland tries to pursue Falsabron, but the latter's horse is too fast. Roland kneels at the bodies of Estout and Jauceran, tells them to take the message to heaven that he (Roland) will be there without delay. Falsabron kills Garnier de Termes. Roland, again unable to catch the Saracen, tells the dead Garnier that he will be in heaven at bed-time. Falsabron kills Salamons and Savaric. Roland makes the same sort of promises to each.

(At this point, Mario Roques has indicated a lacuna in the text of some four hundred lines).

Galien, son of Olivier, enters Charles' camp. This event occurs two days before the present time of the battle. After Galien identifies himself, Charles knights him and provides him with arms and one hundred men.

---

37 Ronsasvals 679-684.
38 The whole matter of Galien will be taken up in some detail in CHAPTER IV.
Back at Rencesvals, Olivier asks Roland again to sound his horn. Roland refuses, giving about the same reasons as at the first request. Olivier reminds Roland that he may never see Aude, his wife, again. When Roland hears this, he decides to sound the trumpet. The blast is so loud that it kills all the birds which hear it seven leagues away. When Charles hears the sound, Ganelon tries to minimize its importance and speaks out against the pride and folly of Roland. Charles suddenly becomes aware of Ganelon's treachery and promises the latter a horrible fate. Naimes orders Ganelon held and guarded by thirteen counts. If Ganelon escapes, these counts are to be deprived of their lands and Ganelon is to have his members cut off. Ganelon denies all guilt, says he has never sold anyone out and he even reproaches Naimes for having accused him.

Here Olivier uses Aude to persuade Roland to blow the horn. In 0, he tells Roland he shall never have Aude if he blows the horn (0 1721) --precisely the opposite reasoning.

Mario Roques in his résumé, of the Ronsasvals states that "dans cet effort, Roland fait éclater les veines de son cou." (Romania,LVIII (1932), 4.); but a search of the text gives no clear indication of such an idea. Roland (R 925-936) sounds his horn so loudly that the noise kills all the birds which hear it:

R-925: "De tal vertut vay lo graylle sonier
926 Que li aucels que l'auziron sonier,
927 La vos del graylle lur fes lo cor crebier,
928 E las venas del cor si vay trenchier:
929 Lo sanc del cor li vay per lo gravier."

In a second blowing (934-935) the blast breaks the horn itself. Unless we arbitrarily interpret line 929 above to refer to Roland, we must maintain that the cause of Roland's being near death here is never stated in Ronsasvals.
Galien and his knights arrive at Rencesvals. Olivier, at that moment is struck by Orgelin. Olivier, dazed by the blow, strikes Roland by mistake. Roland reproaches his friend for this act; Olivier asks to be forgiven. Roland meets Galien and takes the latter to his father, Olivier. Orgelin strikes Olivier a mortal blow. Galien kills Orgelin in revenge.

Gandelbuon, horribly wounded, arrives on the scene. Roland, who is now near death, asks the former to place him upon a little stone there. Roland sends Gandelbuon to Charles with news of the disaster. On the way to Charles, Gandelbuon meets Garin de Sayna who is leading a troop of three thousand "Alamans." Gandelbuon asks the latter for a fresh horse, but Garin refuses:

"So non farem niant," without any explanation for his refusal.

Gandelbuon brings Charles the news of the disaster at Rencesvals. Charles and the army set out for the scene of battle. Roland, alone at Rencesvals, confesses and lies down to die. A Saracen, Alimon, approaches to attack the prostrate Roland; but Falceron, "un Sarrazin cortes," who

41 Ronsasvals 1157.
42 The text states he is afraid to die. R 1307.
43 Ronsasvals 1381. Mario Roques identifies Falsabron, the nephew of Marsile as differing from the Falceron here who protects Roland. See Romania LVIII (1932) 186. This whole matter will be discussed subsequently in CHAPTER III.
respects Roland for being a great warrior, reproaches Alimon forbidding him to strike Roland. Alimon, heedless of the warnings of Falceron, strikes Roland, piercing his chest as he lies upon the stone. Falceron holds Roland's head and comforts him until he is forced to flee because of the approach of Charles' army.

Charles arrives and grieves at length over Roland's body. Through Charles' prayer the sun is stopped for three days to allow time for the burials. Charles says a brief farewell to Durendal and casts it into a lake. He confesses having begotten Roland sinfully by his sister. A jongleur, Portajoyas, comes forth and grieves so much over the death of Turpin that he falls dead. A lion appears on the battlefield, sorts out the Christians' bodies and brings them all to one spot. Charles orders all to be buried except the Peers who will be taken back to France. On his return to France, Charles tries to hide Roland's death from Aude, but Aude, who has already been told of the disaster by a pilgrim, forces Charles to tell the truth. She goes to Roland and embraces his body so hard that her heart fails. Charles orders the bodies of Roland and Aude to be embalmed and buried in the same monastery.

---

Barroux, in his translation (Mario Roques, op. cit. Tome III, P.143) seems to have misinterpreted the action here when he assumes Alimon to be striking Barbarot, a Frenchman. Barbarot is, as Roques indicates, Alimon's horse. See Ronsasvals 1402-5.

Roland, in any case is near death before this blow from not clearly stated causes.
This, in essence, is the Ronsasvals version of the Roland, and one can readily perceive, even from this brief résumé, numerous departures from the traditions of the Oxford and the remaniements. The action and other elements will be expanded further in the subsequent Concordances where essential elements of the Oxford and the Turpin will also be outlined.

The present study encompasses the general problem suggested by Mortier, i.e. How are the versions of the Roland such as the Turpin and Ronsasvals related to Oxford or its prototype? The work of Mario Roques on the Ronsasvals will be re-examined and expanded and the findings will include a revised picture of OTuR relationships that will modify Mortier's Table proposé de filiation in that area.

The presentation of materials will include a series of OTuR concordances of proper names, plot and selected matières, plus a number of categorical comparisons along with other evidence found in Tu and especially in the Ronsasvals which will reflect upon the nature of Q itself as well as upon an Ur-Roland.

A particular study of Turpin in itself or a direct comparison of Turpin to Oxford is not intended specifically; these studies have undergone ample treatment by various authors. Several titles of such works will be noted in the BIBLIOGRAPHY. The Turpin has been included here principally

---

See note 17, this chapter.
to provide perspective to the main interest: a comparison of Oxford with Ronsasvals.

Some of the key questions and problems relative to the present study are the following:

1. While Ronsasvals contains only some twenty-seven lines which appear to be identifiable with Oxford, how can one explain the presence of these at all when the bulk of the Provençal poem shows such radical departures from the traditions?

2. How was the Ronsasvals version transmitted? Orally? By manuscript? By what sort of author or copyist?

3. While Ronsasvals shows episodic connections with some Italian works, Galiens and the remaniements, how is it that the latter works show considerable direct knowledge of traditions while Ronsasvals indicates quite the contrary?

4. How can the "distortions" in Ronsasvals be explained in terms of transmission? What part of these variations is due to oral transmission, to other sources, or to subjective modification?

5. What relationships, if any, can be established between Turpin and Ronsasvals?

6. Does the three-way comparison (OTuR) justify in any way the André Burger and Menéndez Pidal theories on the Ur-Roland?

---

47 André Burger, "La légende de Roncevaux avant la Chanson de Roland," Romania, LXX (1948-49), 433-473. See also note 6, P. 129.
7. What would the findings here suggest as to the existence of a Provençal epic tradition?

The point should be made clear that, in attacking these and other problems, the technique in research has been to examine (after having established all obvious positive concordances) those areas in the remaniements, as well as in the Turpin and Ronsasvals, which show substantial divergency from 0. For the most part, the study has been approached on the basis of ideas or matières rather than on outward, physical resemblances. This search through matières, however, is a two-way street, for it has upon occasion, revealed secondarily, near physical similarities which would otherwise have gone unnoticed.
CHAPTER II
Les matières

Concordances of nearly identical and of readily identifiable lines for the Remaniements, K and V4 are designated by Mortier in his edition of the texts. Such marginal notation has not been provided for the Carmen, Turpin and Ronsasvals although the latter contains a few scattered footnotes along with the Barroux translation.

The following Oxford, Turpin and Ronsasvals concordances are of two main types: (1) A concordance of names of persons involved in the action; and two categorical lists dealing with sword and horse names; (2) A concordance of the action selected on the basis of idea.

Names of persons

The concordance of names is complete except for two categories: all names classified as classical, geographical or of Biblical reference are omitted; names of parents

2 Ibid., Tome III, 118-150.
or lords of fighting men at Rencesvals are omitted if these persons themselves are not at the battle or in Charles' army. Six names in Ronsasvals which are not in the action are included because they have particular bearing on connections between the three texts. These names are marked with an asterisk (*).

Further markings are the following:

(S) Saracens
(P) Pagans
MTL Not in the Langlois table (manque table langlois)
? Names about which there is notable discussion or doubt.

Numbers in parentheses to the right of a name indicate that there are two or more such names which may or may not be intended to be the same person.

Names in parentheses indicate certain names which are graphically different but which may correspond in character or other matière; or names which are the same graphically but which may not be of the same origin.

Spelling of names is given as the name appears in the particular text used in this study. Except in special cases, only one form of the name is given. The names are listed alphabetically within the manuscript combination in which they are found, so designated by symbols O, Tu and R.

---

3 e.g. Burdel, Malcud, Oedun of Oxford.
4 The geography in O has been discussed numerous times. Boissonnade (op. cit.), for example, defends its authenticity; but Menéndez Pidal believes the contrary. There is scarcely any amount of geographical mention in R and Tu to merit comparison with the abundance of such references in O. It is of some importance, perhaps, that both R and Tu mention Saint Jacques de Compostelle, a departure from O.

Biblical references abound in O but are scarce in Tu and R, offering in fact, little for comparison.

### Table I

Concordance of names of persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(OTuR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Otes, Attun ?</td>
<td>Attes, Estouz</td>
<td>Estout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Berengers ?</td>
<td>Berengiers</td>
<td>Berenguier (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Karlemaines</td>
<td>Karle (Mayne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Guenelun</td>
<td>Ganelon</td>
<td>Gayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marsilie (S)</td>
<td>Marsiles (S)</td>
<td>Marcili (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Naimes</td>
<td>Naismes</td>
<td>Nayme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OTu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Oger</td>
<td>Ogiers</td>
<td>Augier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>Olivier</td>
<td>Olivier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rollant</td>
<td>Rolant</td>
<td>Rollan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sansun</td>
<td>Sances</td>
<td>Sampson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Turpins</td>
<td>Turpin</td>
<td>Turpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Baldwin ?</td>
<td>Baudoins</td>
<td>(Gandelbuon ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Baligant(S)?</td>
<td>Baliganz (S)</td>
<td>(Father of Juz-ian ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gerers</td>
<td>Geliers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gerin</td>
<td>Gelins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gaifers</td>
<td>Gaifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ivon</td>
<td>Yvorins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Milun ?</td>
<td>Milon7</td>
<td>(Milon ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pinabel</td>
<td>Pinabiaus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tierris</td>
<td>Tierri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yvoerlies, Ivoirie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Alde ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Engelers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Angeliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Falsaron (S)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Falsabron (S) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jozeran ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jauceran (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gualters?) 26</td>
<td>Arrastans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrastat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gualters?) 27</td>
<td>Gautiers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gautier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Gondrebues</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gandelbuon ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Salemons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salamons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Andre de Mandach, in listing common names of OTu, omits Gaifers and Milun, (op. cit., P. 152), but they are found in the manuscripts used including both the French and Latin versions of the Turpin. See Raoul Mortier, op. cit., Tome III, 82-83.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abisme (S)</td>
<td>Acelin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Acelin</td>
<td>Aelroth (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Almacurs de Moriane</td>
<td>Almaris (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Almaris (S)</td>
<td>Alphairen (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Amborres</td>
<td>Anseis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Antelme</td>
<td>Aestorje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Amurafles de Balaguez (S)</td>
<td>Basbrun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Besgun</td>
<td>Bevon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Blandandrins (S) ?</td>
<td>Bramimunde (S) ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Canabeus (S)</td>
<td>Canelius (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Chernubles (S)</td>
<td>Clarien (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Clarien (S)</td>
<td>Clarifan (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Clarin (S)</td>
<td>Climborins (S) ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Corsablix (S)</td>
<td>Dapamort (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Dapamort (S)</td>
<td>Escremiz (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Escremiz (S)</td>
<td>Espaneliz (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Esprières (S)</td>
<td>Esprières (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Esturganç (S)</td>
<td>Esturganç (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Esturguz (S)</td>
<td>Esturguz (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Esturmarin (S)</td>
<td>Eudropin (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Eudropin (S)</td>
<td>Faldrun (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Faldrun (S)</td>
<td>Flurit (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Flurit (S)</td>
<td>Galafes (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Gebuin</td>
<td>Gefreid d'Anjou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Gefreid d'Anjou</td>
<td>Gemalfin (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Gerart de Rossillon</td>
<td>Godselmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Godselmes</td>
<td>Grandonies (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Grandonies (S)</td>
<td>Qualters de l'Hum ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Falsabron?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Qualters de l'Hum ?</td>
<td>Guarlan (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Guarlan (S)</td>
<td>Guiun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Guiun</td>
<td>Guinémán</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Guinémán</td>
<td>Hamon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Hamon</td>
<td>Henri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Henri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Turpin</td>
<td>Ronsasvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Hermans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Jouner (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Jurlaleu (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Justin (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Machiner (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Maheu (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Malbien (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Malduit (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Malprimis (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Malquiant (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Maltraienn (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Malun (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Marcules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Marganices (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Margariz (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Nevelun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Priamun (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Rabel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Rembalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Richard li velz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Siglorel (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Sulians (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Tedbald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Timozel (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Torleu (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Turgis de Turteluse (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Valdabrungs (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Willalme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Auberis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Begues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Berarz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Estormiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Garins de Loherene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Guinarz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Hernauz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Hoiaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Lamberz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Renauz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Aygolant (P)* (Agolan (P) ?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Alimon (S)MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Amalroc (S)MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Aybelina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Aysseleneta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Baracla (P)MTL ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Barbaron</td>
<td>Nicolau (MTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>Ronsasvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Turpin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Baynant (S)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Belmiant (S)MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Bossiran (S)MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Cauligon (S)MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Estout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Guilhalmier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Falceron (S) ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Frontals (S) ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Gabaut (P)*MTL ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Gaete MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Galant *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Galian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Galibot MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Garin de Sayna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Garin ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Giborga ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Gilan (Angelan)MTL (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Guilhelme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Guizon, Gui, Gis ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Horonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Juzian (S) ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Maladori (S) ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Maradan (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Mion MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Navalier MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Naymon (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Orgelin (S)MTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Portajoyas MTL ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Simon ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is readily notable that 0, without other qualifications, contains far more characters which are active than either Tu or R; but of course, the difference in length of the three works must be considered. The Oxford consists of some thirty thousand words; Turpin, in the section dealing with Rencesvals, about ten thousand; and R with 1802 lines is about half the size of 0.
Oxford has 102 persons in the above list; Tu has 36 and
R has 54, thus, proportionally, all three are of approximately
the same density. The classification of the characters, how­
ever, is a different matter. O has nearly twice the percen­
tage of pagans as R and almost seven times the number in Tu.
Note the following table:

Table II
Ratio of Christians to Saracens in OTuR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pagans</th>
<th>% Pagans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53 1/2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turpin</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 1/2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronsasvals</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One might expect that the Baligant episode of O (missing
in Tu and R) would account for the far greater number of
Saracens in that version. However, the passage in question
accounts for only nine new Saracen names.

The first eleven names are common to all three versions.
The most interesting aspect of these names is their exclusion
of Baligant, Thierry and Pinabel, Baldewin, Aude, Blancandrins,
and Bramimonde among the most notable, which bring important
implications concerning the common source of OTuR.

The common names of OTu number twenty-one, or twice as
many as OTuR while common groups for Turpin-Ronsasvals and
Oxford-Ronsasvals number only four each. On the basis of
names alone, then, it would appear that O and Tu spring from
more immediate common prototype and that Ronsasvals shows
more substantial connections to a source previous to the OTu
model, a position which will be strengthened by subsequent
concordances and comparisons.
The last three groups of names (30-106), (107-117), (118-152) indicate names found exclusively in each of O, Tu and R. The most significant thing to note here is that Ronsasvals contains fifteen names (marked MTL) not found in any other chansons de geste.

Names bearing question marks, numbers in parentheses and those names in parentheses seemingly appearing out of place have been singled out for various reasons. While it is not intended to pursue an extensive name study here some attention and a few remarks should be made regarding these items. Otes, Attun, Estout et al. have been marked because of uncertain identity, not only between manuscripts but within single versions. T. A. Jenkins lists Otes and Attun separately, yet certain orthographies in the O Ms. itself would warrant single identity. Berengers in O is one of the Twelve Peers, in Tu he is just a name and in R he is Turpin's deacon. Are we dealing here with two different models or simply with distortions of transmission? Baldewin of O is assumed to be just a boy back home in France. In Tu he is a full-grown knight and plays an important part in the battle: namely, he carries the message of the disaster to Charles. The name of Gandelbuon has been inserted opposite Baldewin-Baudoins because of evidence warranting such identification. This matter will be discussed under "Hidden matières" in CHAPTER III. Baligant and the insertion (Father of Juzian?)

