MIMETIC AND EXEMPLARY MODES IN THE CHANSON DE GESTE: RAOUL DE CAMBRAI AND LA CHANSON DE ROLAND

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JEAN THERESA STRANDNESS
1974

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

MIMETIC AND EXEMPLARY MODES IN THE CHANSON DE GESTE: RAOUL DE CAMBRAI AND LA CHANSON DE ROLAND

presented by

Jean Theresa Strandness

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in English

Major professor

Date 11-11-74

O-7639

BINDING BY
HOAG & SONS'
BOOK BINDERY INC.

ABSTRACT

MIMETIC AND EXEMPLARY MODES IN THE CHANSON DE GESTE: RAOUL DE CAMBRAI AND LA CHANSON DE ROLAND

By

Jean Theresa Strandness

The Old French chansons de geste occupy a pivotal position in the development of medieval narrative: personages in the early chansons de geste tend to be exemplary, superhuman, idealized beings like Beowulf and the heroes of the early Germanic epics; personages in later chansons de geste tend to be projected as individual, complex personalities, representative of actuality. To pinpoint this enormous change in the nature of medieval narrative, I have selected two chansons de geste, La Chanson de Roland and Raoul de Cambrai, as test cases for the analysis of characterization.

Out of all the chansons de geste, I find that personages are most exemplary in the Roland and most mimetic in the Raoul. By "exemplary" I mean "typical" or "serving as a model." By "mimetic" I mean "representative of actuality." I sometimes define "mimetic" in a more limited way as "psychologically complex."

Jean Theresa Strandness

Throughout the dissertation I employ the concept of a continuum lying between exemplary and mimetic poles as a method of analysis. While the Roland lies close to the exemplary pole and the Raoul lies close to the mimetic pole, personages in both chansons, at times, move in the direction of the opposite pole.

The first three chapters deal with context. In Chapter I, I discuss the jongleurs' premises and the structures of the works. In the Roland the jongleur's premises are ordering principles and guides to personages for leading exemplary lives; in the Raoul premises describe a confusing, problematic world. The structure of the Roland--order, disorder, order--implies an exemplary life pattern: order may be upset, but a means exists to restore order when it is upset. The structure of the Raoul--order, disorder, further disorder--implies that "things fall apart" and that order cannot easily be restored.

In Chapter II, I establish that the presence of the supernatural in the Roland permits a vision of the world in absolute terms, while the absence of the supernatural in the Raoul reinforces a vision of the world as absurd, confusing, problematic.

In Chapter III, I treat the representation of time and space. In the Roland space is not localized and may have symbolic significance; time is compressed

or suspended altogether. In the Raoul, space is localized and time is marked and extended. Also in the Raoul we find represented the fluid time of the human psyche.

In Chapter IV, I examine relationships between personages. In the Roland, where relationships tend to be exemplary, few relationships between personages are portrayed. In the Raoul the psychological complexity of personages is revealed through a network of mimetic relationships.

In Chapter V, I examine characterization in terms of the concept of an exemplary-mimetic continuum and in terms of three other continuums--the collective-individual, the generic-individual, and the supernatural-natural--which are allied with the exemplary-mimetic continuum. Personages may locate on more than one continuum simultaneously. Furthermore, personages may locate at different points of a single continuum during the course of narrative, although personages in the Roland are primarily exemplary and personages in the Raoul are primarily mimetic.

MIMETIC AND EXEMPLARY MODES IN THE CHANSON DE GESTE: RAOUL DE CAMBRAI AND LA CHANSON DE ROLAND

By

Jean Theresa Strandness

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English and Comparative Literature

1974

©Copyright by
JEAN THERESA STRANDNESS

1974

DEDICATION

To my parents

For their example and encouragement

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my director, Arnold Williams, for his good advice and criticism during the writing of this dissertation. The method of analysis used here grew out of his inspirational course on literature in the allegorical mode. I am grateful, as well, for the counsel of Ann Tukey Harrison and John Yunck, members of my committee. And I thank these three people and John Alford for their guidance and encouragement throughout my Ph.D. program in comparative medieval literature.

The completion of the dissertation also owes a great deal to the abiding friendship of Bob Baldori, S. Therese Coyne, Mary Harrison, Catherine Jones, and Carolyn and Win Wilkinson. I thank them for discussions about the Roland and the Raoul and for their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Old French chansons de geste occupy a pivotal position in the development of medieval narrative: personages in the early chansons de geste tend to be exemplary, superhuman, idealized beings like Beowulf and the heroes of the early Germanic epics; personages in the later chansons de geste tend to be projected as individual, complex personalities, representative of actuality.

Critics in the past have tended to generalize about the chanson de geste as a genre, sometimes only on the basis of a reading of La Chanson de Roland, without taking into account developments in the representation of characterization within the genre. Erich Auerbach, for example, says:

> The style of the French heroic epic[1] is an elevated style in which the structural concept of reality is still extremely rigid and which succeeds in

---

[1]Later in the same paragraph, Auerbach substitutes the term "chanson de geste" for "French heroic epic." Thus, it is unlikely that he uses the term "French heroic epic" here to distinguish one group of chansons de geste from another.

> representing only a narrow portion of objective life circumscribed by distance in time, simplification of perspective, and class limitations.[1]

Actually, although the early chansons de geste of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries antedate the medieval French romance, for the most part the chanson de geste developed concurrently with the romance in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and later chansons de geste share the same concerns of the romance with introspection and complex personality.

To pinpoint this enormous change in the nature of medieval narrative, I have selected two chansons de geste, La Chanson de Roland and Raoul de Cambrai as test cases for the analysis of characterization. Out of all the chansons de geste, I find that personages are most exemplary in the Roland and most mimetic in the Raoul.[2]

The plots of both the Roland and the Raoul originate from minor historical incidents. In 778 the rearguard of Charlemagne's army, retreating from Spain after a partially successful attempt to assist a group of

---

[1]Erich Auerbach, Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature, trans. Willard Trask (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953), p. 106.

[2]By "exemplary" I mean "typical" or "serving as a model." By "mimetic" I mean "representative of actuality." In dealing with characterization I will sometimes define "mimetic" in a more limited way as "psychologically complex." I use the term "mimetic" rather than "realistic" to avoid the ambiguity of the term "realistic."

Saracen princes in a battle against their enemies (also Moslem), was ambushed and slaughtered by a party of Basques at the Pyrenees. In 830 the chronicler Eginhardt wrote about the incident in his Vita Caroli, concluding: "In the action were killed Eggihard the king's seneschal, Anselm count of the palace, and Roland duke of the Marches of Brittainy, together with a great many more."[1]

In the Annales Flodoardi, anno 943 we find mention of a battle between Raoul of Gouy (a geographic area which has not been identified), whom scholars believe to be the historical Raoul de Cambrai, and the sons of Herbert: "Count Herbert died and was buried at St. Quentin by his sons. When these sons heard that Raoul of Gouy had advanced with the intention of invading their inheritance, they attacked him and killed him."[2]

In the case of the late eleventh-century Roland, over time historical fact became distorted and inflated to legendary proportions and epic significance, simplifying in the process: three groups (the Basques, the Saracens, and the Moslem enemies of the Saracens) merge to become a single pagan enemy; the little-known persons

---

[1]This information on the historical background of the Roland comes from the introduction to Dorothy Sayers' translation of the chanson (Penguin Books, 1957), p. 7.

[2]Jessie Crosland cites this excerpt from the Annales Flodoardi, anno 943 in the introduction to her translation of Raoul de Cambrai (London: Chatto & Windus, 1926), p. xi.

of Charlemagne's rearguard become personages of exemplary stature in a French Christian army which ultimately conquers the pagan infidels. The base of historical fact in the Raoul remains undistorted--the Raoul is the story of a minor feudal squabble--while at the same time the jongleur represents the personalities and motivations of the personages involved in the incident as more complex than the historical document indicates. In the century between the composition of the Roland and that of the Raoul, then, we find a definite evolution, from the exemplary to the mimetic, in the representation of personages in the Old French chansons de geste.

I am not the first to point out the development of mimetic characterization in the chansons de geste. William Calin, for example, makes this observation about several personages from the Feudal Cycle: "The spiritual crisis undergone by Renaud, Girard, Bernier, and Isembard is a sign of the interiorization of the epic, of its transformation from concern with external deeds to internal emotions and states of mind."[1] But, while acknowledging that the portrayal of characterization in the Raoul, for example, is "realistic,"[2] Calin

---

[1]William C. Calin, The Old French Epic of Revolt (Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1962), p. 143.