---

T. A. Jenkins, La Chanson de Roland (Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1924), cf. p. 292; also 0, 795. V4 (1297) has Astolfo who would be identified with Estout of R.
refers to a possible implication that Baligant was known to the author of *Ronsasvals*, a matter also to be treated in "Hidden Matières." It may further be remarked that Baligant of 0 appears as the superior of Marsilie and is called in after the routing of the rear-guard. In the *Turpin*, Baliganz is the brother of Marsilie and is present at the battle from the start. Miolon of *R* is designated by Roques as not identifiable with Milun of the *Table Langlois* but one wonders whether he may not be identified with the Milun-Milon, son of Garin de Monglane and uncle of Olivier and Aude. This notion is further enhanced by the fact that Miolon of *R* is one of great importance being listed as one of the Twelve Peers. The Alde-Auda matter will be treated subsequently concerning sources of *R* and omissions by Tu. Falsaron-Falsabron, Gandelbuon, Aelroth, Climborins, Grandonies, Malquiant, Gualters de l'Hum, Juzian and Valdabruns will all be discussed in "Hidden matières." Jozeran of 0 and Jauceran of *R* appear in such different circumstances in the two Ms. that doubt is evoked regarding their identification. Blancandrins and Bramimunde of 0 are unique to 0 in this study and bear upon theories regarding the Ur-Roland. Aygolant and Baynant will be discussed regarding sources, Falsaron in his connection with Falsabron, Frontals regarding connections between *Ronsasvals* and the *Remaniements*, Gabaut and Galian regarding the Galian episode. Has Giborga any connections with the wife of Guillaume d'Orange, or Garin with the Gerin-Gelins of OTu?
Names 106, 141, 144 and 152 challenge identification. Portajoyas (number 150) will be taken up as an item of special importance regarding sources and authorship of Ronsasvals.

Swords and horses

The comparison of horse names is only partial between the three versions, since Turpin offers no such examples, Ronsasvals only two, while Oxford gives ten; but there may be significant indications in the fact that proportions parallel those of character names: O has the most, R is second, and Tu has the least. Five of the ten horses of O are those of Saracens, approximately the O proportion of character names. Roland's horse in R is named Malmatin, a radical departure from O. Malmatin also appears in Roland à Saragosse.

Table III
Names of horses in OTuR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Barbamusche(Climborins)</td>
<td>11. Barbarot(Alimon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gaignun(Marsilie)</td>
<td>12. Malmatin(Rollan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gramimund(Valdabruns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marmorie(Grandonies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Passecerf(Gerers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Saltperdut(Malquiant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sorel(Gerin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tachebrun(Guenelun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tencendur(Charles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Veillantif(Rollant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mario Roques, Homenaje ofrecido a Menéndez Pidal (Madrid: Librería y Casa Editorial Hernando, 1925), III, 407-418. See also Romania, LXVII (1942-43), 289-330.
The Turpin mentions only one sword, Roland's famous Durendal. Ronsasvals shows a concordance of three with the Oxford, and has eight sword names not found in any other chanson de geste, another parallel with the two preceding tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Durendal (Rollant)</td>
<td>Durendal</td>
<td>Durendart (Rollan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Halteclere (Oliver)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Autaclara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Joiuse (Charles)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joyosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mort el camp (MTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bat servellas e cant (MTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Costana la valhant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aygradura la grant (MTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cortajoya (MTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lauzana la valhant (MTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fortana la prezant (MTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Magdalena la gran (MTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Forbeia la trenchant (MTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Almace (Turpin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Murglies (Guenelun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Preciuse (Baligant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the swords in Ronsasvals, only Durendart is identified within the poem as to its owner, namely, Rollan. However we need not doubt that Joyosa belongs to Charles; and it quite likely that Costana is the Cortain of Ogier (Ogers li Daneis- of O et al). Barroux, in his translation of R has omitted Cortajoya and Lauzana from the list. Since these two appear in the Provençal text on consecutive lines (91-92), it would appear to be a copying error on the part of Barroux.

Comparable and contrasting features of the action

The following concordance table should complement previous comparisons as well as the narrative résumé of the Ronsasvals version, and will in addition, greatly amplify the OTuR comparison.

Numbers in parentheses accompanying each matière indicate, in the case of O and R, the line where this action begins in that particular text. In the case of Turpin, the number indicates the page or pages on which the action occurs in the Mortier edition.

Oxford's order of events has been maintained in this table. Where it has been necessary to change the order of any event in Tu or R, this item will be underlined to warn the reader that it is out of place. This arrangement will provide two sorts of information: (a) where Tu or R have changed the order with respect to O, and (b) a graphic comparison of OTuR matières regardless of order. Both types of information are valuable to this study.

Where matières have been identified on parallels, it is not intended in every case that they be taken as identical. In some instances, only one element in the whole unit is being considered. For example, in item 59 Roland, in O ranges the dead peers at the feet of Turpin. In R, a lion

\footnote{op, cit., Tome III., 1-104.}

\footnote{The author of O, of course, may also have altered his source.}
brings the bodies of all the Christians to one spot. Obvious elements of this pair of matières could well be cited as examples of great divergency between O and R; however, it is the element of collecting the bodies that is being considered as a comparable idea.

Where Oxford and Ronsasvals agree on an item missing in the Chronicle of Turpin, the term (omission?) has been placed in the Turpin column. The validity of this assumption of a Tu omission is not proposed here (although a few more remarks will be made concerning it in the CONCLUSION) with an aim to defend the point in itself, in spite of the fact that other specific studies of the Turpin offer defense of the position. The reason for making the assumption at all is that, considering the great probability of Turpin omissions, the failure to recognize them as such would seriously distort the picture of the Ur-Roland and would lead to a far greater extent of error.

Table V
Concordance of selected matières in OTuR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Charles, 7 years in Spain, has conquered all but Saragossa held by Marsile(2).</td>
<td>Charles conquered all Spain and Galicia except Saragossa where Marsile is(59, 61).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Marsile's council. Blancandrins suggests plan to deceive Charles(10).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Charles' council, discusses Marsile's offer(157).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Roland would reject proposals(193).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oxford

5 Ganelon opposes Roland, wants compromise (214).
6 Roland nominates Ganelon as messenger. Ganelon, furious, promises revenge. (274).
7 Ganelon and Blancandin plot to destroy Roland. (366).
8 Charles to return to Aix; Marsile to follow; Pagans to become Christians (38-694).
9 Gifts to Charles. (617).
10 Ganelon's costly presents (617).
11 Ganelon nominates Roland for rearguard (737).
12 Charles returns through pass of Cisaire (814).

Turpin

Ganelon messenger (61).

Ronsasvals

Ganelon as messenger mentioned (962-5).

Gifts alluded to (993).

Marsile to follow Charles; Pagans to become Christians. (61).

Gifts to Charles. (61).

Ganelon's costly presents (61).

By advice of Ganelon, Charles commands Roland and others to remain at Rencesvals (61).

Charles returns through pass of Cizaire (61).

Many of rearguard get drunk, cavort with Saracen women. (61).

Saracens appear suddenly from woods, attack French (61-3).

Exempla and sermonizing about taking women along to battle. (63).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>Roland ties black Saracen to tree, later forces him to point out Marsile (65).</td>
<td>17 Juzian nephew of Marcili, boasts he will slay Roland (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td>Aelroth, nephew of Marsile, boasts he will slay Roland (860).</td>
<td>(Omission?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>Description of pagan nobles (374-993).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>Oliver sees pagan army coming (1017).</td>
<td>21 Estout de Lingres kills Juzian, gives latter's armor to son, Jauceran (66).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>Oliver asks Roland to sound horn; Roland refuses three times (1049).</td>
<td>(Omission?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>Turpin sermonizes French and blesses them (1124).</td>
<td>(Omission?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>Aelroth taunts, says French were sold out (1188).</td>
<td>(Omission?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>Falsaron tries to avenge nephew (1213).</td>
<td>(Omission?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>Personal combat (1235-1395).</td>
<td>(Limited examples).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roland sees pagan army coming (207).
Turpin tells Roland he will never marry Aude (230).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Great omens of evil in Charles' camp (1412).</td>
<td>31 Turpin praises French (1438).</td>
<td>28 Gast Navalier asks first blow of battle; Turpin gives it to Roland (305).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Turpin tells men they are doomed but promises them paradise (1510).</td>
<td>32 Turpin tells men to die bravely so God will pardon them (500).</td>
<td>29 Angelier kills Bossiron (470).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Personal combat (1526-1670).</td>
<td>33 (Some examples).</td>
<td>32 Turpin tells men to die bravely so God will pardon them (500).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 All but 60 French dead (1671).</td>
<td>34 (Omission?).</td>
<td>33 (Various examples more comparable to 0 than those of Tu).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Roland wants to blow horn but Oliver objects (1702).</td>
<td>35 (Omission?).</td>
<td>34 All but 30 French dead (562).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37 Falsabron kills Jauceron (721).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 Falsabron kills several French; his horse fast, Roland unable to catch him; Roland's promises to dead (730-820).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second proposal of Roland to blow horn. Oliver says if he blows he will not have Aude (1713).

Turpin advises Roland to blow horn so Charles will come to bury them, preventing wolves etc. from eating their bodies (1737).

Roland sends Gandelbuon to Charles with message to bury them so dogs, wolves etc. won't eat them (1115).

Roland blows horn; 100 Saracens come out of woods (65).

Prodigious blow by Roland cuts horse and rider in two (1644); many other great blows: (1198, 1326, 1370, 1584, 3615).

Prodigious blow by Roland cuts horse and rider in two (65).

Some strong blows but not identifiable with Tu or O (139, 407).

Marsile sees Roland and flees; Roland kills Marsile (65, 67).

Baligant flees when Marsile killed (67, 69).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Roland's blast heard 30 leagues away; blood from mouth and temples, etc. (1753).</td>
<td>Roland's blast heard 8 miles away, breaks horn and nerves of neck (69).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ganelon denies call, says Roland will blow horn for a rabbit (1761).</td>
<td>Ganelon denies call, says Roland will blow horn for any little animal (69).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Charles heads back (1796).</td>
<td>Charles heads back (77).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Charles has Ganelon seized (1807).</td>
<td>(Omission?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Combat (1851-1939).</td>
<td>(Omission?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Oliver blinded by blood, strikes Roland, who later pardons him (1995).</td>
<td>(Omission?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Gualtiers terribly wounded calls to Roland (2045).</td>
<td>(Omission?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gandelbuon terribly wounded calls to Roland (1100).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59 Roland ranges dead at feet of Turpin (2184).
60 Turpin goes to get water for Roland (2225).
61 Saracen tries to take Roland's sword; Roland kills him with horn (2259).
62 Horn gets smashed when Roland strikes Saracen with it (2288).

64 Roland tries to break sword on stone (2297).
65 Roland says farewell to Durendal (2316).
66 Roland confesses (2366).
67 Charles laments (2397).
68 Naimes recalls Charles to duty of vengeance (2418).
69 God lengthens day in answer to Charles' prayer (2443).

59 (Omission?)
60 Roland sends Baudoin for water, but none to be had (69).
61 (Omission?)

59 Lion brings Christian bodies all together (1680).
60
61 Saracen tries to kill prostrate Roland (1380).

63 Falceron tries to protect Roland (1380).
64 Roland asks Gandelbuon to place him upon a stone (I111).
65 Speech to Durendal delivered by Karle (1604).
66 Roland confesses (1310).
67 Charles laments (1495).
68 Naimes recalls Charles to duties (1489).
69 Sun stopped three days (1487).
70 Charles laments Durendal, throws it into lake (1607).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Pursue Saracens, kill or drown in Ebre (2458).</td>
<td>Catch Saracens at Saragossa, many die in river (79).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Baligant matièrre (2609) and taking of Saragossa (3633).</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Jeffrey recalls Charles again to duties (2945).</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Charles takes Bramimunde prisoner (3675).</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Charles builds two chapels, puts Roland and Aude in same (1799).</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some general remarks and observations on the Concordances

The preceding Concordances serve two general purposes: to establish the areas of substantial agreement between any two or all three of the versions under study and to point out the areas of disagreement. In the areas of agreement, categorical grouping provides the necessary information to reconstruct the outline of the following bodies of matière:

Material common to all three versions (OTuR).
The common source of Oxford and Turpin (OTu).
Matter exclusive in this comparison to O Tu and R, respectively. (O), (Tu), (R).

In subsequent chapters we shall examine many of the details as well as some general ideas suggested by these concordances, concentrating especially on areas of exclusive variation to determine which variations result from other sources, whether an apparent concordance is only superficial, or whether an outward dissimilarity may contain obscured matière in sufficient quantity to provide substantial agreement.
The concordances of names as opposed to that of matières, provide two different types of information: names, for example, render statistical data such as Oxford's high percentage of Saracens, and general suggestions as to common sources. The concordance of matières complements that of names, and clarifies, in some instances, false suggestions or omissions in the name lists. The OTu presence of Baligant, for example, is shown by the concordance of matières to be one of name only: the matière involved with Baligant in each of these two manuscripts is highly lacking in positive concordance, the only similarity being that Baligant in both cases is associated with Marsile against the French forces. On the other hand, names completely dissimilar in form may be shown to be rather closely identified through the matières associated with them. Certain items of importance in the total comparison of OTuR, such as descriptive style, prodigious blows, specific numbers, etc., things not specifically stated by the concordances will also be discussed in the remaining chapters.
CHAPTER III
Categorical comparisons

The following comparisons vary in their pertinence to the main questions under consideration here, and they fall into three main areas: some of these items relate directly to and clarify other items not explained in the concordances of CHAPTER II. (e.g. those instances of positive concordance in which the details vary considerably). Other elements present details of matières only briefly sketched in the previous two chapters. A third group of variations, unique to each of the three versions, relate to the main questions only as they show evidence in detail of substantial variation.

It is difficult to determine whether some of these items may be related to sources as yet unidentified or whether they are mostly subjective. In any case, these divergencies are presented here for consideration; and it is hoped they will make fertile suggestions to other Roland researchers.

1 Note for example the matter of gifts from Marsile, Table VIII, p. 62.
Descriptive style

Among other things, Oxford has one characteristic in description not found in either Turpin or Ronsasvals: Oxford provides not only minutiae but also the larger picture. For example, we see a close-up of Marsile who:

"Sur un perrun de marbre bloi se culchet," and in the next breath, the massive scene:

"Envirun lui plus de vint milie humes."

Again Oxford gives the panoramic view in the famous passage:

"Halt sunt li pui e li val tenebrus, Les roches bises, les destreiz merveillus."

Olivier, in but two lines, describes the great Saracen army approaching:

"Devers Espaigne vei venir tel bruur, Tanz blancs osbercs, tanz elmes flambius!"

While Turpin harangues the men in both O and R, it is only in Oxford that we see him in the physical setting:

"D'altre part est li arcevesques Turpin; Sun cheval broche e muntet un lariz, Francesi apelet, un sermun lur ad dit:"

---

2 Not, however, to such a degree as that of R.
3 Oxford, 12.
4 Ibid., 13.
5 Ibid., 814-15.
6 Ibid., 1021-22.
7 Ibid., 1124-26.
Note again, the descriptive stroke of vast proportions in the description of Marsile surrounded by his army:

".XX. escheles ad li reis anumbrees.
Lacent cil elme as perres d'or gemmeses,
E cil escuz e cez bronies sasfreees;
.VII. milie graisles i sunent la menee."8

We see Charles' whole army preparing for the charge back to Rencesvals:

"Franceis descedent, si adubent lor cors
D'osbercs e de helmes e d'espees a or.
Escuz unt genz e espiez granz e forz,
E gunfanuns blancs e vermeilz e blois."9

Baligant's formidable army sailing at night is a descriptive feat of wonder and brilliance:

"Granz sunt les oz de cele gen averse:
Sigient a fort e nagent e guvernei.
En sum cez maz e en cez (les) (h) altes vernes,
Asez i ad cartuncles e lanternes;
La sus amunt pargetent tel luiserne
Par la noit la mer en est plus bele.
E cum il viennent en Espaigne la tere
Tut li pa's en reluist e esclairet."10

Descriptive style in the Chronicle of Turpin

The Turpin gives no such vast pictures as does O, and few smaller ones. The combined Marsile-Baligant army is only referred to as a "granz oz," and the whole business of choosing the rear-guard and of Charles' leaving through the pass of Cizaire is dismissed with a simple, journalistic

---
8 Ibid., 1451-53.
9 Ibid., 1797-1800.
10 Ibid., 2630-2638.
11 Turpin, 61.
statement:

"Par le conseil Ganelon, comanda à Rolant, son neveu, duc du Mans et conte de Blaives; à Olivier, son compagnon, conte de Genes, e aus autres combatteors de l'ost que il demorassent en Roncevaus, o tot XXm Francois pour faire l'ariere garde, jusques a tant que li oz eust passez les porz de Cizaire. Ensi fu fait come il devisa."

Of the appearance of Baligant-Marsile's army, we know nothing except that "Marsiles et Baliganz oissirent des bos a tot Im Sarrazins armez; des montagnes et des valées oissirent espessement."

Turpin indicates that at Rencesvals there were mountains, valleys and some woods (in which Thierry and Baudoins hid) but nothing more of any consequence.

Descriptive style in Ronsasvals

Ronsasvals shows no scenes of massive armies assembled or approaching, but gives, for the most part, individual pictures of warriors and the approach of small groups:

"Per meiy la prieyssa venc .I. Sarrazin brocant,"

We know little about the local scenery except for the mention of the greenness of spring, and of the French being in a valley:

---

12 Ibid.
13 Ibid., 63.
14 Tu gives the notion of a wooded area; O and R of more open country. Note O, 3305-6 where trees are also mentioned.
15 Ronsasvals, 3.
"Gardes aval en sel priet verdejant,
E lay on s'arman Olivier ni Rollan
E totz los .XII. que justa els estan;"16

Again, a single warrior is portrayed:

"Per la batalha ve vos penhent sobrier
Un Sarrazin mot ergulhos e fier,"17

In battle scenes, however, Ronsasvals and Oxford show substantial similarity of form. Note the following in R:

"Aquí viras tanz perpons e tantz pantz,
Tant astas novas, tantz goffarons sagnentz,"18

Compare the above with these lines from O:

"La veíssez si grant dolor de gent,
Tant hume mort e nasfret e sanglent!"19

This literary formula is found not only in other Old French epics but also in the Cantar de Mio Cid.