[2]Ibid.

nevertheless continues to describe its personages in exemplary terms. For example, in speaking about the episode in which Raoul attacks Origny, Calin says: "There can be no greater opposition in temperament than between Raoul and Bernier on this occasion. The one stands for unbridled violence and pride of destruction, the other for quiet meditation and the search for truth."[1] Calin suggests that in the Raoul each of the two families, the Cambrésiens and the Vermandois, is "more or less homogenous from the psychological point of view":[2] "The Cambrésiens are wild and impulsive, full of démesure . . . The Vermandois, on the other hand, represent the gentle reasoning side of man's nature. . . . The two clans are set off against each other, one symbolizing the demonic powers of evil, the other the virtues of heaven."[3] While recognizing that these personages are mimetic, Calin ends up describing them in simplified, exemplary terms which are far from accurate.

In an attempt to deal with complexity of characterization in a given personage, Calin will describe the characterization as a cluster of archetypes. For example, he describes Raoul's personality, as well as

---

[1]Ibid., p. 64

[2]Ibid., p. 177.

[3]Ibid.

the personalities of several other protagonists from *chansons de geste* in the Feudal Cycle, as follows:

> The baron must act in a twisted, fragmented, demonic world, set in sharp contrast to the apocalyptic splendor of the Rolandian framework. As a result, the Hero Archetype, as seen in the *Roland*, also tends to disintegrate, losing its original cohesiveness as it absorbs other views of man and the universe. Because Raoul, Renaud, and Girard are victims not permitted to make use of their talents in the normal (idealized) way but are persecuted by a malevolent, tyrannical king seeming to incarnate a demonic rather than celestial world-order, their character partakes of the Prometheus-figure, an image of man pure and innocent, a pathetic victim of universal madness. Furthermore, since they are also rebels, considering the peculiarly authoritarian bent of the medieval mind, it is not surprising to find them assimilated to the universal Devil Archetype as well, painted as enemies of the group, threatening to undermine society's most sacred values. Last of all, since harmony can only be restored after the rebel has been defeated and punished, he may have to act as the *Pharmakos* or sacrificial victim, whose immolation is necessary to fulfill the tragic ritual. The rebel holds as much to tradition as any other hero but because he partakes of several different types at once seems much more sophisticated and lifelike. We pity him because he is a victim and fear him because he is a rebel, admire his bravery and wonder at his cruelty. He is hero and villain, God and Devil, at the same time. This ambivalence of perspective, or rather simultaneous existence of disparate reaction levels, contributes to the mimetic action; since the hero's character no longer exists as a simple semi-divine block we can treat him as an individual--almost superhuman yet tender and weak, perfect material for high tragedy.[1]

I object to Calin's method of analysis here for this reason: while Raoul's personality may approach the

---

[1]Ibid., p. 152.

archetypal level, he never fully operates as an archetype, let alone a cluster of archetypes.

I find it useful in dealing with personages in the Old French chansons de geste to view characterizations, and contexts, as lying somewhere between two poles, which might be exemplary vs. mimetic, supernatural vs. natural, or generic vs. individual. It seems to me that the Roland and the Raoul, respectively, are the best examples of these polarities. In the Roland, personages tend to lie close to one or more of the first poles, the exemplary, the supernatural, the generic, whereas in the Raoul personages lie near the mimetic, natural, and individual poles. Viewing personages in this way, we can say, for example, that Olivier in the Roland is exemplary, though at certain points in the narrative he tends towards the mimetic. Conversely, Aalais in the Raoul locates at the natural pole, though at certain points she tends towards the supernatural--what we actually see in the case of Aalais is the supernatural rationalized. This method of analysis permits us to contrast the personages in the Raoul with those in the Roland without having to label any personage in absolute terms. It is not necessary to say that a personage lies at one pole or another; all personages lie somewhere in between one or more pairs of poles. Personages do not necessarily stay at the same

point on a continuum throughout the entire narrative; they may move back and forth along a given continuum.

My aim in this dissertation is to show how this continuum concept operates as a tool for analysis in the Roland and the Raoul, to show the means by which the Roland jongleur creates personages primarily exemplary and/or supernatural and contexts appropriate to such personages and the means by which the Raoul jongleur creates primarily mimetic personages in mimetic contexts. In each chapter I apply the continuum concept in a different way.

The first three chapters deal with context. In Chapter I, I discuss the jongleurs' premises and the structures of the works. In the Roland the jongleur's premises are ordering principles according to which personages may lead exemplary lives. The structure of the work--order, disorder, order--implies an exemplary life pattern: order may be upset, but a means exists to restore order when it is upset. The premises of the Raoul jongleur, on the other hand, suggest that the world is absurd and problematic. Consequently, personages are represented as frustrated. The structure of the work--order, disorder, further disorder--implies that "things fall apart" and that order cannot easily be restored. The premises and structure of the Roland tend towards an exemplary pole, while those of the Raoul lie near the mimetic.

In Chapter II, I consider the effects of the presence of the supernatural in the Roland and of its absence in the Raoul. In the Roland the presence of the supernatural is an ordering principle permitting a vision of the world in absolute terms. The absence of the supernatural in the Raoul reinforces a vision of the world as absurd, confusing, problematic. Again, the Roland world is primarily exemplary, while that of the Raoul is primarily mimetic.

In Chapter III, I treat the representation of time and space. The personages of the Roland practically exist out of time and space, whereas the Raoul personages are very much located in time and space. If we consider time and space as artificial means by which men attempt to create order in a world which they perceive as essentially without order, to impose order upon chaos, then the representation of marked time and localized space is indeed a mark of mimesis. In the Roland, where ordering principles already exist in the structure of the work, in the premises provided by the jongleur, and in the presence of the supernatural, there is little need for the representation of time and space.

In Chapter IV, I examine quantitative and qualitative differences in relationships between personages in both works. In the Raoul a complex network of relationships exists between personages, representative

of actuality. In the Roland few relationships between personages are portrayed; the effect is to make personages seem autonomous, transcending the psychological conflicts of the actual world. Relationships in the Roland tend to be exemplary; those in the Raoul tend to be mimetic. In the Roland we can see mimetic tendencies in an exemplary relationship--in that of Roland and Olivier, for example. In the Raoul we can see exemplary tendencies in a mimetic relationship--in that of Raoul and Bernier, for example. But no relationship in the Roland comes as close to the mimetic pole as those in the Raoul do, and, conversely, those in the Raoul do not come as close to the exemplary pole as those in the Roland do. In this chapter, to a limited extent, I show how dialogue structures contribute to the representation of a relationship as either exemplary or mimetic.

In Chapter V, I consider the continuum concept in terms of specific personages in each work, showing both how one personage may move back and forth along a continuum and how one personage may operate on more than one continuum. The continuums I discuss can be seen as running parallel to each other thus:

exemplary . . . . . mimetic

collective . . . . . individual

generic . . . . . individual

supernatural . . . . . natural

The four continuums are closely allied and in some instances overlap. All four may be grouped under the general headings: exemplary and mimetic modes.

CHAPTER I

PREMISES, SITUATIONS, AND STRUCTURES

Premises

In each of the two chansons de geste we are considering, the jongleur situates his personages within an appropriate context. One way in which each jongleur establishes context is by setting forth a number of premises, statements describing the world in which the personages operate. The premises of the Roland and the Raoul are very different.

In the Roland these premises are ordering principles and guides to the personages for leading exemplary lives. For example, all of the French feel that they are right in fighting for the Christian cause. Roland expresses the viewpoint of the French when he says: "Paien ont tort e chrestien ont droit." ("Pagans are wrong and Christians are right." l. 1015); "Nos avrom dreit mais cist gloton ont tort." ("We are right and these scoundrels are wrong." l. 1212). Later in the chanson Charlemagne says to the French, "Ja savez vos contre paiens ai dreit." ("You know that I am right in fighting against the pagans." l. 3413). And the French

respond: "Sire, vos dites veir." ("Lord, you speak the truth." l. 3414). The jongleur presents as a premise the fact that the pagans are in the wrong and the Christians in the right. Consequently, in fighting for the Christian cause, a personage automatically becomes an exemplary soldier.

Another premise is that one should be willing to fight, and even die, in the service of his king. For example, Roland says: "Bien devons ci ester por nostre rei; Por son seignor deit hom soffrir destreiz." ("We must fight for our king; a man must be willing to suffer in the service of his lord." ll. 1009-10). In a sermon to the French, Turpin says: "Por nostre rei devom nos bien morir. / Chrestiëntét aidiez a sostenir." ("We must be willing to die for our king in order to help maintain Christianity." ll. 1128-29). This premise implies a rigid, ordered social structure, one in which each personage knows and acts out his role in society with the certainty that he is doing what he should be doing. This premise gives direction, as well as meaning, to life.

In fighting for Christianity, death becomes equated with martyrdom for the French. With death comes the absolute guarantee of salvation. On three different occasions Turpin makes that promise.

Se vos morez, esterez saint martir,
Sieges avrez e·l graignor paredis. (1134-35)

(If you die, you will become holy martyrs. You will have seats in paradise.)

Mais d'une chose vos soi jo bien guarant:
Sainz paredis vos est abandonant,
As Innocenz vos enz serez sedant. (1521-23)

(One thing I promise you: the paradise of saints will be open to you. You will be seated with the Innocents.)