Individual portraits and other items in all three versions

Turpin's descriptions of warriors are all brief and factual. The black Saracen whom Roland ties to a tree is described simply as "un Sarrazins aussi noir come arrement."20

Durendal, in the Turpin has the most extensive and concrete description of any element in this version:

16 Ibid., 15-17.
17 Ibid., 109-110.
18 Ibid., 97-98.
20 Turpin, 65.
"O espée très bele, clere e flambeanz, que il ne covient pas forbir ausi come autres, de bele grandor et d'avenant leesee, fort et ferme. sanz nule maum- esture, blanche come I yvoires, par l'enheudeure en- tresengnie de croiz, d'or resplendidanz, aornee de pomiau de beril, sacrée et benoite des lettres du saint non Nostre Segneur A,w, et avironée de la force Nostre Seigneur Jhesu Crist!"21

Roland's speech to Durendal in the *Turpin* continues in the above vein to some extent, half a printed page. The corresponding speech in *O* occupies a comparable amount of space, an entire laisse of twenty-six lines. The be­ beginning lines of the speech in *O* compare rather closely to the first lines in that of *Turpin* above:

"E! Durendal, cum es bele, e clere e blanche! Cuntre soleill si luises e reflambes!"23

The address of the *Turpin*, as can be readily seen in the passage above (note 21), overflows with an abundance of clerical feeling. The remainder of the Durendal speech in *O*, while mentioning God's hand in delivering the sword to Roland, speaks mainly of Roland's conquests, ending with a patriotic note and a prayer that France not be shamed by the sword's falling into pagan hands.24

As has been mentioned previously, the speech to Durendal in *Ronsasvvals*, is delivered by Charles. It is quite

21 Ibid., 67.
22 Oxford, laisse CLXXII.
23 Ibid., 2316-17.
24 Oxford, laisse CLXXII.
25 See p. 20.
brief, six lines in its entirety:

"Karle l'esgarda, contra.1 solelh resplant:
'Ay! Durendart, bona espeya trenchant,
Mays non vos aura nuls homs que valha tant;
En aquest segle non tenres pron ni dan.'
En un gran lac la va gitar breumant:
Anc pueys non la vi nuls homs petitz ni grans."26

While Turpin is practically devoid of physiological
and physical descriptions, both R and O have in common an
abundance of individual portraits which include arms and
battle-dress. Note the following description of Juzian's
arms in Ronsasvals:

"Sieu saudadier l'armeron bellemant:
Causes de fer li lassan amb aytant
E en son dors un bel alberc pesant
E en sos pes bons esperons trenchans
E en sa testa un vert elme luzant
E davant si una targa pesant
E a son latz un brant d'assier valhant."27

Rather vaguely similar is the portrait of Roland in O:

"Sur Veillantif, sun bun cheval curant.
Portet ses armes.. mult li sunt avenanz,
Mais sun espiet vait li bers palmeiant,
Cuntu le ciel vait la mure turnant,
Laciet en su un gunfanun tut blanc;
Les renges li batent josqu'as mains.
Cors ad mult gent, le vis cler e riant."28

With the exception of O's detailed description of
Turpin's famous horse, several of Ronsasvals' descriptions
of this sort exceed in detail any of those in O. The des-
cription of Juzian's equipment above (note 27) continues at

26
Ronsasvals, 1603-8.
27
Ibid., 32-38.
28
29
It is curious that such a famous horse is not named.
R, 49, with these details:

"En son ponh un bon espieu trenchant
E lansa bona de fraysse atriand
E gonfaron d'un pali affricant;
Caval cavalca meravilhos e gran,
Filh d'una fera e del destrier corrant,
Sella ac d'ori e.l peytral fon d'arjant,
E sonalhetas ha son peytral davant:"

The description of Naymon in Ronsasvals is equally detailed:

"Caussas de fer e trenchans esperons,
Cambals de seda obratz de fin coton,
Elme ac en la testa ben fach e de faysson,
Alberc el dors que menut malhat fon
E davant si un escut bel e bon
Asta ac grossa de fraysse de carton,
Espieu trenchant, senha de sicolaton,
Brant de Colonha que anc melher non fon,
Espieu e massa, cors de be bella faysson;"

The poet of the Oxford uses two techniques in his description not found in either Tu or R. One of these is the greater use of action in the description. In Ronsasvals, the subjects being described, even though in the process of being armed as in the above examples, are rather still pictures compared to examples in O; and after the words "l'armeron" and "lassan," the rest is mostly a list of things. In Oxford, such descriptions seethe with movement. Note the following arming of Baligant; the first line denotes his restlessness, the next three are each dominated by verbs: "vest," "lacet," "ceint."

"Li amiralz ne se voelt demurer:
Vest une bronie dunt li pan sunt saafret,
Lacet sun elme, ki ad or est gemmet,

\[30\] Ronsasvals, 374-388.
\[31\] Ibid., 32-33.
Puis ceint s'espee al senestre costet."

Some of the best examples of motion in description in Oxford are in prodigious blows where the poet describes the victim's dress, arms, etc. while the sword is passing through them. Note the following in which Roland kills Chernubles:

"L'elme li freint u li carbuncle luissent,
Trenchet le cors e la cheveleure,
Si li trenchat les oilz e la faiture,
Le blanc osberc; dunt la maile est menue,
E tut le cors tresqu'en la furcheure,
Enz en la sele, ki est a or batue;"

By contrast, the Turpin, in its one example of a prodigious blow, follows its usual brief, condensed style:

"...le feri si de s'espée Durendal, que il le fendit
tout dès le chief jusques en la sele et coupa a
un seul cop li et le cheval..."

The second technique used by the poet of 0, in contrast to Tu and R, is his frequent inclusion of the subject's facial and bodily portrait, as well as a comment on his character, along with the description of dress and arms. Note this sketch of Charlemagne from 0:

"Blanche ad la barbe e tut flurit le chef,
Gent ad le cors e la cuntenance fier:
S'ест kil demandet, ne l'estoet enseigner,"

Another example is that of Ganelon in 0:

"De sun col getet ses grandes pels de martre,
E est remes un sun blialt de palie.
Vairs out (les oilz) e mult fier lu visage,

32 Oxford, 3140-43.
33 Ibid., 1326-1331.
34 Turpin, 65.
Gent out le cors e les costez out larges;"36

It is rather remarkable that in neither Ronsasvals nor Turpin does there exist one example of description of beard, countenance, color of eyes, or bodily stature of any character. In the Turpin, there is little description of any sort; yet in Ronsasvals there is much description of arms and outward trappings in minute detail.

In comparing Ronsasvals with Oxford as to descriptive techniques, some of the differences may certainly be attributed to the superior artistry of the poet of O. However, R's preoccupation with minutiae--such things as a whole set of arms and armor with no notice at all of the man bearing them--suggests strongly that the poet drew his pictures from personal contact with the inanimate items themselves, namely relics of war, rather than with knights on the field, real or imagined.

Ronsasvals contains one detail in its descriptions of armor that is of interest although its significance remains obscure except that it suggests some remote contamination between R and the remaniements. This is the rather consistent use of the green helmet for all Saracens. Juzian, for example, has "un vert elme luzant," and the first Saracen who taunts the French has "en sa testa un elme vert obrriet."37

36 Ibid., 281-284.
37 Ronsasvals, 36
38 Ibid., 116.
The green helmet cannot be found in 0 where this item is either "flambius," or "ad or...gemmez," etc., but there are green helmets in certain of the remaniements. Curiously enough, however, in these it is the Christians who wear them: both Ganelon and Oton in Châteauroux have green helmets:

"Et des verz elmes font les pieres quasser," Roland has a green helmet in the manuscript of Paris, and the same green headgear is found on Christians in Venice.

The prodigious blow as a poetic device

The prodigious blow has already been mentioned in connection with descriptive style; a word or two should be said about its forms and general importance in the three versions. The one blow in Turpin (see note 34), exceeds any in 0 in the sense that it cuts both horse and rider in two. The blows of Oxford reach only into the horse; the blows of R are as brief as that of Turpin cited previously, and these go only as far as the saddle:

"Tal colp li dona sus per l'elme vert clier,
Tot lo fendet entro sus el brayer;"
The use of the prodigious blow in Oxford, however they may compare individually with those of Tu and R, far exceeds the latter versions not only in detail but also in frequency. Oxford, indeed, contains seven prodigious blows of first magnitude, not to mention a great many remarkable thrusts with the lance.

Table VI
Major prodigious blows in O

1. Roland kills Aelroth, 1197-1205.
2. Roland kills Chernubles, 1326-1334.
3. Oliver kills Malun, 1353-56.
4. Oliver kills Justin, 1370-1374.
5. Roland kills Valdabrun, 1584-1589.
7. Charles kills Baligant, 3615-3619.

There are but two blows nearly of the above proportions in R, and they do not include the saddle.

One notable peculiarity among blows in Ronsasvals is the apparent custom reflected there of some rather "cere-
monious trimming performed after the victim has been slain:

"Tray Durendart, ben say sa talhazon,
E ha presa la testa par e par del menton."46

"A Orgelin annet tal colp donier,
Tot lo fendet entro sus al brayer,
E pueys li vay totz los nembres copier."47

---

45 Ronsasvals, 139-40, and 1048-1050.
46 Ibid., 410-11.
47 Ibid., 1048-50.
There are, to be sure, heads lost in O; but these are cut
off in the wild slashes of heated battle. In Ronsasvals,
the decapitation appears calculated or ritualistic.

A comparison of specific numbers

Of all specific numbers in O, Tu and R, only two actu­
ally agree. This fact alone would lead one to doubt that
the authors of Tu and R had direct access to the manuscript
of Oxford or its remaniements: OTuR concur precisely on
the number of twenty-thousand men in the French rear-guard;
and the Twelve Peers appear in O and R. Interestingly
enough, the Chronicle of Turpin never mentions the Twelve
Peers.

One particular of Ronsasvals is that while the poet
speaks of the Twelve Peers:

"Amb aytant s'arman li .XIJ. companhons:"49
--in the actual naming of them, there are fifteen: the Oxford Ms. is little more precise in naming the twelve, in­
cluding peers and non-peers in the same lists.

0 and the remaniements show a high degree of posi­
tive concordance in the matter of specific numbers.

Ronsasvals, 355.
Ibid., 355-364.

See O, 2402-2410 where Turpin is included, bringing
the list to thirteen; O, 2186-89 has only eight names. At O,
792-800 the list is altered. See T. A. Jenkins, op. cit.,
Table VII
The Twelve Peers according to O and R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ansel's</td>
<td>1. Estout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Attun</td>
<td>2. Berenguier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Berengers</td>
<td>3. Angeliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engelers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gerart</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ivon</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Oliver</td>
<td>10. Olivier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rollant</td>
<td>11. Rollan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sansun</td>
<td>12. Sampson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Horonel</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. (Turpin)</td>
<td>20. Turpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Gandelbuon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 12 (excluding Turpin) 15

Marsile's gifts to Ganelon and to the French differ radically in both number and content in OTuR. In O there are two lists of gifts for Charlemagne, one suggested by Blancandrins:
"Vos li durrez urs e leons e chens,
Set cenz camelz e mil hosturs muers,
D'or e d'argent .III.C. muls cargez,
Cinquante carre qu'en ferat carier:"

--but later when Marsile orders the gifts to be sent, he mentions only the camels loaded with silver and gold:
".VII.C. cameilz, d'or e argent cargiez,"

---

52 Oxford, 30-33.
53 Ibid., 645.
The gifts which Ganelon receives in 0 are numerous and costly: Valdabrun gives his expensive sword with gold-filled hilt, Climborins donates his helmet, Bramimunde, two brooches for Ganelon's wife, Marsile, ten mules loaded with Arabian gold, and the keys to Saragossa.

In the Chronicle of Turpin, Charles gets thirty horses charged with silver and gold, forty horses carrying pure wine, and one thousand beautiful Saracen girls. Ganelon's presents in Tu are twenty horses loaded with gold, silver, and silk cloth.

Ganelon's presents in Ronsasvals are only mentioned when Naimes accuses the former of treachery. At that point, Ganelon (Gayne) refers to his having given Naimes (Nayme) three thousand horses. This passage is charged with overtones. Did Ganelon pay Naimes to keep him quiet about the evil plot? Naimes had suspected him earlier, at least, for he declares:

"Semblant mi es mortz son li .XIJ.pier,
Que cant ye.l vi de Marcili tornier,
Lo comte Gayne portar lo messagier
E yeu lo vi de sa color muydier."59

54 Ibid., 620-24.
55 Ibid., 629-631.
56 Ibid., 637-9.
57 According to Turpin, it is the wine and girls which lead to the downfall of the French.
58 Ronsasvals, 991-994.
59 Ibid., 963-966.
Ronsasvals makes no mention at all of gifts from Marsile to Charlemagne.

There is no more agreement of numbers in the various armies and divisions in OTuR. In Oxford, Marsile at first laments that he has no army to battle Charles:

"Jo nen ai ost qui bataille li dunne," but later appears with 400,000 men. In one instance, 50,000 Ethiopians attack the French. At another point all but sixty of the French are killed. Some time later, the three remaining Frenchmen (Roland, Turpin and Gualters) battle against one thousand foot soldiers and 40,000 horsemen. Roland and Turpin make their final stand against four hundred. When Charles' army prepares for Baligant, the French have 100,000; Baligant has thirty divisions or about 450,000.

In Turpin, the Saracens have 50,000 men at one point. All but three Frenchmen are killed (as in 0) at the final stand; but in Turpin, these are Roland, Baudoins and Thierry. Charlemagne finally catches the Saracens at Saragossa where he kills four thousand. Turpin contains one

60 Oxford, 18.
61 Beginning at Oxford, 1913.
63 Ibid., 2066 and following.
64 Ibid., 3217.
65 Turpin, 63.
item regarding numbers which is an enigma and apparently unique to that version: after all the French are supposedly killed (with exception of Roland), Roland blows his horn and one hundred Christians suddenly appear.

There are numerous counts of the number of Saracens attacking in Ronsasvals. The total of these amounts to 216,000 Saracens. The French make their final stand with thirty men. At one spot, Gandelbuon meets a group of "Alamans" numbering three thousand.

Table VIII
Summary of selected items involving specific numbers in OTuR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Turpin</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French in rear-guard</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>12 (13)</td>
<td>(none mentioned)</td>
<td>12 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts to Charles</td>
<td>700 camels, gold and silver</td>
<td>30 horses, silver and gold, 1000 pagan girls</td>
<td>(mention of 3000 horses to Naimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts to Ganelon</td>
<td>10 mules with gold</td>
<td>20 horses with gold, silver, silk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saracen army</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>216,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last battle</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(100?)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final stand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(not stated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

66 Turpin, 65.
67 Ronsasvals, 577.
68 Ibid., 1147.
"Hidden matières"

Among the most interesting of matières showing substantial concordance between various combinations of OTuR, are certain elements which persist in essence but which may be out of place, under a new label, or greatly changed in detail but retaining enough of the idea to be identified.

One such item involves the Saracen, Falsaron (O) and Falsabron (R). This comparison is further complicated by the appearance, in Ronsasvals, of a Falceron. Adding to the confusion, moreover, are the conflicting positions of Mario Roques and Jessie Crosland on the matter. Crosland merely assumes that the Falsabron of Ronsasvals is the same person as Falceron of the same poem. Roques, on the other hand, lists the two separately and equates Falceron with the Falsaron of Oxford. There are flaws in both of these positions; furthermore, there is a most interesting hidden matière here which involves Aelroth of O and Juzian of R, in addition to some other elements. Let us re-examine the entire question and bring all the evidence to light.

Falsaron in the Oxford tradition is the brother of Marsile. He is one of the Saracen twelve who are to oppose

69 "Ronsasvals, poème épicque provençal," Romania, LVIII (1932), 1-28, 161-189; Romania, LXVI (1940-1) 433-480.
70 op. cit., p. 259.
71 Ronsasvals, 687-803.
72 Ibid., 1382-1423.
the twelve French peers; and he is one of the worst felons under the sun:

"Suz cel nen at plus encrisme felun."73

A giant of a man, he measures half a foot between the eyes. Seeing the body of his nephew, Aelroth, who has just been slain by Roland, he charges infuriated; but he is killed immediately by Oliver.

For the moment, let us call the Ronsasvals subjects Falsaron A and Falsaron B.

Falsaron A is the nephew of Marsile. He leads a group of 60,000 men against the French. Estout de Lingres kills Juzian, nephew of Marsile, and gives Juzian's armor and arms to Jauceran (son of Estout). Falsaron A, seeing Jauceran wearing Juzian's arms, becomes enraged, slays both Estout and Jauceran.

The next series of events is unique to Ronsasvals in outward appearances, but as will be shown a little later, the basic idea of it may be connected to 0 traditions. Falsaron A kills in succession Gautier, Salamons and Savaric. At each slaying, Roland charges forth to avenge the fallen Frenchman; but each time Falsaron escapes on his extremely fast horse. Roland tells each of the dead Frenchmen that he

73 Oxford, 1216.
74 Ibid., laisse XCIV.
75 See notes 71, 72.
will be with him in Heaven soon, etc. The Saracen escapes and this terminates the episode of Falsaron A of Ronsasvals.

Falsaron B (Falceron in the text) appears in Ronsasvals line 1381. Roland is dying. A Saracen, Alimon, is about to attack the prostrate knight when Falsaron B intervenes to stop him. Falsaron B declares that Roland is a great knight, and that if Ogier, Olivier and Gautier, etc. were here, Alimon would not dare to try such a thing. Alimon strikes Roland anyway, piercing him through the chest. Falsaron B remains with Roland, holding the latter's head and blessing him until he (Falceron) is forced to flee because of the approach of Charles' army.

Crosland, who assumes Falsaron's A and B to be the same, remarks on the oddity of the man at one point slaughtering the French, then later playing this rather different role as comforter to the dying Roland.

Roques considers Falsaron A (Falsabron) and Falsaron B (Falceron) to be two different persons. It appears on this point that Crosland has not read the text carefully and that Roques is correct in assuming the duality. Two things support the latter's position: in the first place, the spelling of Falsaron A varies between Falsabron and Falsabroni; that of Falsaron B appears only as Falceron. In the second place,

---

76 See page 17, CHAPTER I.
77 Ibid. note 70.
Falceron is introduced rather formally at line 1381:

"Ab tant lo li venc un Sarrazin cortes,
Falceron avia nom, dejusta luy si mes."

Since we have already, at this point, seen so much of Falsabron in his devastating attacks on the French, why would the poet introduce him again unless he were intended to be a different person?