Aprés at dit: "Mare fustes, seignors.
Totes voz anmes ait Deus li glorios.
En paredis metet en saintes flors!" (2195-97)

(Afterwards he said: "What an unhappy hour, my lords. May glorious God receive all your souls in paradise amid the holy flowers.")

It is a premise in the Roland that any Frenchman fighting for Christianity will automatically achieve salvation, and that, in dying, he will become an exemplary martyr.

In fighting for the emperor and for Christianity, men may suffer. But the Roland jongleur says "Molt at apris ki bien conoist ahan." ("He who knows suffering has learned much." l. 2524). The implication is that suffering has value in and of itself and not just because it will merit salvation. In the Roland, suffering is equated with wisdom: Charlemagne is wise, and therefore exemplary, because he has suffered so many battles in fighting for Christianity.

In the Raoul none of these premises are ordering principles. On the contrary, they describe a world in a state of confusion. In the Roland, the jongleur says

that men should serve their king; in the Raoul the jongleur says "Par malvais roi est mains frans hom honnis." ("Many noble men are ill-treated by a bad king." l. 825). The premise is merely descriptive, offering no prescriptions. What is a personage to do when ill-treated by his king? The jongleur offers no solution to this problem which is central to the piece. A personage in the Roland knows what he should do--he should serve his king--but for a personage in the Raoul, right and wrong are not so clear. Is one justified in rebelling against the king if the king does not uphold his end of the feudal contract? The answer to that question is not clear. The jongleur uses the premise, "Par malvais roi est mains frans homs honnis," as a basis for the creation of problematic situations[1] in the Raoul.

Two premises stated in the Raoul are similar: "Hom desreez[2] a molt grant painne dure." ("A man confused must endure great suffering." l.498); "Hom sans

---

[1]I define a "problematic situation" as one in which a personage perceives no clearly correct course of action. A problematic situation is not necessarily a dilemma, a situation requiring a choice between equally undesirable alternatives, though it may be. Problematic situations in the Raoul are often dilemmas.

[2]No single translation of "desreez" is adequate. Literally, "desreer" means "to leave the path," i.e. to be in the wrong place. Figuratively, "desreez" came to mean "departing from good sense" or even "out of one's senses."

mesure est molt tos enpiriés." ("A man without measure is soon brought down." l. 2212). These premises are again more descriptive than prescriptive. They may seem to imply a prescription--don't be confused; don't be without measure--but none of the personages in the Raoul are represented as being capable of such exemplary behavior. Rather, the jongleur is saying that it is a given that men are confused and without measure and that as a consequence they suffer. In the Roland there is a reason to suffer: suffering can lead to martyrdom and wisdom. In the Raoul suffering is given no transcendant meaning; it is the suffering of mimetic personages in an absurd world.

One premise in the Raoul is stated ironically. Bernier and Gautier agree to fight a duel to stop the war between the Cambrésiens and the Vermandois. Finally Gautier manages to chop a large chunk of flesh from Bernier, whereupon Guerri says "Mieus aim cest colp qe boivre ne mengier. Diex, laisse m'en mon grant duel essaucier!" ("This blow means more to me than eating or drinking. God, let my great sorrow be assuaged." ll. 4529-30). Bernier overhears Guerri and responds with the same kind of sardonic black humor that we find in the Old Icelandic sagas.

> Par Dieu, Guerri, ci a lonc desirier.
> Cil m'a feru, ci ravra son louier.
> De ceste part me sent je plus legier.
> De povre char se puet on trop charchier.

> Je n'en ai cure, ja porter ne la qier.
> Malvaise chars n'est preus a chevalier
> Qi veut s'onnor acroistre et essaucier. (4532-38)
>
> (By God, Guerri, it will be long before your wish is granted. Gautier struck me; he will get his due. As for me, I feel much lighter. One can be too burdened by his poor flesh. I don't care for it nor do I wish to carry it around. Miserable flesh is of no advantage to a knight who wishes to increase his honor and bring glory to his name.)

The ironic premise which Bernier states--"Malvaise chars n'est preus a chevalier / Qi veut s'onnor acroistre et essaucier."--reinforces the jongleur's representation of the Raoul world as absurd.

Significantly, of the premises in the Roland, all but one--"Molt at apris ki bien conoist ahan"--are presented in speeches by personages. Therefore, the personages themselves know and understand the laws of the world in which they operate. In the Raoul, on the other hand, only one of the nonironic premises--"Hom sans mesure est molt tos enpiriés"--is presented through a personage (Wedon, one of the four sons of Herbert). The effect is ironic: the audience knows the premises of the Raoul world, but the personages themselves do not know the premises of the world in which they operate.

Situations

Each jongleur controls the kinds of situations his personages encounter. Never in the Roland, for example, is a personage put in a problematic situation, one in which the personage perceives no clearly correct

course of action. The best example is the war against the pagans: it is clear to the French that they should be fighting on the Christian side; there is no problem. The Saracens, too, are sure of their faith and, thus, that they are right in fighting the Christians. It then becomes clear to the Saracens--when their god Tervagent does not prevent them from drowning as they cross the Ebro River--that they were mistaken in worshipping Mahound, Apollon, and Tervagant. Bramimonde, wife of the Saracen king Marsile, then curses the pagan trinity:

> Cist nostre deu sont en recredantise,
> En Rencesvals malvaises vertuz firent,
> Noz chevaliers i ont laissiét ocidre,
> Cest mien seignor en bataille faillirent.
> Lo destre poign at perdut, n'en at mie. (2715-19)
>
> (These gods of ours are traitors. They certainly didn't manifest their powers at Ronceval; they allowed all of our men to be killed. They failed my lord in battle; he lost his right hand, he no longer has it.)

The Saracens convert to Christianity, but the question--whether to convert or not--is never perceived as a problem. Rather, the Saracens are pagans as long as they believe they have the support of the pagan gods behind them; when it becomes clear that they don't, that it would be to their advantage to convert to Christianity, they do so.

By minimizing the problematic nature of the pagan-Christian conflict, the Roland jongleur restricts the representation of psychological complexity in his

personages; when there is no ambivalence about a situation, a personage's mental processes, in dealing with the situation, need not be complicated. Because the Roland personages transcend the frustrations of a mimetic personage dealing with a problematic situation, they appear exemplary.

In discussing situations in the Roland we should consider the two episodes (laisses 83-85 and 128-29) in which Roland and Olivier debate about whether to blow the olifant or not. It might be argued that those two situations are problematic. They might be, from the audience's point of view, the audience having to contend with two conflicting viewpoints. But neither Olivier nor Roland perceives the situation as a problem; each feels strongly that his own viewpoint is correct. (See the Olivier-Roland relationship in Chapter IV, pp. 108-113, for an elaboration.) And the jongleur suggests that each viewpoint, even though they are contradictory, is exemplary: "Rodlanz est proz ed Oliviers est sages: Ambedui ont merveillos vasselage." ("Roland is valiant and Olivier is wise: both are admirably loyal."[1] ll. 1093-93).[2]

---

[1]No single word adequately translates the meaning of "vasselage," a term connoting all virtues proper to a good vassal.

[2]According to Old French dictionaries, the meanings of "prod" and "sage" are not necessarily exclusive: while the first definition of "prod" is "vaillant, preux,"

In the Raoul, unlike the Roland, the plot is comprised of a series of problematic situations, which are often organic, one generating another. We can see this phenomenon in operation by considering the beginning laisses of the chanson, those leading up to the point where it becomes definitely clear that Raoul and the Cambrésiens will attack the sons of Herbert. As a consequence of confronting these problematic situations, personages in the Raoul are made to appear mimetic.