Roques, however, apparently because of the spelling, equates Falsaron B (Falceron) with the Falsaron of Oxford, but a close scrutiny of episodes concerning this composite character, reveals that it is Falsaron A (Falsabron-Falsabroni) who by his relationships and actions, should be equated with the traditional Falsaron of Oxford. Note the following summary of the comparison of Falsaron (0) and Falsabron-Falsabroni (Falsaron A) of Ronsasvals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Ronsasvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Falsaron</td>
<td>1. Falsabron (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. brother of Marsile</td>
<td>2. nephew of Marsile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. tries to avenge death of</td>
<td>3. avenges death of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aelroth,</td>
<td>4. Juzian,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. his nephew who</td>
<td>5. Marsile's nephew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. asks for first blow of battle, and</td>
<td>6. who asks for permission to fight Roland, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. boasts he will slay Roland.</td>
<td>7. boasts he will slay Roland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As well as with Falseron of the Entée d'Espagne and Fauceron of Galiens li restorés.
In view of the above, how can we doubt that it is Falsabron (A) of R who corresponds to Falsaron of O and not Falceron (B) who soothes the dying Roland.

There are two more items connected with Falsaron which disclose obscured OR matière. As a by-product of the above concordance (Table IX), it is evident that Aelroth (O) may be identified with Juzian (R). A second connecting element is the great speed of Falsabron's horse in R.

In Ronsasvals, as has already been noted, Falsabron attacks several times, on each occasion slaying one of the French nobles. At each slaying, Roland is unable to catch the Saracen because of the remarkable speed of Falsabron's charger. No such sequence of events occurs to Falsaron of O where the latter rides forth and is immediately slain by Oliver. However, the idea of the pagan who rides a swift horse and who slays a Frenchman is found not once but four times in the Oxford; and these four occasions come in sequence:

1. Climborins on his horse, Barbamusche, which "Plus est isnels que esprever ne arunde," slays Engeler.®

2. Valdabrun, on Gramimund, "Plus est isnels que nen est uns falcuns," slays Sansun.®

---

79 Cf. numbers 4-7 in Table IX.
80 Oxford, laisse XCIV.
81 Ibid., 1535.
82 Ibid., laisse CXVIII.
3. Malquiant, on Saltperdut: "Beste nen est ki poisset curre a lui," kills Ansel's.


Falsaron's victims in Ronsasvals appear to be totally unrelated to those above of O. They are: Jauceran, Estout, Gautier, Salamons, and Savaric. It should be noted, though, that Valdabrun of O who kills Sansun, bears more than casual resemblance to Falsabron of Ronsasvals. The names themselves are rather close in appearance. It is further notable that of the four Saracens (1-4) above, only Valdabrun is described as more than an ordinary felon; he is said to have taken Jerusalem by treachery, to have violated the temple of Solomon, and to have killed the patriarch upon the baptismal font. Is it mere coincidence that in O, Valdabrun "Si violat le temple Salomon," and that Falsabron in R kills the knight, Salamons?

An item persistent in all three versions (OTuR) is the element of the black Saracen. In O, there is Abisme, slain

---

83 Ibid., laisse CXX.
84 Ibid., laisse CXXII.
85 Ibid., 1566-68.
86 Ibid., 1567.
87 Cf. page 60 and notes 54 and 55 where Valdabruns and Climborsins play a prominent part in the gifts to Ganelon, another indication of the importance of this matière to Roland traditions. Turpin's horse in O may also be linked with this matière. Note O 1496: "Beste nen est nule ki encontre lui alge."
by Turpin. Abisme is the most felonous one in Marsile's
army; his shield was given to him by the Devil, and he is
black as pitch: "Issi est neirs cume peiz ki est demise;"
Turpin in 0 slices him with a mighty blow. Again, in 0,
the Caliph of Carthage and Ethiopia leads a force of blacks
"Ki plus sunt neirs que nen est arrement."

The Turpin contains a nameless black Saracen "aussi
noir come arrement," who is involved in a rather odd way
with Roland. The line from Tu, incidentally, is suspiciously
similar to Oxford, 1933. Ronsasvals contains a black Saracen
"mot ergulhos e fier," whose face is as black as the bottom
of a caldron. He meets the same fate as Abisme of Oxford:
he is sliced to the waist.

While it can be seen readily that the three versions
have handled the matiè re in different ways, the notion of
black Saracens must be labeled as a persistent item in the
Roland legend.

The black Saracen is drawn even further into this involv-
ment by another persistent matiè re connected with the black
Saracen of Ronsasvals and the taunting of the French by

88 Oxford, 1474.
89 Ibid., 1933.
90 Turpin, 65, see item 16, Concordance of selected
matières, p. 38.
91 Ronsasvals, 110.
92 Ibid., 114.
93 Roland is the victor in R; in 0, it is Turpin.
See R circa 138 and 0 1504.
Aelroth of O. Connections between this episode and lines 123-149 of Ronsasvals are of even more importance because of their bearing upon a recent thesis of Rita Lejeune in the study, "Une allusion méconnue à une Chanson de Roland." In her attempts to show connections between the Cansó d'Antiocha and Ronsasvals, she compares the lines from Antiocha:

"Francs reis, car no t'en fui e perpren la montagna."
"Francs reis, car no t'en tornas?"
"Franc reis, car no t'en tornas?"

with the lines from Ronsasvals beginning:

"Fuges, Frances..."

The above lines are the beginning of the taunts of the black Saracen in Ronsasvals. Mme. Lejeune concludes that the lines of the Antiocha

"...paraît répondre, en écho sarcastique et vengeur, au 'Fuges, Franses!' lancé par les Sarrasins de Ronsasvals...Cet effet épique, ce conseil de fuite, si énergiquement répété, il n'a son corrépondant ni dans le Roland d'Oxford, ni dans les autres versions."

While Mme. Lejeune's statement that O does not contain the advice to flee found in the three "Fuges, Frances" of R,
is literally true, the matièrre contained in the episode of Ronsasvals' taunting, black Saracen contains such striking parallels with the taunts of Aelroth in Oxford as to render the passage suspect of an O-R connection.

The following pairs of six matières are listed precisely in the same order in which they occur in O and R. Whether or not Ronsasvals' advice to flee is connected to the Cansó d'Antiocha, the reader will readily note in these lines that these two areas of O and R are linked to some common tradition. Items 2, 3, and 6 have already been cited in CHAPTER I among twenty-seven lines from R which have comparable lines in O.

Table X
Comparison of matières pertinent to Aelroth of O and the black Saracen of R

1. O "Feluns Frances, hoi justerez as noz.
Traı̈t vos ad ki a guarder vos out.
Fols est li reis ki vos laissat as porz."

R "Fuges, Frances, Dieu vos don encombriers.
Gayne vos ha vendut trastotz los .XIJ. biers:
Karle mayne ho comprara mot chier."

2. O "Enquoi perdrat France dulce sun los,
Charles li magnes le destre braz del cors."

R "De dousa Fransa morran li .XIJ. pier.
Cant auran mort .xx. millia cavalliers,
Ni fach ha Karle lo destre bras copier,"
3. "Quant l'ot Rollant, Deus! si grant doel en out!
Sun cheval brochet, laisset curre a esforz,
Vait le ferir li quens quanque il pout."

R "Cant l'aus Rollan, non poc en pes estier;
Malmatin broca dels esperons daurietz,
Trays Durendart don le brant es d'acier;"

4. "L'escut li freint e l'osberc li desclot,
Trenchet le piz, si li briset, les os,
Tute l'eschine li desevret del dos,
Od sun espiet l'anme li getet fors,
Enpeint le ben, fait li brandir le cors,
Pleine sa hanste del cheval l'abat mort,
En dous meitiez li ad briset le col;"

R "Tal colp li dona sus per l'elme vert clier,
Tot lo fendet entro sus el brayer;
Mort lo .trabuca del corredor destrier."

5. "'Ultre, culvert! Carles n'est mie fol,
Ne trai'sun unkes amer ne volt.
Il fist que proz qu'il nus laisad as porz;
Of n'en perdrat France dulce sun los."

R "'Per Dieu, payan, ar podes pron gabier;
Ton fol gabar vey tornar messongier.
Totas sazons ay ben ausit contier
Que fol gabar mays val gentil tayzier;
Al mens de vos no.s cal assegurier."

6. "Ferez i, Francs, nostre est li premers colps!"

R "Firez, Frances, lurs es le colps premier."
Gandelbuon of *Ronsasvals* offers a fertile area for speculation as to sources of $R$ and to hidden matières connecting $O$ and $R$ as well as $Tu$ and $R$. The name itself with the ending "buon" suggests links with the Italian epics. The morphology of the name also evokes suspicions of poetic comment on the character of the person: e.g. "gandel" plus "buon" especially when the name is opposed to the evil Ganelon ("ganel" plus "hon(te)"?), where the meaning of "ganel", or "gandel", however, is highly uncertain.

The notion itself of Gandelbuon being opposed to Ganelon is supported in the *Remaniements* and *V4*, where the former is supposed to guard Ganelon after he has been seized and accused of the treacherous plot. And in *Ronsasvals*, Gandelbuon is the one who brings the news of the disaster to Charles, thus refuting Ganelon's arguments that Roland is in no danger.

Varied spellings in other manuscripts suggest other etymologies of the name: Gondebuef in *Galiens*, and Gondrebues in *Turpin*. Some forms such as Gondel Buffon in the *Viaggio* as well as Gandelbuon of $R$ suggest the possibility of Godefroi de Bouillon as a remote model. Folk etymology may well have entered into the many forms of this name.

---

114 In *Ronsasvals* itself, of course, the argument cannot apply since the spelling of Ganelon there is "Gayne." We are dealing here, however, with the composite character.
Hidden matières concerning this character in R, Tu and other traditions, however, bring to light more substantial connections between certain manuscripts than do speculations with etymology and orthography. Between Turpin and Ronsasvals some sort of remote connection exists concerning the role of Baudoin in Tu and that of Gandelbuon in R. Gondrebues is mentioned in Turpin as being buried among the dead at Belim. The activities of Gandelbuon in R, however, are modelled after those of Baudoin of Turpin. Baldewin in O, it will be remembered, is merely mentioned by Ganelon, his father, as the latter is preparing to leave on the mission to Marsile. We assume that Baldewin there is just a youth who has remained in France on his father's lands. In Turpin, though, he is a full-grown man, present at the battle.

Baudoin of Tu and Gandelbuon of R have the following points in common:

1. Both carry the message to Charles (news of the defeat).
2. Both are among the last three survivors along with Roland.
3. They are both called upon by Roland for help.
4. Both participate in the fateful battle at Ronceval.
5. Roland in two lines (R, 1107, 1114) addresses Gandelbuon as "Gandelbuon frayre." If we accept "frayre" in the sense of family relationship, this would further the comparison. We know Baldewin in O traditions to be the half-brother of Roland.

According to matières, then, Gandelbuon would appear to be identifiable with Baudoin of Turpin, consequently, by gen-
eral traditions, the son of Ganelon. But the latter idea becomes something less than a certainty because of lines 1163-66 of *Ronsasvals* which are as follows:

"'Senher, dis Nayme, yeu vech a mon semblant Lo filh de Gayne, so m'es apareyssant. --Per Dieu, dis Karle, so non es pas niant: Gandelbuon es d'Affrica la valhant."

Mario Roques interprets line 1165 above as a contradiction of Nayme's statement, and subsequently, in his critique of *Ronsasvals*, he declares that the son of Ganelon is at Rencesvals but is never named.

Robert Barroux has translated line 1165 with a meaning exactly opposite from that of Roques: i.e. "...ce n'est pas niable." It must be admitted, first of all, that Barroux's translation makes sense out of the similar roles of Baudoin-Gandelbuon; but this is not necessarily a justification. And Roques' interpretation would be respected if there were no other evidence to consider. However, two points, in addition to the matières already discussed here, evoke some uncertainty about it. In the first place, the line in question (1165) contains more than a double negative; it is a triple negative. The word "niant" (OF. nient?) is used in three other lines from *R*:

736 Mas Falsabron non l'atendet niant.
1107 Gandelbuon frayre, so non vey yeu niant; 1157 Ilh i respondon: 'So non farem niant.'

---

115 Romania, LXVI (1940-41), 471.
117 Cf. items 1-5, p. 74.
In all three cases, *non* is used with *niant*; but in none is *pas* also used. In eight examples of *niënt* in Oxford, none use more than a single other negative element (ne). The second point is this: why should the poem mention the son of Ganelon (lo filh de Gayne) at this critical point when Gandelbuon's identification is imminent if there was not some notion of Gandelbuon being that son? If an initial mistaken identification on the part of Nayme were intended by the poet, why choose, of all people, Ganelon's son rather than the son of Garin, or Berenguier or some other?

Whether or not these arguments are sufficiently conclusive to establish Gandelbuon as the son of Gayne in Ronsvalis, it is certain that there is another hidden matière here which has preserved the name of Gandelbuon and has given him the role of Baudoins of Tu. For this reason, Gandelbuon (name in parentheses) has been placed opposite both the Baldwin-Baudoins item of O and Tu, and the Gondrebus of Tu, in the Concordance of names of persons.

Another matière, this involving Gandelbuon of R and Gualters of O, should be mentioned here in explanation of item 57 in the Concordance of selected matières. Gualters

---

120 Note also numbers 27, 28 in the Concordance of names of persons, p. 26. In the case of Tu and R, there would seem to exist mere name transmission. In Item 28, the Gualters-Gandelbuon connection involves the matière discussed above.
in 0 appears (2035) just as Roland has fainted. He is terribly wounded and calls for help. Roland, Turpin and Gualters, the last three survivors, muster enough strength to fight ferociously again. Gualters, however, is soon killed, leaving Turpin and Roland alone. In Ronsasvals, Gandelbuon appears as Roland lies exhausted from battle. He is badly wounded as was Gualters of 0:

"E suy naffrat de mon cors malamant
Que mos budels port en l'arson davant." 121

From this point, the Ronsasvals sequence of events differs from that of 0: Roland sends Gandelbuon to Charles with a message of the defeat. Roland remains to deliver his confession and to die. The rest concerning Gandelbuon has already been discussed. In spite of differences in the outcome of events involving Gualters and Gandelbuon, OR matières are interconnected in the areas of 0, 2035 and R, 1100.

A final matière to be noted in this category of obscure transmissions is an intriguing one; however, for lack of information, the matter is offered as little more than a footnote. It has to do with the question of "Baligant" in Ronsasvals. Baligant is never mentioned by name in R; but just one line suggests that he may have been known to the Ronsasvals tradition in the Turpin sense: i.e. as the brother of Marsile. Juzian, nephew of Marcili in R is described in

121 Ronsasvals, 1100-1101.
"Neps de Marcili, filh fon de l'amirat,"

Since Baligant is by traditions known as an Emir (l'amiraill), the suspicion is great that somewhere along in the development of the Ronsasvals version, there was the notion of Baligant or at least of a brother of Marsile who was an Emir. Accordingly, the reader will note in item 13 of the Concordance of names of persons, the insertion, (Father of Juzian?).

---

122 Oxford, 2615.
123 Baligant is Marsile's brother too in Galiens 11 restorés.
CHAPTER IV
Sources of divergencies in Ronsasvals
"Un autre accent"

The previous three chapters have, for the most part, pointed out what Mortier refers to as "la part d'imitation" in the Turpin and Ronsasvals, and have, by this process of elimination, outlined some specific areas of divergency among the three versions. The present chapter and the next deal more specifically with these areas of greater divergency. This section might be labeled in Mortier's terms as "la part d'invention" in the larger sense of course, for in this "invention" lie two main categories of matière: that which stems from sources outside the traditions, and that which was created out of local or subjective elements.

First, let us examine some of the outside sources.

Galian de Raynier

One of the most radical departures from the mainstream

1 Cf. note 12, CHAPTER I., p. 3.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
of Roland traditions in Ronsasvals is the inclusion of the son of Olivier. Galian enters the scene in Charles' camp while the doomed rear-guard is suffering defeat at Rencesvals:

"Per lo camp venc un bel vayllet brocant,  
Filh de payana corteza e valhant;"  

He goes straight to Charles and declaims the latter's great renown:

"Vostre pres sabon d'ayssi en Oriant,  
Vostre pres sabon tro al solelh colcant,  
Vostre pres sabon Sarrazins e Persans,"  

When he has finished his lavish praises for Charles, Galian announces that he is the son of one of Charles' great nobles, Olivier de Lauzana la gran. Charles inquires his name and how it is that he could be Olivier's son. Galian explains that his birth was the result of the fulfillment of Olivier's gab when Charles' men boasted in the home of Gabaut le Baron during their trip to the Holy Land. Galian's mother is Baracla who is possibly (although it is not so stated in the text) the daughter of Gabaut.

Galian tells in a few words how he was raised by Baracla and how he thought himself to be the son of Maradan the baron, that he was baptized and that he has come to be made a knight thence to go to his father's aid at Rencesvals:

---

4 Ronsasvals, 830-831.  
5 Ibid., 835-37.  
6 Roques equates her with Jacqueline of Galiens, cf., Romania LVIII (1932) 185.
"E venc ha tu que.n fassas cavallier,
Qu'en Ronsasvals vuelh ha mon payre aydier."\(^7\)

Charles knights Galian and arms him richly. Galian is given one hundred armed knights to his command; he and his troops leave for Rencesvals.

Galian arrives at Rencesvals in the heat of the battle. He and his one hundred men plunge into the melee. Orgelin strikes Olivier so hard on the helmet that the latter, in a daze, strikes Roland by mistake. Galian, at this point, meets Roland and asks the latter to lead him to Olivier. While Galian and Olivier are enjoying a tender father-son reunion, Orgelin strikes Olivier again, this time with a fatal blow. Galian avenges his father by killing Orgelin with a prodigious blow. Roland, impressed by Galian's show of valor, cries:

"....................! Ben agra agut mestier
Que Galian fos vengut en premier."\(^8\)

Galian fights fiercely until half his men are gone and until he, himself, is mortally wounded. At least we are told that:

"Del cor li part le fege e.l polmon,
E es remazut solet sus un erbos,"\(^9\) and that is the last mention in Ronsasvals of Olivier's gallant son.

---

\(^7\) Ronsasvals, 873-74.
\(^8\) Ibid., 1051-52.
\(^9\) Ibid., 1089-90.
It need hardly be remarked to those familiar with the 
*Oxford Roland* that Galien is not to be found there; and it 
may be added that there is no mention of Galien or of 
Olivier's son in the *Turpin, Carmen, Roncesvalles* or any of 
the remaining standard *Roland* versions listed in Mortier's 
"Table proposée de filiation."¹⁰

Unless a discovery is made of an earlier version or 
prototype of the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, there would seem 
to be no reason to doubt that the whole Galien legend must 
stem originally from this *chanson de geste* in which occurred 
the daring *gab* of Olivier. Nothing at all is said in the 
*Pèlerinage* about Olivier's engendering a child in the daughter 
of King Hugue, but only that the former boasted that he would 
sleep with the girl and perform the conjugal act one hundred 
times. King Hugue, learning of the various boasts of Charle­
magne's men, forced them to perform their boasts on threat 
of death. All the Frenchmen except Olivier accomplished their 
gabs through the power of their relics. The latter achieved 
the act of love only thirty times; but his female companion 
lied to protect him.

The *Galien* story must have developed from the suggestion 
of a son, born of this union, which evolved into a legend of

---

¹⁰Cf. CHAPTER I, p. 9.
Galien's reunion with his father at the battle of Rencesvals.\textsuperscript{11} That some form of this full-blown legend was known to the author of \textit{Ronsasvals} is self-evident. What his precise model was is not at all certain. At least two other versions of Galien have survived: that of the \textit{Viaggio di Carlo Magno in Ispagna},\textsuperscript{12} and \textit{Galiens li restorès},\textsuperscript{13} both of the 15th century.

The \textit{Viaggio} starts with Charles going to Spain and ends with the trial of Ganelon.\textsuperscript{14} The work contains most of the essential elements of the traditions of \textit{Q}, but with obvious variations. The Rencesvals incident begins with Chapter XXXXXVII (Vol. II). It includes Blancandrlns, the wily Saracen, and Braidamonte (Bramimunde), the wife of Marsile. Ganelon suggests to Marsile that he send the French much wine and quantity of women to corrupt them.\textsuperscript{15} The \textit{Viaggio} also includes the famous trip of Charlemagne and his peers to the Orient; there the boast of Olivier results in the engendering of Galien.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{11} This pattern is analogous to the creation of the \textit{Entrée d'Espagne} which seems to have been stimulated by the \textit{Roland}'s second line: "Set anz tuz pleins ad estet en Espaigne;"


\textsuperscript{13} Edmund Stengel, ed. (Marburg: Elwert, 1890).

\textsuperscript{14} See note 11.

\textsuperscript{15} This idea marks a connection with \textit{Turpin}, 61, 63.

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 175, Vol. II.
Except for the most fundamental substance, most of the details differ considerably from those of the Pèlerinage. The gabs themselves are different. Olivier, specifically, boasts that he could have his will with the daughter of the King, but mentions no particular number of times. The host king is ruler of Portogallo, rather than of Constantinople, and the Viaggio does not mention the name Hugue. In view of the above, it would seem unlikely that the author of the Viaggio had direct access to any manuscript close to the Pèlerinage.\textsuperscript{17}

The Viaggio's Galien theme concludes thus: Years after his birth, he suddenly appears in the fighting at Rencesvals. By a miracle, the dead Roland's hand raises his sword to be given to Galien by Charles. This is taken as proof that Galien is truly Olivier's son. Charles knights Galien. The Baligant episode begins. Galien is killed in battle. Charles ends up with Durendal and he goes searching for some good knight to give it to.

While it is evident, as already pointed out, that the author of the Viaggio did not draw directly on the Pèlerinage, it is apparent that he drew upon traditions close to 0 and

\textsuperscript{17} The list of sources noted by Ceruti are: \textit{Entrée En Espagne, Presa di Pamplona, Viaggio di Rolando in Oriente, Alda bella ed Ulivieri, Oggiero il Danese, Canzone di Rolando, Rotta di Roncisvalle}. Pp. XXXI et suiv., \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. II.
its remaniements. Besides the Baligant and Blancandrins elements mentioned above, there is the incident of the escape of Ganelon from Otes which would connect it positively with the remaniements. 18

A few names and at least one idea, the gab of Roland, connect the Viaggio and Ronsasvals to some common intermediary. Astolfo, for example, corresponds to Estout de Lingres of R, and Gonduel Buffon to Gandelbuon. In the Viaggio, Roland's boast is that he will blow his horn so loudly that it will kill all the birds around. This idea connects the work with Ronsasvals which has the lines:

"De tal vertut vay lo graylle sonier
Que li aucels que l'auziron sonier
La vos del graylle lur fes lo cor crebier,
E las venas del cor si vay trenchier." 19

Galiens li restorés starts with Galien's origins. It too, contains the Pèlerinage story but the details differ from both the latter and the Viaggio. Olivier boasts that he will have carnal knowledge of the King's daughter fifteen times. Galien, the son engendered by this union, grows up and goes to seek out his heritage. The scene shifts to

18

19
Charlemagne where the treason of Ganelon has begun. Galien appears in Charlemagne's army where Charles recognizes him because of his great resemblance to Olivier. Galien enters the battle at Rencesvals and plays an important part in the action. The work contains a long passage of personal combat between Galien and Pinart. Galien is later knighted by Charles.

The Galiens shows elements of positive concordance, as in the case of the Viaggio, with the Remaniements: There is Roland on Vieullentini (not Malmatln as in R), Blancandrin and Ganelon plan the treason, and there is Baligant.

There are also elements connecting Galiens to the Turpin. For one thing, Baligant is the brother of Marsile. another is that Gondrebuef (like Gandelbuon of R and Baudoins of Tu) brings the message of the disaster to Charles; who only then rushes back to Rencesvals.

Names and matières also connect Galiens to Ronsasvals: Estoufle and Gondrebuef le frison (correspond to Astolfo and Gonduel Buffon of the Viaggio) are identifiable with Estout de Lingres and as mentioned above with Gandelbuon of R. Escot Guillemer and Savaris find counterparts in R in Estout Guilhalmier and Savaric. Among matières connecting Galiens with R there is the same episode in which Gondrebuef (Gandelbuon of R) takes the message of the defeat to Charles. He meets Galien leading troops to Rencesvals, and asks the latter for a fresh horse, but is refused, because Galien is
in a hurry.\footnote{See Mario Roques, *Ronsasvals, poème épique provençal,* *Romania*, LXVI (1940-41), 442.} In *Ronsasvals*, as discussed in CHAPTER III, Gandelbuon encounters Garin de Sayna under the same circumstances and meets with the same refusal.

The *Galiens* contains one item which ties it in still more closely with the *Pèlerinage*: i.e. the King involved in the matter of the *gabs* is Hugon of Constantinople (Hugue in the *Pèlerinage*). The *Viaggio* makes him the King of Portogallo, and *Ronsasvals*, as we have seen, names him Gabaut lo baron (origin not specified).

There is a single note of unique character in *Ronsasvals'* treatment of Galian; there he is the son of a pagan woman.\footnote{Ibid., p. 437. See also note 4.} No such label is put upon her in the other versions, except perhaps, that in the *Viaggio* the King involved is the King of Portogallo who might possibly be assumed to be pagan. Mario Roques concludes regarding the matter:

"Il y a donc lieu d'admettre, entre le récit de *Galien*, et ceux de *Ronsasvals* et du *Viaggio*, un intermédiaire qui a fait de la mère de *Galien* une païenne."\footnote{Ibid., p. 440.}

Summary of results from the Galian comparison

*Ronsasvals*, in certain matières and names, shows positive
concordances with Galiens lii restorés and the Viaggio. None of the three is likely to have had close contact with the Pèlerinage itself, although the Galiens indicates a closer bond with the original than do the other two. While there are connections of a positive nature among the three (Galiens, Viaggio and R), extreme differences of important details shows that none drew directly from the other.

Both Galiens and the Viaggio\(^ {23} \) show (in contrast to Ronsasvals) such great knowledge of traditions, including such important matters like Baligant, Blancandrins, Bramimunde, as well as Turpin matière, that Ronsasvals could not possibly have had contact with anything except far removed prototypes or intermediaries of these manuscripts.

Moreover, the fact that many matière and such names as Galien, Estout (Astolfo), Gandelbuon, and Falsaron who play such prominent parts in the later Italian epics, are also prominent in Galiens, the Viaggio and in Ronsasvals, inevitably suggests that a lost intermediary (or intermediaries) through which these three are connected is close to the Italian mainstream of epic traditions.\(^ {24} \)

\(^{23}\) No special attention is given here to the dates of these works since we are in effect concerned with their sources and earlier prototypes.

\(^{24}\) Cf., Mario Roques' statement CHAPTER I, note 14, p. 4. Of additional interest are certain remarks by Jesse Crosland, op. cit., Pp. 255-257.
Spanish echoes

Ronsasvals contains certain elements which point to Spanish influences. Some of these items have been pointed out by Horrent\textsuperscript{25} and supported by Menéndez Pidal.\textsuperscript{26} One example is the Spanish origin of Durendal as stated in these lines:

"La bona espeya que fes fabre Galant,
Qu'ieu non l'ac pueys ni detras ni davant
D'aquella hora qu'ieu n'aussi Baynant,
E diey la vos de cor e de talant."\textsuperscript{27}

Mario Roques identifies the Baynant above with Braimant of Mainet,\textsuperscript{28} which identification is confirmed by Horrent.\textsuperscript{29} The battle between Charles and Braimant (recounted in the Mainet occurs in Spain.\textsuperscript{30}

The only other Roland version which designates this source of Durendal is the "Fragment de Pampelune," the Spanish Roland known as Roncesvalles. Compare these lines from the latter with those above from Ronsasvals:\textsuperscript{31}

\begin{quote}

\textsuperscript{26} La Chanson de Roland y el neotradicionalismo (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1959).
\textsuperscript{27} Ronsasvals, 1592-95.
\textsuperscript{28} Mario Roques, "Ronsasvals, poème épique provençal," Romania, LVIII (1932) Of. Index des noms, p. 185.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., note 25, Cf. footnote p. 127.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., p. 128.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., note 27.
\end{quote}
One of the most interesting of matières linking Ronsasvals to Spanish traditions is the lack, in the latter version, of any pursuit or vengeance by Charles upon the remaining Saracens. This "vengeance" in the 0 traditions contains two phases: 1. The pursuit of the remainder of Marsile's forces, their destruction and drowning in the Ebre. Menéndez Pidal has aptly labeled this phase "La batalla del sol parado," since God lengthened the day to allow Charles' army to complete the conquest; 2. The conquest of Saragossa. It is of interest to this study to note that the Turpin does contain the "batalla del sol parado" but omits the taking of Saragossa. The Anales anianenses concurs in this with the Turpin. Menéndez Pidal declares:

"...todos los textos rolandianos de España y del sur de Francia están concordes en no mentar la conquista de Zaragoza; están en esto conformes el Poema de Almería, el Pseudo-Turpin, el Carmen de Prodicione Guenonis, el Ronsasvals provenzal del siglo XII y el del XIII y el Roncesvalles español del XIII.37"  

Menéndez Pidal presents the plausible argument that the

34 In 0 traditions, this phase includes the defeat of Baligant.
35 R. Menéndez Pidal, Ibid., note 33 above.
36 Dating of the Ronsasvals will be taken up later.
37 Ibid., note 33 above, Pp. 405-406.
idea of the French taking Saragossa was repugnant to the Spanish jongleurs. Ronsasvals omits not only the taking of Saragossa but also the pursuit of Marsile's men. As a matter of fact, God lengthens the day to three days, but only so that Charles can finish burying the dead. This, Menéndez Pidal sees as a violent departure from Northern French traditions:

"Esta falta total de venganza, que por ser tan contraria a la común tradición francesa del Norte parece ser de directo o indirecto origen español en el Ronsasvals, no es primitiva en el Sur." 39

He further attributes these Spanish-Provençal exchanges to the well-known literary commerce (especially that of itinerant jongleurs) between Provence and Hispania in the 12th Century. 40

Regionalisms

Certain elements of style and theme in Ronsasvals appear to be regionalisms of the Occitanian area. The fact that the battle occurs in the month of May seems to suggest the Provençal preference for Spring and birds and flowers. This is indicated in the very first line of the poem:

"So fon el mes de may quant la verdor resplant, En prima vera quant renovella l'an,"

The above lines are somewhat reminiscent of these lines

---

38 Is it at all significant that this lack of vengeance is in closer agreement with the historical where the army of Charlemagne was unable to contact the perpetrators of the ambush?

39 Ibid., note 33 above, p. 163.

of Jaufre Rudel:

"Lanquan li jorn son lonc en may
M'es belhs dous chans d'auzelhs de lonh," 41

This particular point is, suprisingly, not in contrast to Oxford as far as the calendar is concerned, since some, at least, of the latter's action occurs in May as indicated by these lines describing Baligant's departure from Alexandria:

"Co est en mai, al premer jur d'ested:
Tutes ses oz ad empeintes en mer." 42

There is one point of contrast in the Q-R comparison above: that is, that Q designated the season as the first morning of summer, whereas R calls it spring when the year renews itself.

The author of Q shows no special inclination for describing the season or the weather except that we are told on several occasions that the day is clear and the sun is shining:

"Bels fut li vespres e li soleilz fut cler." 43

And at another point we read that it was hot and dusty:

"Granz est li calz, si se levet la puldre." 44

41 Robert White Linker, A Provencal Anthology (Columbus, Ohio: Harold L. Hedrick, 1940) p. 13.
42 Oxford, 2628-29.
43 Ibid., 157. See also 737, 1002.
44 Ibid., 3633.
Ronsasvals, however, again and again insists on the flowers and birds of spring:

"So fon de may an la gran matineya.
Que l solelh lus e debat la roseya
E ls auzelletz cantan per l'encontreya," 46

The troubadour, Portajoyas, offers in Ronsasvals some typical Occitanian lyrics in the lines where he laments the death of Turpin:

"Per vos devria la terra tremolar,
E las estelas que non luyssan clar,
Solelh e luna de lur clardat mermar,
E los auzels muydar de lur cantar,
E flum correns de lur briefu restancar." 47

In the introduction to the Aude scene in Ronsasvals we read:

"So fon en may cant florisson jardin
E l auzelletz cantan en lur latin," 48

Compare the above with these lines from Cercamon:

"Quant l'aura doussa s'amarzis
E l fuelha chai de sul verjan
E l'auzel chanjan lor latis," 49

Another regionalism to be noted in Ronsasvals is the great attention and frequent mention given to the men of

45 Old Provençal poets often mention birds in their works. cf. Pp. 52-56, R. W. Linker, op. cit., for an extensive Old Provençal treatise on birds.

46 Ronsasvals, 177-79.

47 Ibid., 1654-58.

48 Ibid., 1700-1.

Provence. While it is true that the Oxford contains men of Southern France (laisses CCXX, CCXXII and CCXXIV), Count Jozeran de Provence, "Peitevins" and "des barons d'Alverne", Ronsasvals shows signs of favoring the Provençaux declaring that they are artful in battle:

"Els Proensals son de batalha artos,  
E traysseron lurs bons brans assiros  
E comenseron un torney perilhos;"50

The favoritism is confirmed a few lines later when we are told that the "Alamans" kill fifteen hundred of the enemy; but the "Proensals" slay 15,000!51

Relics and Portajoyas

Certain elements in the Ronsasvals concerning the subject of relics, plus the incident of the jongleur, Portajoyas, offer some support to the Bédier theory of monk-jongleur cooperation, and the role of abbeys and relics in the formation of this epic. The following are some examples which suggest that relics may have played some part:

1. Roland offers seven ounces of gold to the church; another group gives gold, and silver, but it is most interesting to note that Angelier gives a red plaque and Roland, a gold cup.52

2. Before, the great battle, Roland calls for his

---

50 Ronsasvals, 1284-1286.
51 Ibid., 1290-91.
52 Ibid., 185-188.
sword, Durendart. The sword is not just handed to him but is brought forth with ceremony and it is wrapped in costly cloth:

"E Rollan ha Durendart demandeya; Tres fils de comte la li an aporteeya Diins en un pali que fon envolopeya."53

3. When Charles orders the twelve peers to be carried back to their countries, they are to be taken with their rustic lances:54

"Portan am barras, amb espieus bordales."55

4. As already discussed in CHAPTER III56 note Ronsasvals descriptive technique of describing arms and dress in minute detail but omitting any description of the man wearing them.

Whether any of the objects mentioned above qualify as relics or whether they may merely reflect some regional or period battle procedures; the presence of such things as plaques, gold cups, rustic lances and minutely described armor suggests the possibility that the writer may have had much of his inspiration from viewing objects in the museum-like atmosphere of a monastery. The unwrapping of the rich cloth to expose the precious sword, suggests the notion even more strongly.

53 Ibid., 192-94.
54 Robert Barroux has provided this interpretation of the word. cf., Mortier, op. cit., Tome III, p. 148.
55 Ronsasvals, 1695.
56 Cf., Pp. 54-55.
The incident of the jongleur, Portajoyas, in Ronsasvals, is as intriguing as it is enigmatic. Jules Horrent points out that the lines from Roncesvalles:

"Bueno pora la armas, mejor pora ante Jhesu Xristo, Consejador de pecadores..."

contain the same matière as found in these lines from Ronsasvals:

"Greu cauza m'es, mas non ho puesc muydar, Que anc mielher preyre non cantet ad autar, Ni anc sa gent mielh saupes monestar, Ni melhor d'armas si saupes adobar."

Portajoyas enters the scene in Ronsasvals after Charles has grieved long over the death of Roland. The jongleur grieves just as intensely over Turpin:

"Mentre aquest dol venc ponhent un juglar, Portajoyas ac nom, si si fa appellar. Trobet l'evesque mort justa un vallat E deyssendet aval sus en un prat; Estranhamens comenset ha plorar:"

His grieving is exceeded only by that of Charles, and indeed merited enough importance to the poet to consume some thirty-nine lines (two complete laisses).

According to Portajoyas, the worst loss at Rencesvals

57 Jules Horrent offers at least two examples of Provençal jongleurs with similar names and suggests that the name was common among jongleurs of southern France. Cf., Roncesvalles (see note 25) p. 107.