As the Raoul opens, Raoul Taillefer has just died, leaving his wife Aalais pregnant with Raoul. Aalais, the jongleur tells us, "n'ot pas le cuer frarin" ("is not faint-hearted," l. 96); she assumes responsibility for Cambrai and for the care of her son. When Raoul is only three years old, Louis, the king of France and also

---

the second is "sage"; "habile" is the third definition of both adjectives. Nevertheless, critics generally agree that the Roland jongleur uses the adjectives "prod" and "sage" to distinguish the personalities of Roland and Olivier. Ramón Menéndez Pidal in La Chanson de Roland y el neotradicionalismo (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1959) defines "prod" as "arrojado" and "sage" as "prudente" (p. 343). Pierre Le Gentil in La Chanson de Roland (Paris: Hatier, 1967) defines "prod" as "preux" and "sage" as "sage," and describes the two adjectives as "antithetical" (p. 175). Critics generally agree further that while the jongleur distinguishes between "prod" and "sage," the differentiation is not one of value; both qualities are exemplary. Menéndez Pidal, for example, says:

> Bien se ve, según notan Bédier, Horrent y otros, que el poeta aprueba por igual al proz, al altrevido, al osado, lo mismo que al sage, al prudente. En efecto, en este pasaje acqui citado el poeta no toma partido ni por la proeza de Roland, ni por la sapiencia de Olivier . . . (p. 317)

Aalais' brother, accepts the counsel of his barons and gives the fief of Cambrai to Gibouin of Mans as reward for his service. Louis stipulates that the land revert to Raoul when he comes of age. Gibouin promises to accept the condition if the king will arrange for him to marry Aalais. Louis sends a messenger to Aalais to inform her of his decision. Guerri, Raoul's uncle, goes to court to try to dissuade Louis from his decision, but is unsuccessful. He returns to Cambrai and advises Aalais to marry Gibouin: "Pren l'a mari, por tant porras garir / Vers Loeys qi France a a baillir." ("Marry him, so that you can stay on good terms with Louis who rules France." ll. 329-30). Through this succession of events the Raoul jongleur has created a problematic situation with which he confronts Aalais: if she refuses to marry Gibouin, Louis will take Cambrai from her by force; but if she does marry Gibouin (whom she dislikes), she will nevertheless lose direct control over Cambrai and could not be absolutely sure that Gibouin would eventually return it to Raoul. This is a dilemma: neither choice is desirable. No matter what her decision, Aalais will be compromised, reduced in dignity and stature. Here is her decision.

> Ains me lairoie ens en .j. feu bruïr
> Que il a viautre face gaingnon gesir!
> Diex me donra de mon effant norrir
> Tant qe il puist ces garnemens tenir. (332-35)

> (I would rather burn in a fire than let [Louis] make a greyhound [Aalais] lie with a watchdog [Gibouin]. God will permit me to raise my child until he is old enough to bear arms.)

We could hardly call her reaction exemplary, for she is rebelling against the king. Rather, her response illustrates that psychologically, she is strong-willed, aggressive, and independent; her response illustrates the jongleur's previous remark that Aalais "n'ot pas le cuer frarin."

When Raoul turns fifteen, Aalais sends him to court where he becomes knighted and seneschal of France. One day Guerri goads Raoul into reclaiming Cambrai. First, Raoul reminds Louis that he has served him faithfully and asks him to return Cambrai as a reward for his service. Louis claims he cannot do so since he has given Cambrai to Gibouin of Mans. The jongleur has made Raoul a victim of circumstances: through no fault of his own, but rather as a result of Aalais' decision twelve years previously, Raoul, too, is confronted with a problematic situation. If he wants Cambrai, Raoul must break allegiance with Louis and fight for it; if he wishes to keep peace and his feudal bond, he will lose Cambrai. No matter which choice he makes--to break his feudal bond or to give up Cambrai--Raoul will be open to criticism. He chooses to fight for Cambrai, saying:

L'onnor del pere, ce sevent li auquant
Doit tot par droit revenir a l'effant.
Des iceste eure, par le cors s. Amant,
Me blasmeroient li petit et li grant,
Se je plus vois ma honte conquerant,
Qe de ma terre voie autre home tenant. (700-05)

(Everyone knows that the land of the father ought by rights to pass to the son. By St. Amant, from this day forward, all men would criticize me for permitting another man to hold my land.)

The problematic situation forces Raoul to justify himself; his response is defensive. That is, because of the situation he finds himself in, Raoul is reduced in stature. His motives for action are partially based upon a fear of public disapprobation and, as such, are mimetic rather than exemplary.

In response to Raoul's statement, Louis comes up with a proposal. He offers Raoul the land of the next vassal to die and forty hostages to back up his offer if Raoul will refrain from attacking Cambrai. Raoul accepts the proposal. It happens that the next vassal to die is Herbert, whose land should by rights pass to his four sons, one of whom is Bernier's father. Now Louis faces a problematic situation: if he carries through with his promise and grants Vermandois to Raoul, he takes away the land rights of four of his vassals; if he doesn't grant Vermandois to Raoul, he jeopardizes the lives of the forty hostages. No matter which choice he makes, Louis will appear to be a weak king. He decides to grant Vermandois to Raoul, knowing that

warfare will ensue as a result. For this, his men reproach him: "Si muet li rois une guere si grant / Dont mainte dame avront les cuers dolans." ("The king is setting into motion a terrible war, which will end with many women sorrowing." ll. 919-20).

We can make several generalizations about these three problematic situations in the Raoul. When a personage in the Raoul is confronted by a problematic situation, he finds that none of the alternatives presented is clearly a best choice; the problematic situation creates a dilemma in the mind of the personage because each choice is about equally undesirable. As a result of making the decision, something of the personage's psychological make-up is revealed to the audience. No matter what choice a personage makes in the face of a problematic situation, he will be reduced in stature immediately upon making the choice. Consequently, if we view personages as being on a continuum between an exemplary pole and a mimetic pole, we can say that a personage will move away from the exemplary pole towards the mimetic any time he is confronted with a problematic situation. Problematic situations tend to generate others; thus, once set in motion, they continue to increase the confusion and disorder of the world with which the personages must contend.

Structures

In discussing the structures of the Roland and the Raoul, I will consider the use of the battle as a device for the illustration of theme, and I will also consider the components of the plot as implicit commentary on the social orders of the two worlds.

In the Roland, the battle works as an ordering device. Given the premise, "Paien ont tort e chrestien ont droit," the battle becomes a metaphor for the struggle between good and evil. When the chanson begins, the battle has been going on for seven years. The events of the Roland proper take place in four days. On the first day Ganelon initiates the treason which results in the defeat of the rearguard on the second day. But on the third day, Charlemagne and the French triumph over the forces of Baligant, i.e. good triumphs over evil. Thematically, this is the high point and resolution of the chanson. On the fourth day, after Bramimonde has been baptized, Gabriel appears to Charlemagne, summoning him to undertake another battle against the pagans. It is important to note, for points of comparison, that the Roland jongleur is talking about an entirely new battle here; what we see in the Roland is the complete resolution of one battle and the beginning of a new one. The structure of the work suggests that there will always be new battles to fight for the

Christian cause. But it also suggests that with the completion of each battle, with the triumph of good over evil, moral order is restored--at least in the area where the battle took place.

In the Raoul, the battle as structure is not an ordering device as it is in the Roland; it is a disordering device. It is a means by which the Raoul jongleur introduces perpetual chaos into the Raoul world. The battle begins due to a chain of circumstances (the series of problematic situations I have just discussed); there is no single personage or cause responsible for the beginning of the battle. It might be argued that Louis could have prevented the war between Raoul and the sons of Herbert by giving Raoul Cambrai instead, but if he had done that, there still would have been a battle, only between Raoul and Gibouin of Mans. As the jongleur has set up the situations preceding the battle, war is inevitable, for circumstantial reasons, not ideological ones. The battle as structure in the Raoul illustrates the theme that in the mimetic world "things fall apart."

In the Roland, the battle is a metaphor for the struggle between good and evil, resulting in the triumph of good over evil. But in the Raoul it is impossible to polarize the two sides fighting in this way: Raoul and the sons of Herbert are both in the right. The sons of Herbert are right in defending their inheritance,

and Raoul is right in claiming the land Louis offered to him in lieu of Cambrai. Nobody blames Raoul for doing this; rather the French say: "L'enfes Raoul n'a mie sens d'effant; L'onnor son pere va molt bien chalengant." ("Young Raoul hardly has the sense of a child; he does well in demanding an exchange for his father's land." ll. 917-18). Thus, the question as to which side should win is not at all clear--cut as it is in the Roland.

In the Roland the forces of good triumph over the forces of evil; the battle is resolved. In the Raoul the battle between the Cambrésiens and the Vermandois is never resolved--as the jongleur says at the beginning of the Raoul, "Huimais orrez la paine et le hustin / De la grant guere qi onques ne prist fin." ("You will now hear about the suffering and the struggling of the great war which never ended." ll. 96-97). The initial battle is not resolved, but diverted into another. Near the end of the chanson, it becomes clear to both sides that Louis has a vested interest in perpetuating warfare among his vassals. Extensive warfare between the Cambrésiens and the Vermandois has not resolved the questions about land rights and vengeance at issue, but nevertheless the two sides join forces in order to attack Louis. The problems which existed before the war began still exist; they are simply being ignored at this point in order to deal with another problem.

Implicit in the battle structure of the Raoul, then, are the notions that warfare does not really resolve problems, though war is inevitable, and that warfare is likely to be interminable.

In The Narreme in the Medieval Romance Epic, Eugene Dorfman shows that the Romance epics he studies exhibit substantially the same structural pattern.[1] Each begins with a family quarrel (1), which is followed by an insult (2). Then follows an act of treachery (3), which concludes with punishment (4).[2] (See Chapters 5-8 in Dorfman's book for an elaboration.) What is important in our examination here is that in the structure of the Roland the jongleur portrays society as ordered; order disrupted; then order restored. Society is represented as strictly structured, and while it is possible for the social structure to be momentarily disrupted (as when Ganelon commits treason), a definite means exists for the restoration of social order. The jongleur states as a premise "Ki home traist sei ocit ed altrui." ("He who is a traitor must be killed, along with those who support him." l. 3959). By purging society of the traitor through death (which happens after Ganelon is

---

[1]Eugene Dorfman, The Narreme in the Medieval Romance Epic (University of Toronto Press, 1969), p. 223.