58 Ibid., p. 17. Lines 2-3 of the Fragment.

59 Ronsasvals, 1641-4.

60 Ibid., 1627-31.

61 Ibid., 1627-1665.
was that of the great archbishop:

".........aquest dol non ha par.
Jamays nuls hons non si deu en ren fiar
Qu'el segle sia don gauch si deya dar;" 62

He justifies God's action partially in agreeing that He is wise to gather around Him the best of men; but he feels that God should have at least left this one (Turpin) because of his great importance to everyone:

"Anc non poc Dieus plus durament raubar
Que.ls miels del mont n'a fach ainsi menar;
E fes que savi, car volc a si tirar
Los miels del segle, mas vos degra layssar." 63

Never a better priest ever sang mass, or administered to his men or bore arms. 64 Addressing the archbishop, he declares that the earth should tremble, the stars, sun and moon should put out their lights, the birds should stop singing and the rivers cease to run. 65 The jongleur cries that he shall never have joy anymore. His heart is so pressed that he can no longer speak; he falls dead beside the body of the priest.

The Portajoyas episode offers various possibilities for speculation. Could this matière be an insertion of an element

62 Ibid., 1632-34.
63 Ibid., 1635-38.
64 Ronsasvals, 1642-44.
65 Ibid., 1654-58.
from some other source of Roland material? Probably not, since, with the exception of the vague connection already mentioned with Roncesvalles, neither the name Portajoyas nor the idea of a jongleur lamenting Turpin is found in any other version of Roland. This incident is quite likely an "invention" by the unknown poet or compiler of Ronsasvals.

The fact that a jongleur appears at all in a Roland version is striking enough; that he is the instrument of such lavish praises for a priest is even more provocative in its implications. Are we dealing here with one of the most obvious examples of Bédier monk-jongleur cooperation? We have little reason to doubt it, unless we should assume that the Portajoyas affair merely represents this poet's penchant for dramatization. But why choose a jongleur for this role? Let us examine this question again in the CONCLUSION after having taken up the role of Turpin in CHAPTER V.

To terminate this phase of Ronsasvals' sources, local and foreign let us point out briefly two other areas of possible episodic intrusion involving 1. Charles' sin, 2. some small possibility of Arthurian or far northern influence.

"Mon nep e mon enfant"

Immediately prior to the entry of Portajoyas and fol-

---

66 See note 57.
lowing Charles' great lament for Roland, the emperor declares:

"Bel neps, yeu vos ac per lo mieu peccat gran
De ma seror e per mon falhimant,
Qu'ieu soy tos payres, tos oncles eyssament,
E vos, car senher, mon nep e mon enfant." 67

Mention of this legend concerning Roland's incestuous birth does not occur in Oxford, V4 or the Remaniements, the Carmen or the Turpin; but on the other hand, it is mentioned in the Karolusmagnussage, Konrad, and the Kaiserkronik. Mario Roques has discovered a possible reference to the idea in the Spagna in verse:

"Cara mia speme, nepote e figliuolo
Che non avevi in prodezza compagno,..." 68

Other works containing this reference to incest, in greater or lesser development, are Huon de Bordeau (1180-1200) in which a great sin of Charles is mentioned although incest is not specified. 69 The prose Berte (late 13th Century) contains the following lines:

"Pepin celle nuyt engendra une fille, nommee sur fons Gille, et d'icelle Gille vinst le noble combattant Raoulant...Et veulent racompter les histoires que Charlemagne, que aussi fut fiz au roy Pepin et qu'il engendra en la noble Berthe apres, l'engendra, celuy Raoulant, en icelle sa soeur Gille." 70

67 Ronsasvals, 1623-6.
70 Ibid., 381.
One should keep in mind, however, that epics were not the only treasury of this incest legend. Gaston Paris reports that a 10th Century Latin story of Saint-Gilles refers to a "mortal sin" of Charles but does not specify the exact sin. Gaston Paris further asserts that this particular piece of literature was completely accepted within the Church. The same report found in the story of Saint-Gilles was repeated in the office of Saint-Charlemagne in 1165. The chronicle of Phillippe Mousket (1243) also has a report of the legend.

With this information of Charles' alleged incest so widespread at an early date, why is the expression of it lacking in O and its close cousins? Consider the fact that the legend appears only in non-French versions. Is the conclusion too obvious that the non-French authors were not so prone to overlook any real or supposed defects in Charlemagne?

Arthurian and northern connections?

As to the possibility of some Arthurian influence in Ronsasvals (as suggested by Crosland), the evidence is

71 Ibid., 379-80.
72 Ibid.
73 Ibid., p. 380. See also Boris Jarcho, "Junyi Roland" Romania, LII (1926), 522-25.
74 Another example of lack of sympathy with French heroes by non-French compilers is found in Konrad laisses 35, 36. Also note Roland's chest actually pierced by Alimon in Ronsasvals. (See pages 19-20 CHAPTER I).
75 op. cit., p. 257.
rather scanty. Two items may perhaps give some such indications: as Crosland suggests, the death of Aude may perhaps resemble the death of Iseut in that both die embracing the body of the lover; however, the phenomenon may be too usual to be significant. The disposal of Durendart, on the other hand, is more indicative not only as its being thrown into a lake reminds one of the fate of Arthur's Excalibur, but also as it related to the Scandinavian epics. In R we see the end of Durendart:

"Karle l'esgarda, contra.l solelh resplant:
'Ay! Durendart, bona espeya trenchant,
Mays non vos aura nuls homes que valha tant;
En aquest segle non tenres pron ni dan.'
En un gran lac la va gitar breumant:
Anc pueys non la vi nuls homes petitz ni grans."

This passage is interesting in view of Paul Aebischer's thesis that in the 12th Century there were two versions relative to the fate of Durendal: 1. In the Oxford-Remaniements; it was recovered and kept among the French (apparently Rabel has it). 2. In the Hispano-norroise; it was thrown into the water, the blade, at least and of course, the latter applies to Ronsasvals.

We may add in concluding this chapter, that there are hints here and there of certain items in common between Southern manuscripts of the Roland and with those of the

76 op. cit., p. 257.
77 Ronsasvals, 1603-1608.
79 Ibid.
Scandinavian group: e. g. both Ronsasvals and n lack the Baligant episode. But sufficient evidence is lacking to point out any real contacts between the two areas. One possibility is that some of the Scandinavian versions branched off as a pre-Oxonian stage as may very well be the case of Ronsasvals. OTuR relationships as to the core story of the three versions will support this idea and will be restated with a few more remarks in the CONCLUSION.
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Aebischer maintains that a manuscript which he calls B Roland (Norwegian) is the oldest extant Roland. op. cit., p. 290.
CHAPTER V
Significant variations

Superficially, the principle characters in Oxford, Ronsasvals, and partially in the Turpin, are cast in similar roles. Charlemagne is the renowned emperor, leader of Christendom. He adores Roland, his nephew, and laments loudly and long over the latter's death. Naimes, old and trustworthy is always at Charles' side; he is ever ready with sober advice when Charles becomes overwhelmed by great emotions. Roland is loyal to his king, formidable in battle and devoted to his men. Turpin inspires the French by word and deed. Olivier is Roland's closest friend and comrade in arms. Aude, devoted to Roland, dies because of the latter's death. Ganelon is the traitor who sells out Roland and the rearguard to avenge himself on his stepson, Roland.

But these characteristics and dispositions, especially in Ronsasvals, are often only outward labels; there are some significant departures from the Oxford among these principle characters as to varying neglect or attention by the poet, their relative importance or rank, and their basic character.
and other details.  

A word or two should be said about the Turpin at this point. First of all, it is rather a fruitless task to deal with characterization in the Turpin because of its style. This version, of course, has Roland, the valiant fighter. Charlemagne is the leader of the Christian world. The archbishop himself does not appear as a participant in the Rencesvals disaster but remains with the main body of Charles' army. Aude is not mentioned at all. Olivier is mentioned only twice briefly. Ganelon is pointed out initially as the traitor and a second time when he is brought to trial. Baudoin and Thierry have special parts to play here as the last two survivors along with Roland. In short, most of the Turpin is taken up by Roland and Charles, with the author, supposedly Turpin, narrating and inserting long, exemplum-type commentaries on the events.

Let us examine seven of the most important characters common to OTuR in the Roland legend, concentrating especially on those features which contrast significantly.

"Nostre emper(er)e magnes"

In the Oxford, Charlemagne, as is well-known, plays an

---

1 Mario Roques and others have consistently overlooked or ignored the radical departure in spirit from O traditions in Tu and especially in R. Crosland, in fact, leads one to believe that Ronsasvals is merely another "remaniement" of O. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

2 There is a great resemblance between these Turpin commentaries and those found in medieval bestiaries, even those of Portugal of the 14th Century. See "Historia natural das aves," Kimberley S. Roberts, An Anthology of Old Portuguese, (Lisboa: Livraria Portugal, 1956), p. 68.
extensive and important role. Some have even considered his part in this version great enough to merit calling it a "Chanson de Charlemagne." The poem starts with his name:

"Carles li reis, nostre emper(er)e magnes,"

and he participates throughout the poem up to the next to the last line:

"Pluret des oilz, sa barbe blanche tiret."

White-haired, more than two hundred years old, but still a vigorous fighter on the battlefield, he is a formidable figure:

"S'est kil demandet, ne l'estoet enseigner." He respects his noble barons, calling them before him to ask their advice on the matter of Marsile's proposal. He listens to each one, but there is never any doubt about his own absolute control; for when he is displeased or annoyed, he orders them to shut up and to speak only when told to do so. When Naimes offers to take the message to Marsile, Charles tells him:

"Vos n'irez pas uan de mei si luign. Alez sedeir, quant nuls ne vos sumunt!"

---

4 Oxford, 4001.
5 Indeed he defeats Baligant in personal combat.
7 Ibid., 250-51.
When both Roland and Olivier volunteer, he tells them both to be silent; then he rebukes all the barons for failing to make a good suggestion and his fierce attitude subdues them all:

"Franceis se taisent: as les vus aquisez."\textsuperscript{8}

When Turpin offers to go, Charles speaks to him much as he had spoken to Naimes:

"'Alez seder desur cel palie blanc!
N'en parlez mais, se jo nel vos cumant!'" AOI\textsuperscript{9}

Roland nominates Ganelon as messenger, but it is Charles who makes the decision and gives the order:

"Go dist li reis: 'Trop avez maltalant,
Or irez vos certes, quant jol cumant.'"\textsuperscript{10}

Even Ganelon and Blancandrins have to admit their great admiration for Charles in the Oxford. Blancandrins says:

"Dist Blancandrins: 'Merveilus hom est Charles,
Ki cunquist Puille e trestute Calabre;"\textsuperscript{11}

and Ganelon adds:

"Guenes respunt: 'Itels est sis curages;
Jamais n'ert hume ki encunte lui vaille.' AOI"\textsuperscript{12}

Charles' love and tenderness are just as intense as his fierce authority. He weeps while crossing the mountains

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., 263.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 272-3.
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., 327-8.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 370-1.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 375-6.
when he thinks of his nephew whom he has left in Spain.  

When Charles finally returns to the field at Rencesvalis, he bursts out with bitter outcries and lamentations. He weeps and rages:

"Tiret sa barbe cum hom ki est iret;"  
He stops his lamentations only when Naimes reminds him of his duty of vengeance.  

In the Oxford, Charles is cast in the mold of Biblical prophets. He has dreams and visions frequently and God answers his prayers. He receives the visitation of angels. He is surrounded by apocalyptic portents. His great prowess in battle is at last shown in the Baligant episode where, after slaying numerous powerful Saracens, he even slays the great Baligant himself.  

Finally, when Ganelon has been tried and found guilty, we see that Charles, like an Old Testament patriarch, can also mete out swift and terrible punishment. He not only has Ganelon quartered but he has thirty of his family hanged. 

---

13 Ibid., 826 and following.
14 Ibid., 2414.
15 Ibid., 2428.
16 Charles' dreams are not entirely lacking in R where he dreams that a Greek fire destroyed Paris (925). He prays too: e.g. when God lengthens the day but the passage in contrast to O is filled with liturgy. (circa, 1487).
17 Oxford, 3619.
18 Ibid., 3958.
Charles does not appear in the opening part of Ronsasvals. We first hear of his greatness through the reputation of his sword. When all the famous swords are listed, we are told that if Joyosa were here the pagans would be grieving. He is mentioned next in laisse X when Olivier asks Roland to blow the horn. Again Charles' renown is indicated:
"Si o aus Karle ho mans homes honratz, Socorra nos, car grans es son barnatz," Charles does not appear in person until nearly half-way through the poem when Galian enters the scene. Galian sings flowery praises for the great emperor whose fame stretches from Europe to the Orient; but nowhere here in Ronsasvals do we get through his manner of acting or speaking a picture of an awe-inspiring commander. Along with Naimes, Charles even personally carries out the menial task of putting on Galian's spurs. However ceremonious this act may have been intended to be, it is somewhat below the dignity of the Charles of Q.

Charles next appears (in Ronsasvals) in his exchange with Ganelon on the matter of Roland's horn blowing. This

19 Ronsasvals, 85-95.
20 Ibid., 96.
21 Ibid., 529-30.
22 Ibid., laisse XXI.
is fairly similar to the corresponding one in 0: Charles hears a horn blast. Ganelon first tries to deny hearing it; then, on the second blast, when Charles is convinced he has heard it, Ganelon tries to discredit Roland as one who is accustomed to blowing the trumpet for anything.

Charles next appears in R, when Gandelbuon arrives from Rencesvals with the message of the French defeat. Here Charles, shaken by the news, leaps from his horse and begins to complain to God about his misfortune. In his own words, we get a sort of portrait of him, and how different a one it is from the Oxford's great "Charles li reis."

"Bel senher Dieu, so dis Karle lo bier. Tout m'aves joya e rendut consirier: Tot cant avia, senher Dieu drechurier, Pas la gonnella que.n degra ajudier: Vielh suy e freol, armas non puesc portier, Una perdis may non poyray mangier, Ar auray guerra cant degra repauzier;"23

What a degeneration from Charles the great of 0 who slew King Canabeus and split the jeweled helmet of Baligant!

Charles at last arrives in Rencesvals, finds Roland's body and bursts out in long and tearful lamentations. Here he resembles Charles of 0 more than in any other passage. There is some similarity in style, too. In Oxford, five speeches in succession are introduced by "Ami Rollant."

_____________________
23 Ronsasvals, 1207-1214.
24 Oxford, laisses CCVI-CCX.
In **Ronsasvals**, six laisses are introduced by "Bel neps Rollan..."  

As one can see by this comparison, **R** expands the lamentation. It may be of some significance to remark that within laisse 39 of **R**, six lines in succession are started with "Bel neps Rollan", a repetitive style which reminds one of Charles' lament in Luigi Pulci's *Morgante*.

In **Ronsasvals** we find:

"Bel neps Rollan, que faray de pezanza,
Bel neps Rollan, perdut ay m'alegransa,
Bel neps Rollan, mon gauch e ma burbansa, etc..."  

In Pulci:

"Io benedico il di che tu nacesti,
io benedico la tua giovinezza,
io benedico i tuoi concetti onesti,
io benedico la tua gentilezza,
io benedico cio che mai facesti,
io benedico la tua gran produzza,
io benedico l'opre alte e legiaddre,
io benedico il seme di tuo padre."  

"Naimes li dux"  

Not much can be said about Naimes as he appears in **O-R** except that in both versions he is Charles' closest companion,

25 **Ronsasvals**, laisses 39-44.


27 **Ronsasvals**, 1505-1510.

28 Ibid., note 26.

29 He is Naimes li dux in **O**, but in **Ronsasvals**, Turpin and Konrad he is Naimes de Bavière. (cf. André de Mandach, *op. cit.*, p. 201.), also in **V4**.
and is always at his side. In O, Charles indicates his affection for Naimes when he refuses to let the old man go as messenger to Marsile. In both O and R, it is Naimes who draws Charles out of his grieving and reminds the emperor of his duties. In both, it is Naimes and Charles (along with Ganelon) who first hear Roland's trumpet-blast.

Naimes in R never takes part in battle, but in O, he fights against the forces of Baligant; and he is struck, but not killed, by King Canabeus.

In Turpin, nothing at all is said of Naimes except that he is buried with the dead at Blaives. This, of course, represents a departure from both O and R since it implies that the Naimes of Turpin died at Rencesvals with Roland.

Naimes in the Ronsasvals is indicated in one connection which differs from O-Tu; he has supposedly been given some three thousand horses by Ganelon as part of the tribute from Marsile.

"Le destre braz del cors"

Roland in both Oxford and Ronsasvals is shown to be both proud and impetuous. He refuses to blow the horn at

---

30 See note 7, p. 105.
31 Oxford, laisse CCXLIX.
32 Turpin, 85.
33 See notes 58-9 and other remarks on p. 60.
34 An interesting article by Alfred Foulet on the subject of Roland's alleged "demesure" is found in Romance Philology, X (1957), 145-8.
the initial requests of Olivier, and thus the rear-guard perishes. In Oxford, as the poem begins, he is quick to suspect Saracen treachery and urges Charles to remain and fight. Of course, as has been indicated in the Concordance of matières in CHAPTER II, this whole preliminary sequence of council and betrayal is lacking in R. In Ronsasvals we are told only that Ganelon sold out the French because of the pride of Roland:

"Que. ls vendet Gayne per l'erguelh de Rollan:"

Roland is among the fiercest of fighters. He is never killed by enemy arms in the Oxford and the Turpin where he dies from the effects of the mighty blast on his trumpet. And in Ronsasvals, near the end, when thousands of pagans are unable to conquer a handful of remaining French, a Saracen scout explains that:

"A la un diable c'om apella Rollan,
Ten Durendart, un speya trenchant,
Tan fort l'estrenh entre.l ponh e lo brant,
So que consec, de mort non ha garimant,"37

But Roland, although receiving numerous praises and verbal witness of his valor, is shown in certain actions to be something less than he is described in Ronsasvals. When

36 Ronsasvals, 83.
37 Ibid., 679-82.
he is near death and is attacked by a Saracen, he is not only unable to rise up to protect himself, but he is actually struck by the pagan, Alimon, the blow piercing his chest.\textsuperscript{38} In the Oxford under similar circumstances, Roland rises and smashes the Saracen's skull, the weapon being the famous oliphant:

"Tient l'olifan, que unkes perdre ne volt,
Sil fier en l'elme, ki gemmet fut a or:
Fruisset l'acer e la teste e les ôs,
Amsdous les oilz del chef li ad mis fors;"\textsuperscript{39}

At another point in Ronsasvals, Roland is shown to be rather ineffectual, when the Saracen, Falsabron, attacks again and again killing off the peers while Roland is unable to avenge any of these "foul deeds."\textsuperscript{40} Somewhat later, when Roland is on the point of death the poet tells us that he was afraid to die:

"Rollan esta, que ha paor de morir,"\textsuperscript{41}

Again in Ronsasvals, Roland succumbs to the desire to have Aude, and he blows the trumpet only when reminded of her by Olivier.\textsuperscript{42} By contrast, in the Oxford, Roland is fiercely uncompromising with death and the enemy and he steadfastly refuses to blow the horn in spite of Olivier's pleas.

But while Roland's valor suffers in these instances cited he loses even more of his rank and prestige in Ronsasvals through the overblown role of Turpin with whom we shall deal

\textsuperscript{38} Cf., CHAPTER I, Pp. 19-20.
\textsuperscript{39} Oxford, 2287-90.
\textsuperscript{40} Cf., p. 17 and Ronsasvals, 720-820.
\textsuperscript{41} Ronsasvals, 1307.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 918.
It should be noted here that Roland in both 0 and R is portrayed as a loyal champion to France and his King. But in the Turpin, as we might expect, he is noted as a champion of Christianity and is called "li benooiz martyrs;" and he is cast in a rather conventional mold of an obedient servant of the Church.

"Li arcevesques"

Turpin, as has already been noted in the previous chapter, receives substantial attention in Ronsasvals, specifically in the eulogy given him by the jongleur, Portajoyas. He disappears in Ronsasvals during the battle, and is thus denied some of the most touching and dramatic moments of the Oxford where he fights valiantly to the end alongside Roland and Gautier. But the Turpin of R, while he is on the scene, does many of the same things as his counterpart in 0: he sermonizes, blesses and absolves the men. He encourages them to be Christian martyrs in both versions. In 0 he hints a little that he scorns the sedentary monk:

"Ki armes portet e en bon cheval set;
En bataille deit estre forz e fiers,
U altremen ne valt .III. deners;
Einz deit monie estre en un de ces mustiers,

---

43
Turpin, 71.
Si prierat tuz jurz por noz peceez."

The Turpin of *Ronsasvals* is also an example of the church militant; Roland declares of the archbishop:

"Qui vi anc mays tal preyre en l'encontreya,
Plus gent saupes predicar sa mayneya,
Ni miels feris de lansa ni d'espeya?"

but the poet of *R* leaves us with the impression less of righteous indignation than with the notion of a Turpin who is somewhat bloodthirsty. In the *Oxford*, we must admit that at one point Turpin is said to have struck more than a thousand blows. But a study of his scenes of personal combat there will reveal that the poet has carefully spared the archbishop from delivering prodigious and bloody blows. Turpin in *Ronsasvals*, on the other hand, speaks more like a soldier of fortune when he says:

"En vuelh aver mon goffaron sagnent.""47

and again:

"Que jeu que suy preyre, evesque e clezon,
En vuel aver sagnent mon goffaron."48

Turpin of the *Ronsasvals* is not only more militant than his counterpart in *O*; but he also assumes higher authority

---


45 *Ronsasvals*, 221-3.

46 *Oxford*, 1414.

47 *Ronsasvals*, 264.

48 Ibid., 300-301.
--an authority which is comparable to that of Charles in the Oxford. In 0, Turpin is treated as somewhat of an equal with the Peers, it is true, but Roland is in charge of the twenty thousand. Roland in 0 is never given an order by Turpin. In the latter version, there is great respect for Turpin as the spiritual leader, but one perceives there too, a definite separation of the clergy and the ruling nobility—and the nobility holds the balance of power. In Oxford, when Turpin rises and offers to take the message, Charles tells him (as previously cited):

"'Alez sedeir desur cel palie blanc!
N'en parlez mais, se jo nel vos cumant!' 49

but in Ronsasvals, Turpin takes on the imperious attitude reserved in 0 for the emperor. He asks Roland what he has seen of the enemy and when Roland's report of the vast army of Saracens seems to irritate the archbishop, the latter rebukes him like a child:

"So dis l'evesque: 'Tayzies vos, si vos agreya;
Nos cantarem vespres e matineyas.' 50

Roland takes this discipline like a youthful hero-worshipper:

"Dieus, dis Rollan, ver filh sancta Maria,
Qui vi anc mays tal preyre en l'encontreya," 51

Later, Turpin addresses Gast Navalier and tells him too to

50 Ronsasvals, 214-15.
51 Ibid., 220-21. Note the similarity of these praises here with those uttered by Portajoyas. Also see previous page for the rest of this passage (note 45).
shut up, when the latter asks for the first blow of battle. Furthermore, most of the lines between 164 and 354 deal with or are delivered by the archbishop in *Ronsasvals*. It is the clergy in charge here; and Roland is no longer a champion of Christian France, but a vassal of the Church.

"Li proz e li gentilz"

Olivier, in *Ronsasvals*, receives some attention not given to him in *O* because of his relationship to Galian; but for the most part, he plays a similar role. Just as in *O*, he asks Roland to blow the oliphant, and here too, Roland refuses him. However, as already mentioned on the subject of Roland, Olivier’s arguments and not Turpin’s finally sway Roland and cause him to sound the trumpet:

"Que nos serem en Fransa ha ton repayre, 
Am ma seror Auda, de qui yest messennayre, 
E vuelh que tengas ha ton plaser a fayre."

Olivier, in both *O* and *R* accidentally strikes Roland during the heat of battle. Roland reproaches him for it in both versions, but details of the incident differ. In *R*, Orgelin strikes Olivier on the helmet with his mace. The blow almost knocks the eyes out of his head. Olivier, dazed, strikes Roland’s shield with his lance, knocking Roland off his horse. Roland declares:

---

52 *Ronsasvals*, 311.
Olivier apologizes saying that he became so dazed from the blow by Orgelin he thought he had struck the latter. In the Oxford version, Marganices strikes Olivier in the middle of the back with his lance. Olivier, whose sight has been impaired by much bleeding, strikes Roland's helmet with his sword, the blow cutting as far as the nose protector. Roland challenges him, in different words, but with much the same questions and with the reproach:

"Par nule guise ne m'aviez desfiet!" Olivier asks for pardon and Roland forgives him.

"Alde la bele"

The death of Aude in Oxford is limited to one laisse, with the following laisse devoted to her burial. Charles, on his return to Aix, is queried by Aude:

54 Ibid., 1015-17.
55 Oxford, laisse OXLV
56 Ibid., 1997.
57 Ibid., 2002.
58 Ibid., 2007-9.
59 Ibid., laisse COLXVIII.
Charles cries and pulls at his beard. "Sister, dear friend," he says, "you ask me about a dead man." He offers her his son, Louis, to which she immediately replies:

"Ne place Deu ne ses seinz ne ses angles
Apres Rollant que jo vive remaigne!"62

She pales and dies at the feet of the emperor.

The Turpin does not mention Aude at all, but in Ronsasvals, this element takes up nearly all of the final four laisses.63 Back in France, Aude is in the company of her ladies-in-waiting. She tells them of a dream she has just had and asks them to interpret it. The dream is as follows:

It seemed to her that all the universe was exploding. The sun was becoming dark. In the middle of the sky, a fiery ray shot forth entering her mouth and burning her body. She felt that she was dying but then on awakening she experienced such fear as to drive her mad. Aybeline attempts to interpret the dream, saying it means that today they will see both Roland and Olivier. While the ladies are talking, a pilgrim arrives. He has just come from the shrine of Saint-Jacques and he tells them of the disaster at Rencesvals.

60 Oxford, 3709-10.
61 Ibid., 3713.
62 Ibid., 3718-19.
63 Ronsasvals, 1700-1800.
Charles arrives looking extremely sad. Naimes tells him to stop mourning, to make the trumpets sound and to put on an air of joy to deceive Aude. 64 When Charles enters, pretending to be joyous, Aude tells him not to hide anything, but to reveal to her the whereabouts of Roland, Olivier and the twelve peers. Charles replies that they have gone to make an escort and she will see them shortly. Aude warns the King that he should stop the pretense and informs him that she knows the truth. "But we mustn't grieve," she declares, "May God save their souls. You may marry me to someone else!" 65 But she says to herself:

"............'Non plassa al drechurier
Que homes de carn aya mays de mi joya entier!" 66

Naimes advises Charles to tell her the truth. They bring forth the bodies. Aude grieves over Olivier a little, then goes to the body of Roland, embraces him so tightly that her heart fails.

This handling of the Aude episode bears a number of marks identifying it with V4 and the Remaniements. The following items are held in common between R and the above versions:

1. Aude has dreams and visions of a forboding nature. 67

---

64 See Ronsasvals, laisse 51.
65 Cf., Ronsasvals, 1765-1772.
66 Ibid., 1773-4.
67 The dreams in R appear to be unrelated to any dreams in other versions.
2. The royal party feign happiness to deceive her,
3. Aude wants to know the truth.
4. Charlemagne makes up lies,
5. Aude mourns over the bodies of Roland and Olivier then dies.

However, while R and the Remaniements have these elements in common, nearly all the actual details are different. It can only be said that the plot of this episode is connected in some way between R and these other versions and it must be added that it is just as difficult to account for R-Remaniement connections as for O-R connections. There is, however, some reason to believe that there was in circulation some sort of version of the Aude episode as a separate story. There is according to Menéndez Pidal, great resemblance between the Spanish romance, Muerte de doña Alda and the Ronsasvals version of the affair.

"Ki la traisun fist"

Ganelon's role as the traitor in OTuR concurs basically in the three versions. In OTu, however, he is the messenger

68

In R he says only that the peers are forming an escort; in V4 for example, his lies are much more elaborate.

69
Cf., Raoul Mortier, op. cit., Tome II, xiii-xv

70
Cf., Menéndez Pidal, La Chanson de Roland y el neotradicionalismo, (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1959), p. 166 for his comments on Horrent's ideas. There is one interesting item to note concerning Aude or Ronsasvals: namely that she is already married to Roland (R, 921). See p. 18, CHAPTER I. The point is confused, however, by a statement by Turpin (R, 231) where he says Roland will never marry her. As far as is known, an Aude-Roland marriage is unique to R.
to Marsile. This point is not mentioned in R but he is there designated as one who betrayed the French. He denies hearing the trumpet-blasts in OR, and in OTuR he asserts that Roland will blow the horn for any insignificant reason. In OTu there is the joust between Pinabel and Thierry. The trial is lacking in R and we are told only that he shall die a horrible death, that his members will be cut off, or whatever justice may decide to be right.71

As to Ganelon's character, Turpin says little else than that he might be compared to Judas.72 In Ronsasvals, Ganelon too, as was the case of Roland, Charles, and Naimes to an extent, is portrayed as weaker and less desirable in character than his namesake in Oxford. In O, while he is a traitor, he has considerable dignity and noble bearing. He is most attractive in physical appearance:

"Vairs out (les oilz) e mult fier lu visage,
Gent out le cors e les costez out larges;"73

His suggestions for making peace are even supported by Naimes. He is as fierce and as bold as any of Charles' men; and when surrounded by Saracens in the camp of Marsile, he even dares to place his hand on his sword in defiance of the Saracen chief.74 His treason results in the slaughter of

71 Is this a vague memory of the quartering, or is the quartering of OTu an expansion by the author of the OTu prototype?
72 *Turpin*, 69.
73 *Oxford*, 283-4.
74 *Ibid.*, laisse XXXIV.
the rear-guard, but he feels even to the end that he meant only a personal vengeance on Roland. Furthermore, he did the deed only after having openly warned Roland in the presence of all the barons.

The Ganelon (Gayne) of Ronsasvals, however, is furtive and cowardly; and when Gandelbuon comes with the news of the French defeat, he tries to hide:

"Cant auzi Gayne comtar lo messagier,
Arreyre fuch com si volgues cassier." 75

And when he is confronted with the accusation, he lies without conscience or honor, denying everything and heaping abuses on Naimes. 76

75
Ronsasvals, 1200-1201.

76
Ibid., laisse XXVI.
CONCLUSION

Numerous details of the comparison of the Provençal epic, Ronsasvals, with the Oxford and the Chronicle of Turpin clearly indicate the Provençal poem to be a composite of several traditions, these being specifically: Oxford-remaniements, the Chronicle of Turpin, the Galien legend, the Italian and Franco-Italian matières, the Spanish area plus some less well defined matières. A good portion of the poem, apparently not connected to the above or any other sources, points to Provençal regionalisms and subjective modifications by its anonymous author.

The Concordances and certain categorical comparisons, especially the "Hidden matières" discussed in CHAPTER III, readily suggest that the main structure of Ronsasvals rests upon a primitive version similar in form to the "core story" of OTuR. This basic version stemming from a pre-Oxonian form of the legend has by-passed many of the refinements of the Oxford-Turpinian area; but it has, on the other hand, been contaminated by the other sources noted above.
The word "author" used in paragraph one above must of course be taken in a very loose sense. The extant version of \( R \) may have passed through a series of remanieurs; and it may be the immediate product of a copyist who maintained the essentials of his model to a greater or lesser degree. It is, furthermore, not to be assumed that the principle "author" assembled all the components noted above, although, as Mario Roques remarks: it is possible "qu'il ait ajouté à son modèle ou développé librement certaines des scènes de son récit."\(^1\)

In defining the core story of \( OTuR \), one major assumption has been made here which departs from the actual graphic evidence of common matières: in all instances where the Oxford concurs with Ronsasvals exclusively, it is assumed that this matièrre represents an omission by the Turpin. This assumption is based on the following logic: other indications show the Turpin to be much nearer the source of Oxford than is Ronsasvals.\(^2\) It is therefore unlikely that the author of \( R \) would have access in most cases to some aspect of \( O \) which

\(^1\) Mario Roques, "Ronsasvals, poème épique provençal," Romania, LXVI (1941), 476.

\(^2\) The Concordance of names of persons (Pp. 26-29) shows about twice as many common to \( OTu \) as to \( OTuR \). A similar parallel is noted in the Concordance of selected matières.
was also not available to the Turpin compiler.  

The Turpin is, by other indications, highly suspect of omissions: e. g. 1. The author never mentions the Twelve Peers who are found in virtually every other version, 2. His is not an epic, but appears to be, by indications of style, a journalistic summary of the story, 3. Its main purpose seems to be Church propaganda. Note the exemplum on fornication and the offering of this sin as the reason for the downfall of the French, 4. He omits Aude, i. e. the love element (A devout monk might have found an earthly love a distraction from his image of Roland, the Christian martyr), 5. Turpin himself does not perish at Rencesvals, a modification which seems obviously to have been invented by the author.

A résumé of the Concordance of matières

The following is a résumé in symbols of the Concordance of selected matières, of CHAPTER II. Beside each letter symbol is a number which identifies the matière in Table V. To the right of all items designated OTuR will be seen a brief statement of that matière as it may be universally applied to the three versions. The total of these statements represents the common core version of Roland based upon this three-way

---

study. Those areas based on the assumption of a Turpin omission are marked with an asterisk (*) so that they may be readily identified. The symbol OTu represents those elements common to Oxford and Turpin. TuR designates the limited connection of Turpin with Ronsasvals; O shows items unique to Oxford in this comparison, Tu unique to Turpin, and R, unique to Ronsasvals, including elements from other traditions plus inventions by the author of R.

Table XI
Condensed concordance of matières with the core story of OTuR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Tu</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>TuR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 O TuR* Olivier asks Roland to sound horn; he refuses.
22 O TuR* Turpin sermonizes.
23 O TuR* Saracen taunts French.
24 O TuR* Falsaron tries to avenge relative.
25 O TuR Personal combat.
26 R  
27 R  
28 R  
29 R  
30 O  
31 O  
32 O TuR* Turpin preaches on glory of martyrdom.
33 O TuR Personal combat.
34 O TuR* Last small group of French battle pagans.
Roland confesses.

Charles laments.

Naimes recalls Charles to duties.

God lengthens day.

Sending for Charles to bury bodies to protect against wild animals.

Prodigious blows.

Roland's blast heard great distance.

Ganelon denies blast, says Roland will blow for any animal.

Charles heads back.

Ganelon seized.

Olivier strikes Roland accidentally.

One of last survivors badly wounded calls to Roland.

Dead French nobles gathered together.

Saracen attacks prostrate Roland.

Roland to die near a stone.

Farewell to Durendal.
Evaluation of the core story of OTuR

A composite of R. Menéndez Pidal's and André Burger's views on the form of the Ur-Roland concurs generally with the core story of OTuR as disclosed by this study. This is significant, especially when we are dealing with a poem such as Ronsasvals which has early roots, and which has been shown not to be among the group of versions (i.e. the remaniements) which are comparatively minor modifications of traditions. Burger declares:

"Il me semble évident que c'est Turold qui, partant du poème Latin, a inventé la trahison de Ganelon, le rôle de Turpin, l'épisode de Baligant, le duel de Tierri et Pinabel, bref, a fait d'un poème hagiographique l'épopée de la Croisade."\(^5\)

R. Menéndez Pidal has stated:

"Ahora la Nota Emilianense trae algo muy nuevo al resumir un Cantar de Roland que aunque en sus rasgos generales pertenece a idéntica narración que la de Turoldo, sin embargo, difiere de ésta en varios puntos esenciales que revelen un estado general de la materia épica anterior a esas novedades de la conquista de España, de Blancandrin y de Baligant."\(^6\)

With these statements in mind, it becomes more important to restate the core story of OTuR now in terms of what it does not contain. Some of the most notable omissions are:

1. Blancandrin's and dramatization of the treachery.
2. The Baligant episode.\(^7\)

---

\(^4\) We shall deal with the dating under another heading.