[2]A variant, which does not concern us here, is an act of prowess (3) followed by reward (4).

defeated in his trial by combat), Charlemagne's kingdom regains social harmony. Although the pattern occurs only once in the Roland, the formula suggests that any time social order is disrupted, it can be regained. The pattern of social life which the structure of the Roland implies is more exemplary than mimetic.

The structure of the Raoul breaks the rules of the pattern of the Romance epic as described by Dorfman. We could say that we see the continuity of the first three steps--the family quarrel, the insult, treachery--in the Raoul. Raoul quarrels with his uncle Louis over his rights to Cambrai. Louis insults Raoul by refusing to grant him his due. Raoul declares his intent to commit treachery.

> S'or ne saisis ta terre maintenant,
> Hui ou demain, ains le solell couchant,
> Je ne mi home ne t'ierent mais aidant. (694-96)
>
> (If you don't take possession of your land [Cambrai] today or tomorrow before sunset, neither I nor my men will ever be of assistance to you again.)

For Raoul's threat to break allegiance with Louis if Louis does not hand Cambrai over to him, the jongleur calls Raoul "malvais et recreant" ("wicked and traitorous," l. 692).

But as the plot develops, Louis averts Raoul's potential treachery by offering him the lands of the next vassal of his to die instead of Cambrai. Technically speaking, Raoul is committing no wrong in fighting for possession of the Vermandois lands. But he is

nevertheless killed in doing so. It is here that the general Romance epic structural pattern breaks down. When Ganelon is punished through death in the Roland, we feel that his death is deserved; the structural pattern in the Roland is logical: it is logical that a traitor be put to death. In the Raoul, however, Raoul's death is not logically merited. His "punishment" is not at all related to his previous threat to commit treachery; in that respect, his death is illogical. The structure of the Raoul up to this point, then, represents an irrational pattern to life, one which is essentially fortuitous. This structure represents a mimetic world, not an exemplary one.

As I have said, the warfare between the Cambrésiens and the Vermandois is never resolved, but rather diverted. The issue of the Cambrésiens' land rights is never cleared up, and Guerri and Gautier never accomplish their intended vengeance against Bernier for having killed Raoul. Instead, the two sides achieve an artificial reconciliation when the abbot of St. Germain enters the narrative near the end of the chanson and forces a peace settlement (which Guerri and Gautier do not desire). The jongleur then tells us that Louis leaves the room unhappy ("dolans") about the peace settlement and that Guerri observes Louis' departure and makes the following comment to Bernier and the surrounding knights:

> Cis rois est fel, gel taing a sousduiant.
> Iceste guere, par le cors s. Amant,
> Commenca il, se sevent li auquant.
> Faisons li guere, franc chevalier vaillant. (5369-72)
>
> (Our king is a traitor. By St. Amant, everyone knows he began this war. Let's make war against him my noble knights.)

The two sides (previous enemies) agree to join forces against Louis (a common enemy). Louis summons them and in a rage threatens to take away the land rights of all of them. At that, they disperse through Paris burning and pillaging the city. The chanson ends here.

In the Roland the structure of the work implies that order can be restored to society when it is disrupted. But in the Raoul, order, once disturbed, can never be regained. Louis' averting Raoul's treachery leads to warfare between the Cambrésiens and the Vermandois. That warfare causes Raoul's death, which results in many more years of warfare in which the Cambrésiens try, unsuccessfully, to avenge Raoul's death. That warfare, never really resolved, diverts into a common war against Louis. The life pattern which the structure of the Raoul implies is: order; disorder (the disagreement between Louis and Raoul); further disorder (warfare between the Cambrésiens and the Vermandois); and further disorder (the war against Louis). The pattern is certainly not exemplary; it is mimetic.

CHAPTER II

THE SUPERNATURAL

World View

We are very aware of the presence of the supernatural in the Roland world: God and his angels directly intervene in the affairs of that world. God is absent from the Raoul world. In this chapter we will consider the ways in which the Roland jongleur establishes the presence of the supernatural in the Roland world and the ways in which the Raoul jongleur establishes the absence of the supernatural in the Raoul world. We will consider as well the effects which the absence or presence of the supernatural has on characterization.

In the Roland the jongleur tells us that the deaths of Christians are forestalled through the intervention of God. For example, he notes that Naimon would have been killed without the help of God ("Sempres chadist se Deus ne li aidast." l. 3439). When Charlemagne is about to fall during combat with Baligant, the jongleur has God send Gabriel to Charlemagne.

Charles chancelet, por poi qu'il n'est chaduz.
Mais Deus ne voelt qu'il seit morz ne vencuz:
Sainz Gabriël est repaidriez a lui,
Si li demandet: "Reis magnes, que fais tu?"
Quant Charles ot la sainte voiz de·l ángele,
Nen at poör ne de morir dotance,
Repaidret lui vigor e remembrance. (3608-14)

(Charlemagne staggers; he's just about to fall. But God does not wish him to be killed or conquered. St. Gabriel comes to him and asks: "Great king, what are you doing?" When Charlemagne hears the holy voice of the angel, he has no fear nor dread of death. His strength returns to him; he regains his senses.)

In the morning, when Charlemagne awakens "Sainz Gabriel ki de part Deu lo guardet / Lievet sa main, sor lui fait son signacle." ("St. Gabriel who watches over him for God raises his hand and makes the sign of the cross over him." ll. 2847-48).

In order to help the French win their battle, at Charlemagne's petition, God lengthens the day for them.

Colchet s'a tere si priet Damnedeu
Que lo soleil facet por lui ester,
La nuit targier e lo jorn demorer.
Ais li un angele ki od lui soelt parler,
Isnelement si li at comandét:
"Charles, chevalche! tei ne faldrat clartét.
La flor de France as perdut, ço set Deus:
Vengier te poez de la gent criminel." (2449-56)

(Charlemagne kneels on the ground and prays to the Lord God to make the sun stand still for him, to delay the night and let the day remain. An angel who speaks with him comes quickly at his command. "Charles, ride! you won't be lacking daylight. You have lost the flower of France, God knows this. You will be able to wreak vengeance on this criminal people.")[1]

---

[1]This instance of divine intervention has a base in Scripture where, at Joshua's petition, God has the sun stand still so that the Israelites may defeat their enemies (Joshua 10:12-14).

Later, after Charlemagne is victorious over Baligant, the jongleur tells us that it is God's will which forces the pagans to retreat. ("Paien s'en tornent, ne voelt Deus qu'il remaignent." l. 3623).

Sometimes we know that God has intervened in the Roland world simply because the jongleur tells us He has. But at other times the jongleur illustrates that intervention through example, as when Gabriel restores Charlemagne's strength to him and when God stops time in order that the Christians may win the battle against the pagans. Because God does intervene in their world, because He associates with the Christians rather than the Saracens to the advantage of the Christians, the Christian personages in the Roland operate in a context where they receive definite manifestations that what they are doing is right.

In the Raoul, the jongleur does not at all contend that his personages don't believe in God; they do express belief in the existence of God, but God never[1] intervenes in their world as he does in the Roland.

---

[1]I should perhaps not say "never." The jongleur does claim the intervention of God, almost in passing, on one occasion. Raoul and Bernier are fighting, and Raoul strikes Bernier. The jongleur then says:

> Ocis l'eüst, sachiés,.a esciant,
> Mais Diex et drois aida Bernier tant
> Lex le coste li va le fer frotant. (3100-02)

One way in which the Raoul *jongleur* emphasizes the nonintervention of God is by stating, in his own voice or through a personage, before an event takes place, that if God does not prevent that event from occurring, many men will die as a result. Early in the *chanson* the *jongleur* states:

> Se Dex n'en pense qi de l'aigue fist vin,
> Tex onnor est donnez et traiz a fin
> Dont mains frans hom en giront mort souvin. (110-12)
>
> (If God, who turned water into wine, does not prevent it, this fief will be given [Cambrai to Gibouin] to the end that many worthy men will lie dead on their backs.)

When the fief is given and many men do die as a result, the occurrence of the event illustrates God's nonintervention. Later in the *chanson* Guerri makes a similar statement during battle.

> Se dex n'en pense, le peres raemans,
> Ains qu'il soit vespres ne li solaus couchans,
> I avra molt des mors et des sanglans. (3939-41)
>
> (If God, the redeeming father, does not prevent it, before vespers and sunset, there will be many dead and wounded.)

Again, God does nothing to alter the situation.

The *Raoul jongleur* shows the nonintervention of God, as well, by having a personage pray and then showing

---

> (He would have killed him, you may be sure, but Bernier was helped by God and justice so that the sword just grazed him along his side.)

We must take the *jongleur* at his word: God did intervene. But this is the only instance in the entire *chanson* where the *jongleur* makes such a claim.

that his prayer goes unanswered. As the chanson ends, it appears for a moment as if peace might be at hand. Bernier prays:

> Se Dex se done, qi tout a em baillie,
> Qe ma proiere fust en gré recoillie,
> Anqui seroit ceste guere fenie. (5286-88)
>
> (If God, who has everything in his control, grants that my prayer be favorably received, then this war would come to an end.)

Is Bernier's prayer answered? It is true that the sons of Herbert become reconciled with Guerri and Gautier. But the two sides join together only to begin a new war against Louis. That outcome implies that Bernier's prayer was never answered, that God has remained removed from the Raoul world.

At one point, the Raoul jongleur illustrates God's absence by setting up a situation in which we might expect His intervention: if He were ever going to intervene in the Raoul world at all, we might have expected God to have prevented the burning of the convent at Origny. The jongleur has Ybert, former husband of Marcent who died in the fire, express astonishment that Raoul does not receive any divine punishment.

> Quant Diex ce suefre, ce est grans diablie
> Terre ne erbe n'est soz ces piés partie. (1913-14)
>
> (When God suffers this, that the earth does not separate beneath [Raoul's] feet, it must be the work of the devil.)

Ybert's remark makes us think, by contrast, of the instance in the Bible where divine punishment does

consist of the earth opening up to receive the wicked into Hell (Numbers 16:28-33) and of the comparable episode in Statius's Thebaid where the earth separates beneath Amphiaraus's feet during battle, due to the will of the gods, and he falls into Hell (Book VII). The spatial transference of personages in the biblical and classical episodes illustrates supernatural condemnation. The lack of any such manifestation in the Raoul, after Ybert expresses his belief that the event ought to take place, is a means by which the jongleur illustrates God's absence in the Raoul world.

Because the Raoul jongleur notes the absence of God from his fictional world, that world, as a consequence, appears to a large extent to be without ordering principles of morality--"anything goes"--and the personages who must operate in this world perceive it as perplexing.

The Roland jongleur makes no use of liturgical time in his chanson. The Raoul jongleur does employ liturgical time throughout his chanson, but ironically, in order to emphasize God's absence from the world. Without exception, references to liturgical time in Raoul de Cambrai make a point of irony: days which should be occasions for celebration turn out to be just the opposite. On "le jor de Pasques qu on doit celebrer" ("the day of Easter which one should celebrate," l. 548),

Raoul walks out of church into the square where a fight is going on; Ernaut's two sons are killed and Raoul is blamed for their death. "A Pentecoste qe on doit celebrer" ("at Pentecost which one should celebrate," l. 567), Louis holds court. On this day Raoul knights Bernier, who eventually will kill Raoul. Easter arrives, after the burning of Origny, and a banquet is prepared at Ybert's. Bernier tries to get his father to eat--"Jors est de Pasques, c'on se doit rehaitier." ("Today is Easter, we should celebrate." l. 1926)--but Ybert is so upset he can't eat a thing. At Christmas time (l. 3744) Aalais leaves church and goads Gautier into beginning the war again. Gautier promises to take up his arms at Pentecost "se Diex l'a destiné" ("if God has destined it," l. 3761). He does exactly that, although there's no indication given that anyone other than Aalais has destined it. As the chanson ends, Louis gathers his men together at Pentecost "qe on doit bien goir" (l. 4782). Peace is made temporarily but then war breaks out again as Louis' men turn on him and set Paris on fire. This ironic use of liturgical time supports the theme of God's absence from the Raoul world: on the days when his presence should be most apparent, his absence is felt.

In the Roland events occur either as a result of a personage's free will (e.g., Roland blowing the olifant),

a kind of determinism (e.g., Charlemagne not being able to prevent the fact that the Saracen messengers will deceive him, l. 95), or divine intervention (e.g., God lengthening the day so that the Christians can defeat the pagans).[1] But in the Raoul, where God is absent from the world, the jongleur represents the fortuitous. It is fortuitous, for example, that Herbert, grandfather of Raoul's friend Bernier, should die at the point when Louis has promised Raoul the land of the next vassal of his to die. As a consequence, Bernier finds himself in a problematic situation, having to choose between family loyalty and his allegiance to Raoul. It is neither his own will nor divine intervention which puts him in this position, but mere chance. The jongleur's representation of the fortuitous in the Raoul reinforces his representation of the world as being without ordering principles. In this world, at least part of the time, personages are represented as being victims of circumstances.

More than half of the instances of foreshadow in the Roland are somehow linked with the supernatural. The link may be implicit, as when the jongleur says about Marsile:

---

[1]There is only one incident in the Roland that does not fall into one of these categories: Olivier's blow to Roland (ll. 1991-97), which is accidental. This accident differs from the fortuitous events of the Raoul in that it produces no long-range, unfortunate repercussions. It is not a plot element; it does not generate further action.

> Li reis Marsílies la tient, ki Deu nen aimet,
> Mahomet sert ed Apollin reclaimet;
> Ne•s poet guarder que mals ne l'i ataignet. (7-9)
>
> (King Marsile, who does not love God, holds [Saragossa]; he serves Mahound and prays to Apollyon: he cannot prevent the ruin that awaits him.)

The implication is that he will be ruined because he does not love God; God will have a hand in his downfall.

When the Saracen messengers come bearing olive branches to Charlemagne, the jongleur says about Charlemagne, "Ne•s poet guarder qued alques ne•l engignent." ("He can't prevent the fact that they will deceive him." l. 95). The implication here is that the events to come are fated to be; no human endeavor can prevent them.

A foreshadow on one occasion is placed in the mouth of a personage reputed to have a supernatural ability to foresee the future. Jangleu, a seer from whom Baligant often seeks advice, predicts Baligant's death (ll. 3513-14).

The most striking kind of supernatural foreshadow in the Roland is the jongleur's use of signals, actions or events which forecast the future.[1] When Charlemagne extends his righthand glove to Ganelon before Ganelon leaves on his mission to King Marsile, Ganelon drops the glove.

---

[1]See Arnold Williams' "Medieval Allegory: An Operational Approach," Poetic Theory / Poetic Practice (Papers of the Midwest Modern Language Association, No. 1, 1969), p. 83 for a discussion of signals in medieval narrative.

Li emperedre li tent son guant lo destre
Mais li quens Guenles iloec ne volsist estre:
Quant lo dut prendre si li chadit a tere.
Dient Franceis: "Deus! que podrat ço estre?
De cest message nos avendrat grant perte."
"Seignors," dist Guenles, "vos en odrez noveles."
(331-36)

(The emperor extended his righthand glove to him. But Count Ganelon would rather not have been there because of what happened: when he was supposed to take it, it fell to the ground. The French said: "God! what is this? A great loss will result from this message." "My lords," said Ganelon, "you will hear news of it.")

Although Ganelon feels antipathy for Roland, he is on good terms with Charlemagne; throughout the chanson he praises Charlemagne highly. Thus, it is inconceivable that Ganelon might have dropped the glove (a sign that Charlemagne is investing him with the mission) intentionally. Ganelon's dropping of the glove operates as an ominous signal of events to come. The French recognize the signal as being an indication of supernatural intervention.

While Roland is fighting the Saracens and ostensibly winning, the jongleur interrupts the action to tell us that storms are breaking out throughout all of France.

En France en at molt merveillos torment:
Orez i at de toneidre e de vent,
Pluie e gresilz desmesuredement;
Chiedent i foildres e menut e sovent,
E terremoete, ço i at veirement:
De Saint Michiel de·l Peril josqu'as Senz,
Des Besençon tresque as porz de Guitsant,
Nen at recét dont de·l mur ne cravent.
Contre midi tenebres i at granz,
Clartét n'i at se li ciels nen i fent
Home ne·l veit ki molt ne s'espoent. (1423-33)

> (In France, there are terrible storms: gales and thunder, rain and hail without measure; lightening strikes often and rapidly and the earth quakes from Mont St. Michel to Saintes (Sens?), from Besançon to Wissant Port. There is no building whose walls don't crack. At noon the sky is dark. There is no light except when lightening flashes. No man sees it who is not afraid.)

Many who behold this sight are so overwhelmed that they think the world is coming to an end ("Diënt plusor: 'Ço'st li definemenz / La fin de·l siecle ki nos est en present.'" ll. 1434-35); they perceive the catastrophic events as a supernatural signal. The signal is supernatural, but those who have perceived it have misunderstood it. The jongleur tells us, "Icil ne·l sevent, ne dient veir nient: Ço'st li granz duels por la mort de Rodlant." ("But these do not understand; what they say is not true: this is a great sorrowing for the death of Roland." ll. 1436-37).[1]

On several occasions Charlemagne has dreams which forecast future events. We can't rationalize his dreams as strictly psychological. The jongleur makes clear that they are supernatural manifestations: each time an angel appears to Charlemagne and shows him a vision. After his first dreams, Charlemagne later says to Naimon:

---

[1]This storm which signals the death of Roland is a type of the storm which takes place during the crucifixion of Christ (Matthew 27:45, 51, 54).