\(^5\) André Burger, "La légende de Roncevaux avant la Chanson de Roland," Romania, LXX (1948-9), 463.


\(^7\) We are dealing with Baligant as in traditions.
3. Trial of Ganelon, Tierri-Pinabel duel.
4. Vengeance or pursuit of the Saracens.

It will be noted that the three matières mentioned by Menéndez Pidal, namely the conquest of Spain, Blancandrins, and Baligant conform to items 1, 2, and 4 above. One should also note that item 4, above, the duel of Tierri and Pinabel, is designated by Burger, too, as missing from the pre-Oxonian model. Burger also concurs with Menéndez Pidal in including the episode of Baligant among these matières. As we have already demonstrated by the concordances, as well as through learned opinions elsewhere⁸ that ₀ and Ṭᵤ stem from a rather close common source, the four key items above noted as missing from the core story of OTuR would seem strong enough to establish this core roughly as a primitive version of the Roland one step earlier than the OTu prototype. Assuming this, we should then surmise that the actual form of Ronsasvals is the result of this basic story as it has been modified over a period of time. Let us restate some of the main points of these modifying factors, as well as possible dating of the primitive R, after which will be offered a proposed genealogy of OTuR to modify a part of the Mortier table.⁹

---

⁸ See note 3, p. 126.
⁹ See note 17, p. 8.

The second of four "natural" parts of the Roland as designated by Rychner includes 1839 verses and corresponds generally to the OTuR core except for the inclusion of Aude. Cf. Mandach, op. cit., p. 163.
Independent sources in Ronsasvals

While it appears that Ronsasvals is just as remote from the remaniements as from 0 itself, as evidenced by the comparatively close relationships between the two latter, there are some features of the remaniements that point to some outside source in common with R and independent of any primitive forms in the 0 ancestry, thus indicating a later contamination. Among minor items in this category is the frequent mention of the green helmet for all Saracens in R. As has been shown in CHAPTER III, no such color is employed for headgear in 0; but green helmets appear regularly enough in the remaniements, although in the latter, they serve as Christian apparel. The character Gandelbuon, unknown to 0, plays a featured part in the remaniements where he captures Ganelon after the latter has escaped his captors a second time; his importance to both R and the remaniements is significant, although in the former, he plays quite a different role.

Possibly the most important of R-remaniement connections is the mutual concordance of the Aude episode as mentioned in CHAPTER V. It may be added, however, that in view of Men-

11 See page 58, note 48.
12 Pp. 55-56, CHAPTER III.
13 Cf. V4, circa 5528 and following.
14 Cf. Pp. 120-121.
éndez Pidal's demonstration of the close identity of Ronsasvals' version with the Spanish romance, *La muerte de doña Alda*, the Aude story may quite likely have circulated as a separate poem. Another R-remaniement connection has been noted by Mario Roques in his identification of the Christian, Frontals, of the Paris manuscript with the "amirat de Frontals of Ronsasvals.

Turpin and Ronsasvals show some evidence of common traditions. There are certain names common to Tu and R, and lacking in Q. These are Arrastat, Gautier de Termes, Gandelbuon, Salamons and Agolan. The most important Tu-R connection, however, is identified with the matière surrounding Baudoins of Tu and Gandelbuon of R, as discussed in CHAPTER III; and it should be added that Gandelbuon represents a Turpin-Ronsasvals connection to a far greater degree than he does a link with the remaniements where, it is suspected, the concordance is the mere reflection of the fame of a name.

The Galiens element is, of all outside sources in Ronsasvals, the most obvious intrusion. Both Galiens versions

---

15 CHAPTER V, cf. p. 121.
17 See Concordance of names of persons, p. 26, items 26-29 and p. 28, item 17.
18 The forms are those of Ronsasvals.
19 Agolant, the pagan king, is merely mentioned in *R* as the source of Juzian's sword, a twin to Durendal (*R*, 46-47).
20 Pp. 73-76.
incorporated in this study, the Galien li restorés and the Viaggio, are of the 15th Century; consequently, it must be understood that they cannot be taken in their present form as actual sources of the Galien matière of Ronsasvals. We must postulate prototypes of these which crossed the path of Ronsasvals' traditions at some point. Details of the episode as found in R are so divergent from Galien, the Pèlerinage, and the Viaggio that we must believe the connections to be remote; yet a few matières such as the gab of Roland and the effect of Roland's blast in R, the matière dealing with Gandelbuon and Garin de Sayna in R compared to Gandelbuon and Galien in Galien,22 plus the predominance of names in common such as Galien itself, Estout and Falsaron, point out connections between R and the Italian epic traditions which are unmistakable. There is no reason to doubt that some vaguely defined common source joins Ronsasvals to the Italian area and may justifiably label R, as Mario Roques asserts,23 as a link in the chain uniting the two traditions.

As to the Spanish contaminations of the R version, there is the Spanish origin of Durendal as shown through identification of Ronsasvals' Baynaut with the Braimant of Mainet,24

---

23 "Ronsasvals, poème épique provençal," Romania, LXVI (1941), 476.
24 CHAPTER IV, cf. p. 89.
and there is a great similarity of matières between praises by the jongleur, Portajoyas, in R for Turpin the fighting priest, and two lines found in the Spanish Roncesvalles. The most important Spanish connection is perhaps the lack in R of any pursuit or vengeance upon the Saracens. This point has already been noted as one of the key omissions in identifying the OTuR core story as a primitive state of the legend; and it is one of the most severe departures from O traditions.

Provencal regionalisms are evident in a number of instances in Ronsasvals: e.g. the insistence on the time of spring, the birds, the flowers, conceits such as "l'auzelletz cantan en lur latin," and praising the special valor of the Provengaux. Other subjective additions by the author of Ronsasvals may be generally assumed to exist in those areas noted in the Concordance of selected matières as items unique to R. To these may be added certain characteristics of descriptive style, as for example minute descriptions of armor. Among matières of most notable importance which are

25 Cf. CHAPTER IV, p. 96.
26 Ibid., 90-91.
27 Cf. CONCLUSION, Pp. 129-130.
28 Cf. CHAPTER IV, p. 93.
29 Ibid., p. 94.
30 See CHAPTER III, page 55.
probable inventions of the poet R, are the glorified role of Turpin and the episode of the jongleur, Portajoyas.

The apparent isolation of the provençal epic

In spite of all the evidence demonstrating a variety of sources which can be discerned in R, there is considerable reason to believe that this version developed in substantial isolation. It is nearly impossible to believe that the author of Ronsasvals knew the Oxford, its immediate prototype or its remaniements. Only twenty-seven lines in O show any similarity with specific lines of R, the names of the twelve peers agree in only six names, and of all specific numbers in OTuR, the only one in common is the 20,000 of the rear-guard. Other items pointing to Ronsasvals' lack of contact with main O traditions are R's naming Roland's horse Malmatin, lack of vengeance on the Saracens, the great confusion and shifting of roles and the distortion of other matières as discussed in "Hidden matières," and elsewhere.

A number of items discussed under sources of R have been shown to have connections with Galiens, the Viaggio, and the

---
31 Table VII, p. 59.
32 Table VIII, p. 62.
33 These traditions include the Turpin in many cases.
34 Cf. CHAPTER IV, p. 63.
Entre d'Espanne, but these works clearly indicate direct knowledge of O or its remaniements, precluding, as in the case of O, their contact with the author of R.

There is too little concordance between Turpin and R to suppose anything but remote connections between them. What is rather remarkable about this apparent ignorance of the Turpin is that the latter was evidently distributed widely in France and abroad from the 12th Century on. Furthermore, some three hundred extant versions of Turpin have been discovered, and the work was seemingly well known enough as a sort of official version of the Roland that it was taken as the principle base of the English language Roland, the Lansdowne 388.

That Ronsasvals shows at the same time characteristics of isolation and also connections with various identifiable sources would appear to be a paradox. The puzzle is resolved, however, if one or more stages of oral transmission are postulated. Oral transmission perhaps offers the only plausible explanation (barring intentional distortion or change) for the many hidden matières and distortions such as the confusion of roles and the preservation of numerous matières disguised in a cloak of new details. Oral transmission does, in effect,

---

35 André de Mandach, op. cit., p. 364 et suiv.
explain the unique character of Ronsasvals as opposed to the other epics cited under "sources," the latter being, even when they are several stages remote from the main source, examples of copying from one manuscript to another, their variations representing the modernization of the language and minor subjective modifications.

The assumption of oral transmission evokes another problem, however: how can one explain the areas of rather close concordances and persistent matières which exist alongside the various distortions? The answer to this question is not only plausible but even to be expected, namely that certain areas, matières, and certain lines in the more primitive versions made strong impressions on jongleurs or had a measure of popularity among tellers of the story, for one reason or another. It is most significant that in a count of thirty-eight laisses of 0 which are involved with the matières of the core story of OTuR, twenty-eight terminate in the enigmatic AOI, considered by some Roland scholars to indicate passages of greater importance or serious intent. Mario Roques provides ample support of this notion in his remarks on the concordance of the Frontals matière in R and the Remaniements:

37 Cf., CHAPTER IV.

"Il n'est pas impossible que cette laisse, que marque comme une reprise dans l'action du roman de Roncesvaux et qui y introduit une importante addition, ait une sorte de célébrité qui en rendait le rappel presque nécessaire:"39

Monk and jongleur?

Some sort of monk-jongleur cooperation seems probable in the case of Ronsasvals. Indeed, certain items in the poem suggest that this may be a classic example of the Bédier notion of cleric-jongleur collaboration. As discussed in CHAPTER IV, Pp. 94-98, it would seem that the work was created in a milieu of relics, or at least the museum-like atmosphere of some chapel or monastery. The appearance of the jongleur, Portajoyas, is so dramatic and so outstanding as a departure from other traditions in the Roland theme, that it appears to be more than just a meaningless creation. Mario Roques has noted that there is also a jongleur in the companion piece, Roland a Saragosse, to whom Charles demonstrates a noticeable largesse.40 What is even more suggestive of cleric-jongleur affiliations is that Portajoyas' whole literary purpose is apparently to heap lavish praises upon Turpin, the archbishop.

Was the Ronsasvals written by a jongleur or cleric?

39 Mario Roques, "Ronsasvals, poème épicque provençal," Romania, LXVI (1941), 465.
40 Of., Mario Roques, "Roland a Saragosse, poème épicque provençal," Romania, LXIX (1946-7), 317-361.
There are indications both ways: e.g. the prominent part played by the jongleur, the apparent literary skill shown in the work, the writer's knowledge of epic forms and conceits, all suggest a jongleur or lay poet. On the other hand, many points indicate the cleric: extensive sermonizing by Turpin, the imperious attitude of the archbishop, familiarity and frequent use of clerical matière such as Pentecost, vespers and "matineyas," the confession, the praising of Angelier's chastity, the many mentions of "sancta Maria," the "Verge sagreya," "la redemption," to mention only a few. We could, of course be dealing here simply with a cleric possessing more than ordinary literary skills.

Dating of the Ronsasvals

In attempting to date any medieval epic, it is not only difficult to find conclusive proofs but also to make generalizations because of the episodic nature of many versions. Various of the matière may each have individual derivation and age; and a copyist or the latest editor may add an episode or a personal touch here and there. In brief, the folkloric process of reediting, recreating and re-adapting for

41 Ronsasvals, 215.
42 Ibid., laisse 7.
new situations was probably at work in many epics. Menéndez Pidal is probably correct in maintaining that it is really impossible to arrange the genealogy of Roland texts with precision since each episode has its own genealogy.  

The manuscript of Ronsasvals is of the late 14th Century but no critic to date has precluded the probability that it is a copy of an earlier model. Mario Roques takes a rather conservative position regarding its age, timing it after the Albigensian Crusade. This would permit the work to be as early as the second third of the 13th Century. The use of assonance and ten-syllable lines tends to suggest an earlier dating, although it is Roques' opinion that some of the metric practices in R are affectations of archaism by the poet. Might they not then be attempts by a later remanieur to preserve as much as possible of the flavor of his model? R. Menéndez Pidal supports the notion of much earlier dating:

"...importa insistir en que la épica provenzal es mas antigua de lo que comunemente se cree. Los dos poemas provenzales conocidos, Rollan a Saragossa y Ronsasvals, copiados a fines del siglo XIII o en el XIV, tuvieron redacciones muy anteriores."  

Rita Lejeune has exposed a notable citing of the Roland story in Provençal in the Cansó d'Antiocha (1130-1142):

"Ar ausiretz batalha mesclar en tal senblan, Anc non ausi ta(n) fera deus lo tems alsamans O(liviers) fo aussi e Turpi e Rotlan, Estot e Angeliers, Gilis e.l coms Galans, Oto e Berenguers, Gaifres e (no sai dire cant);

44 There are a few alexandrines.
Gaines los trai et us velhs Angelan
E Marssilis lo ros—Dieus en sia lor dans
Els caps de Ro(n)cauls—Deus en sia perdonans.\(^{46}\)

The reference above to the "velhs Angelan" connects the passage to Ronsasvals where Angelan remains spying on the French camp all night,\(^{47}\) and the matièrè is unique to Ronsasvals. Menéndez Pidal, Horrent and Riquer\(^{48}\) point out the lines from Peire Vidal's Drogoman Senher of the late 12th Century:

"E cent lo bran que.m det En Gui l'autrier, la terra crola per aqui on vau;\(^{49}\)

D'ardimen vail Rolland et Olivier,"\(^{50}\)

Compare the above to Ronsasvals 315-316:

"Lo duc Rollan layssas ferir premier, Que lay on passa fay la terra crollier"

Another citation from Menéndez Pidal deals with a "planh" of the Catalan, Guilhem de Berguedán, between 1080-1085:

"...desea que el muerto esté en el paraíso en compañía de Rolán, 'josta N'Olivier de Lausana,'"\(^{51}\)

This parentage of Olivier is found in no Roland version except Ronsasvals which has in line 846:

"Olivier es de Lauzana la gran:"\(^{52}\)


\(^{47}\) Ronsasvals, 558.

\(^{48}\) Ibid., note 43, p. 162.

\(^{49}\) Drogoman Senher, 8-9.

\(^{50}\) Ibid., line 13.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., p. 162, work cited in note 43.

\(^{52}\) See Martín de Riquer, "La antigüedad del Ronsasvals provenzal, "Coloquios de Roncesvalles (Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza, 1956), Pp. 245-51.
Provençal epic traditions?

In view of certain Provençal regionalisms, the apparent connections between R and poetic provençal works of the 12th Century, and the appearance of certain epic formulas which may be unique to Ronsasvals and Roland à Saragosse, it is reasonable to assume some sort of epic traditions in the Provençal area. What is more conclusive, in indicating local epic traditions, however, are the apparent isolation of R as well as the probability that the version was maintained for perhaps two centuries in the Provençal region.

Table XII
Revised table of affiliation of OTuR^53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ur-Roland (OTuR core)</th>
<th>oral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ronsasvals (12th)</td>
<td>oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionalisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mss.</td>
<td>oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote contaminations</td>
<td>Mss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mss.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Viaggio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Galiens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Spanish)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronsasvals (14th)</td>
<td>remaniements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Apt Ms.)</td>
<td>oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^53 Note that the symbols Mss. and Ms. indicate a transmission through manuscripts and that "oral" indicates probable oral transmission.
Summation

Of Ronsasvals we can say that it appears to be, due to its many episodic connections, a compilation although not a compilation in the usual sense, that is, a collection assembled from various manuscripts. It seems evident that the basic version developed in "isolation," a greater part of this isolation being its transmission orally, comparatively removed from at least the "standard" manuscripts of the Roland. It has undergone, in the folkloric process, something more than minor subjective variations, as was the case of the remaniements; it is marked by a unity of style and a regional flavor showing it to have undergone major adaptation to a "foreign" area.

Ronsasvals demonstrates too many poetic and epic qualities to be simply church inspired. However, by comparison to the Oxford version, R has considerable leanings toward the clerical attitude which may well reflect the influence of the Albigensian Crusade. The comparison of attitudes toward Turpin, Roland and Charlemagne in OTuR emphasizes the point that the Oxford is not a message emanating directly from the Church, (even though it may be one of crusading spirit), but

---

Anglade's remarks concerning "poésie religieuse lyrique" support this opinion in part, especially in regard to the expansion of the cult of the Virgin in the Provençal area after the Albigensian Crusade. Turpin in Ronsasvals significantly praises Angelier for his devotion to Mother Mary. (R circa 349). cf., Joseph Anglade, Histoire sommaire de la littérature méridionale au moyen âge. (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1921). Also cf., p. 15, CHAPTER I.
rather one of French patriotism and feudal idealism at its best.

The *Turpin Chronicle*, as Menéndez Pidal has pointed out, represents a true example of a work of Church propaganda which sacrifices episodes, names, epic formulas, and other literary qualities in order to convey the Church's message. *Ronsasvals* would appear to be somewhere between 0 and *Tu* in this respect; and it might well represent what Menéndez Pidal indicates as a clerical attempt to break into the popular epic field. This could easily coincide with the notion of monk-jongleur collaboration. The exact nature of this amalgamation is not at all clear, but the influences of priest and jongleur seem impossible to deny.

*Ronsasvals*, furthermore, differs from 0 traditions not only because of the subjective creations and episodic contaminations, but also because its basic story may stem from a form of the legend more primitive than the prototype of *OTu*. Certain attitudes toward the main characters in *R* (as indicated in CHAPTER V) suggest that non-French versions tended to be far less flattering in their depiction of French heroes. One may conclude from this that the author of the *Oxford*, besides adding a substantial amount to his model,

---

may also have omitted certain elements, e.g. the legend of Roland's incestuous birth which appears to have been well enough known at an early date and to have been in commonly circulated Church literature.

Many of the conclusions here are well supported by the evidence presented, others are suggestions or probabilities; and they are revelations rising from the less well-defined region of Roland research which is on the fringe of the main stream. It is however, in these divergent areas, away from those versions "tous suspects de n'être que des emprunts à la Chanson" that lie some new doors, perhaps the only significant entries into old Roland mysteries. It is sincerely hoped that this study may have helped to unlock some of these adits.

56 André Burger, Ibid., note 11 p. 3.
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