Par Guenelon serat destruite France.
Anuit m'avint par une avison d'ángele
Que entre mes poinz me depeçoit ma hanste. (835-37)

(France will be destroyed by Ganelon. It came to me in the night through the vision of an angel that he broke my lance between my hands.)

The second time Charlemagne dreams, the jongleur tells us that:

Saint Gabriël li at Deus enveiét,
L'emperedor comandet a guaitier.
Li ángeles est tote nuit a son chief,
Par avison ço li at anonciét,
D'une bataille ki encontre lui iert,
Senefiance l'en demostrat molt grief. (2526-31)

(God sent St. Gabriel to the emperor to watch over him. The angel spends the night at his head and by means of a vision announces to him a battle which will take place against him. He shows him a very grievous significance.)

When Charlemagne first dreams, he has two dreams. One is symbolic.

Sonjat qu'il eret as graignors porz de Cízere,
Entre ses poinz teneit hanste fraisnine:
Guenles li quens l'at desor lui saiside,
Par tel adir estrossede e brandide
Qu'envers lo ciel en volent les esclices. (719-23)

(He dreamed that he was at the great gate of Sizer. In his fist he held an ash lance. Ganelon the count seized it from him, and gripped and shook it with such violence that it shattered in the air.)

The lance symbolizes the entire rearguard; because of Ganelon's treachery the entire rearguard is destroyed.

The second is symbolic and typological, the various animals representing personages of the chanson.[1]

---

[1]Such animal typology is characteristic of the Germanic epic tradition.

Après iceste, altre avison sonjat:
Qu'eret en France a sa chapele ad Ais,
E·l destre braz li morst uns vers si mals.
Devers Ardene vit venir un leupart,
Son cors deménie molt fierement asalt.
D'enz de sa sale uns veltres avalat
Que vint a Charle les galos e les salz,
La destre oreille a·l premier ver trenchat,
Iriedement se combat a·l liepart.
Diënt Franceis que grant bataille i at,
Mais il ne sevent li quels d'els la veintrat. (724-35)

(After this, he had another dream: that he was in France at his chapel at Aix. A boar bit him badly on his right arm. From Ardennes he saw a leopard coming; it attacked his body. From within his hall, a greyhound rushed in, leaping and bounding up to Charles. It bit off the right ear of the boar and fought furiously with the leopard. The French say the battle is fierce, but they do not know which of them will win.)

The dream lends itself to more than one interpretation. I find T. Atkinson Jenkins' interpretation the most logical.[1]

> . . . we may suggest that the boar is Marsile, who lays the deadly plot to cut off the emperor's "right arm," Roland (v. 597); the leopard is Marsile's formidable uncle, the Algalife, who makes an even deadlier assault upon the rear-guard (vv. 92 and 1913 ff.). Ardenne is the wilderness, home of wild beasts. The hunting-dog is Roland, who fights with Marsile and cuts off his hand (v. 1903). (p. 60)

---

[1]See Jenkins' footnote to l. 725 in his edition of La Chanson de Roland (Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1924) and Sayers' footnote to l. 727 for other interpretations.

Charlemagne does not immediately interpret these dreams out loud but soon after Roland departs, Charlemagne tells Naimon that Ganelon has ruined them (laisse 67).[1]

Following is Charlemagne's final dream.

> Charles guardat amont envers lo ciel,
> Veit les toneidres e les venz e les giels,
> E les orez, les merveillos tempiers,
> E fous e flambes i est apareilliez,
> Isnelement sor tote sa gent chiét,
> Ardent cez hanstes de fraisne e de pomier,
> E cist escut jesqu'as bocles d'ormier,
> Froissent cez hanstes de cez trenchanz espiez,
> Croissent osberc e cist helme d'acier.
> En grant dolor i veit ses chevaliers,
> Ors e leupart les voelent puis mangier,
> Serpenz e guivres, dragon ed aversier;
> Grifons i at, plus de trente milliers,
> Nen i at cel a Franceis ne s'agiét,
> E Franceis crident: "Charlemagnes, aidiez!"
> Li reis en at e dolor e pitiét,
> Aler i voelt mais il at destorbier.
> Devers un gualt uns granz leons li vient:
> Molt par est pesmes ed orgoillos e fiers,
> Son cors medisme i asalt e requiert,
> Prenent s'a braz ambedui por loitier:
> Mais ço ne set quels abat ne quels chiét. (2532-53)
>
> (Charles looks up to the sky. He sees thunder and wind and hail and storms, terrific tempests. And fire and flames fall on all his people, burning their lances of ash and apple and their shields up to their gold bosses, shattering the shafts of their sharp spears, splitting their hauberks and steel helmets. In great distress he sees his knights. Bears and leopards try to eat them, together with serpents and vipers, dragons and demons; there are more than thirty thousand griffins, none of which does not try to attack the French. And the French cry out: "Charlemagne, help us!" The king sorrows and has pity on them. He wants to

---

[1]Why Charlemagne, knowing what he does, permits Roland to head the rearguard is never made clear. This is one of the instances in the Roland where plot takes precedence over psychological plausibility.

go to them, but is diverted. A huge lion comes from out of a forest; it is terrible and proud and fierce. It attacks and assaults Charlemagne's very body. They clasp each other to fight. But no one can tell who is winning and who is falling.)

The terrific storms are ominous signals, just as the storms signaling Roland's death were. The lion who fights with Charlemagne is a type of Baligant.

Baligant, in fighting against Charlemagne, sees his banner fall. He recognizes the falling as a signal that he (and the pagans) is in the wrong and Charlemagne (and the Christians) in the right, and that, as a consequence, he will lose the battle.

Baliganz veit son gonfanon chadeir
E l'estandart Mahomet remaneir:
Li amirailz alques s'en aparceit
Qued il at tort e Charlemagnes dreit. (3551-54)

(Baligant saw his banner fall, the standard of Mahound. The emir then perceived that he was wrong and Charlemagne right.)

As we have seen in the above examples, the Roland jongleur, to a large extent, uses foreshadow which is intrinsic: when represented as a supernatural signal or as a prophecy by a personage who is a recognized seer, the significance of the foreshadow is available to the personages operating in the chanson, as well as to the audience. Personages may misinterpret a signal (as when the French think the storms predicting Roland's death signify the coming of the Last Judgment) or their correct interpretation of a signal may be delayed (as when Charlemagne does not immediately

denounce Ganelon as a traitor). But nevertheless the signals, clues as to the way the future will unfold, are available to the personages. And, usually, personages do interpret the significance of the signals correctly. Consequently, supernatural signals as foreshadow are a means by which the Roland jongleur creates order and meaning in the world in which his personages operate. Furthermore, because these signals endow the Roland personages with supernatural knowledge, the effect is to elevate them in stature.

In the Raoul, by contrast, reliable foreshadow is never intrinsic, and it is not associated with the supernatural. It is true that the jongleur places prophesies in the mouth of Aalais, but Aalais' prophesies aren't reliable; sometimes they come true and sometimes they don't. (See Chapter V, pp. 192-198, for an elaboration on the rationalization of Aalais' prophetic powers.) In the Raoul reliable foreshadow is always extrinsic: while the jongleur foreshadows events to come, that information is available only to the audience, never to the personages themselves. By withholding such information from his personages, the jongleur in effect reduces them in stature; they locate at the mimetic pole.

Foreshadow in the Raoul is sometimes simply statement of fact. For example, in introducing Raoul,

the jongleur says: "As fils Herbert fist maint pesant estor; Mais Berneçons l'ocit puis a dolor." ("He put up a strong fight against the sons of Herbert, but Bernier then grievously killed him." ll. 10-11). When Louis offers Raoul the land of the next vassal of his to die, Guerri counsels Raoul to accept the offer. The jongleur points out that many men will die as a result of Guerri's counsel.

> Par le concel au riche sor Guerri
> Commença puis tel noise et tel hustin
> Dont maint baron furent mort et trai. (535-37)
>
> (As a result of the counsel of the powerful Guerri the red such strife and warfare began that many barons fell in battle and were killed.) (See also ll. 740-41.)

By employing extrinsic foreshadow in this way, the jongleur emphasizes that, while he may have control of the chanson, from the point of view of his personages, there are no ordering principles in the Raoul world; for them, the future is always uncertain.

Sometimes the jongleur goes a step further and emphasizes through foreshadow that the future in the Raoul world is not only uncertain as far as the personages are concerned, but that it is likely to be unfortunately ironic as well: an event which produces happiness in the present will nevertheless, to the ignorance of the personages, be cause for unhappiness in the future. For example, when Raoul is born, the jongleur states that "Tex en ot joie . . . Qui puis en

ot le cuer triste et dolent." ("Those were joyous . . . who later had sad and sorrowful hearts." ll. 43-44). When Raoul is knighted, Frenchmen rejoice who later are sorrowful as a result of Raoul's prowess ("Tex en fist goie qi puis en fu dolant." l. 517).

A final form which foreshadow in the Raoul takes is condemnation in retrospect (i.e., the jongleur's remark looks back in time since he himself is in the present of the recitation of the narrative and has an overview of the entire chanson, but it looks forward in time within the narrative context). For example, when Gibouin of Mans insists on marriage to Aalais if he is to restore Raoul's inheritance to him when Raoul comes of age, the jongleur says, "Qe fox fist cil qant il l'osa penser / Car maint franc home en covint puis verser." ("He was a fool to insist on this because many noble men died as a result." ll. 131-32). When Raoul and Bernier are fifteen and Raoul introduces Bernier at court in Paris, the jongleur says about Raoul "Miex li venist . . . Q'il li eüst le chief del bu sevré / Car puis l'ocist a duel et a vilté." ("He would have been better off chopping off [Bernier's] head, for [Bernier] later grievously killed him." ll. 389-91). When Louis promises Raoul the land of the next vassal of his to die, the jongleur says " . . . l'emperer ot trop le cuer felon / Qi de tel terre fist a son neveu

don / Dont maint baron widierent puis arçon." (" . . . the emperor's heart was base in giving to his nephew such land that would result in many barons falling from their saddles." ll. 778-80). In these instances of foreshadow (see also ll. 135-39), the jongleur's criticism is ironic: he knows (and the audience knows) that the personages themselves could not possibly have foreseen the future consequences of their actions. Retrospective condemnation is a means by which the jongleur reduces his personages in stature--by directly deprecating them and by indirectly suggesting their ignorance in regard to how the future of their world will unfold.

Personages

Introducing the supernatural into the Roland world is a means by which the Roland jongleur polarizes his personages: the Christians are good because of their association with God; the Saracens are bad because of their association with the pagan trinity, as well as with the devil.

Several of the Saracen personages are black magicians and have connections with the demonic realm. The jongleur tells us, for example, that King Corsablis "barbarins est e molt de males arz" ("is a barbarian and knows much about black magic," l. 886). The land

of Chernuble (a cue name signifying that he is a black magician; see Chapter V, pp. 167-169, for an elaboration of the cue names of Saracen personages) is Moneigre (black mountain).

> Icele tere, ço dist, dont il esteient,
> Soleilz n'i luist ne blez n'i poet pas creistre;
> Pluie n'i chiét, rosede n'i adeiset;
> Piedre n'i at que tote ne seit neire:
> Diënt alquant que diable s'i meient. (979-83)
>
> (It is said of this land that the sun never shines nor can wheat grow there; rain never falls and dew never settles there; there are no rocks which aren't entirely black: they say that it is the abode of devils.)

Chernuble, his hair trailing down to his feet (l. 976), has supernatural strength: "Graignor fais portet par giu quant il s'enveiset / Que .vii. mulet ne font quant il someient." ("In sport he can shoulder a greater burden than seven mules can heave." ll. 977-78). Siglorel the magician has journeyed to Hell; his guide leader was Jupiter, who led him to Hell by means of black magic ("L'enchantedor ki ja fut en enfern: Par artimalie li conduist Jupiter." ll. 1391-92). These personages never use their powers to influence the course of events during the narrative, but nevertheless, because of their associations with the underworld, they exemplify evil. The jongleur illustrates further that the Saracens are evil by stating several times during the narrative when one of the Saracens dies that the devil (called

by various names: Sathanas, l. 1268; Aversier, l. 1553; Diable, l. 3647) claims his soul.

The Roland jongleur implicitly deprecates the Saracens by illustrating the fact that the Saracen gods (Mahound, Tervagant, and Apollyon) remain absent from the world. In fleeing from Charlemagne's pursuit, the Saracens rush into the Ebro River.

> Paien reclaiment un lor deu Tervagant
> Puis saillent enz, mais il n'i ont guarant . . .
> Tuit sont neiét par merveillos ahan. (2468-69; 2474)
>
> (The pagans invoke one of their gods, Tervagant.
> Then they jump in, but receive no protection. . . .
> All of them drown in great pain.)

When Baligant realizes that the battle with Charlemagne is not going well, he appeals to the pagan gods for help, but instead he soon receives news that his son and brother have been killed.

> Ceste bataille est molt fort a soffrir,
> Li amirailz reclaimet Apolin
> E Tervagan e Mahom altresi:
> "Mi damnedeu, jo vos ai molt servit,
> Vostres ymagenes faire ferai d'or fin:
> Contre Charlon devez mei guarantir."
> As li devant un soen drut Gemalfin,
> Males noveles li aportet e dist:
> "Baliganz, sir, mal estes ui bailliz:
> Perdut avez Malprimes vostre filz:
> E Canabeus, vostre fredre, est ocis." (3489-99)
>
> (This battle is hard to endure. The emir invokes Apollyon and Tervagant and Mahound. "My lord gods, I have served you well. I will make images of you in fine gold. You should protect me against Charlemagne." Just then one of his faithful knights Gemalfin appears before him. He brings him bad news and says: "Baligant, lord, you are ill-treated today: you have lost Malprimes your son; and Canabeus your brother has been killed.")

Thus, unlike the Christians, the Saracens have no positive association with the supernatural. The only time there is direct supernatural intervention in their lives is when the devil claims the soul of one of their dead.

The jongleur also employs intervention by the supernatural to reinforce the fact that Ganelon exemplifies evil. When Ganelon suggests that Roland head the rearguard, Charlemagne, furious, claims that he is under the influence of the devil: "Vos estes vis diables: E·l cors vos est entrede mortel rage." ("You are the devil incarnate: mortal madness has entered your body." ll. 746-47). Concerning Ganelon's trial by combat with Thierry, the jongleur tells us that God knows ahead of time what the outcome will be ("Deus set asez coment la fins en iert." l. 3872). God knows whether Ganelon is guilty or not and will determine his success in the battle accordingly. When Thierry kills Ganelon, the French cry out "Deus i at fait vertut!" ("God has made his might manifest." l. 3931). God's rejection of Ganelon is a sign that Ganelon is evil.

By contrast, the jongleur tells us that Charlemagne has a noble character because God has infused that virtue in him ("De tel barnage l'at Deus enluminét." l. 535). Therefore, one reason why Charlemagne exemplifies good is because God has directly intervened in his life in this way.

When Roland is dying, he offers God his righthand glove (l. 2389), signifying that he formally gives up his life to God. (The glove is a common sign of investiture; thus, we could say that God invested Roland with his life and now Roland is formally returning it to God.) Gabriel descends and takes the glove from him (l. 2390). God sends two other angels with Gabriel and together they bear Roland's soul to heaven. By having Roland turn over his righthand glove to God and by having God accept it through Gabriel, the jongleur illustrates Roland's close association with God. The jongleur shows Roland to be good by association (with God), just as he shows the Saracens to be evil by association (with the devil).

Because there is a definite polarity between God and the devil, by having God associate with Roland, Charlemagne, and the Christians and the devil with the Saracens and Ganelon, the Roland jongleur polarizes his personages: Roland, Charlemagne, and the Christians exemplify good; the Saracens and Ganelon exemplify evil. But in the Raoul, where the jongleur does not represent any supernatural intervention, where there are no ordering principles in the Raoul world outside of the personages, the jongleur implies that there is no measure for value judgment in regard to the personages.

In the Roland only one side fighting is Christian, and God clearly favors and assists them. But in the Raoul

both warring parties are Christian; both invoke the help of God and believe that God may help them. When Bernier tells Ybert of Raoul's attack, he adds, "Mais Dieu de gloire nos porroit bien aidier." ("But glorious God can help us." l. 1838). When Guerri learns of the death of his two sons, he implores God for help until he can avenge himself ("Diex, secor moi tant que je m'en esclaire!" l. 2641). Later when Bernier and Gautier are fighting a duel, at the same time both swear, in the name of God, to defeat the other.

> "Mais, par celui c'om apele Jhesu,
> Se ne te toil le chief desor le bu,
> Je ne me pris valissant .j. festu."
> --Voir," dist Bernier, "fol plait avez meu;
> Je me fi tant en Dieu et sa vertu,
> Ains q'il soit vespres t'avrai je confondu."
> (4383-88)
>
> ("But, by the one called Jesus, if I don't remove your head from your body, I don't consider myself worth a straw." "Indeed," said Bernier, "you have made a foolish pledge. I trust in God and His power so much that I will have killed you before evening.")

What happens in the Raoul, though, is that neither side receives God's assistance. The desires expressed by Guerri, Gautier, and Bernier are never actualized. By not providing any clear signs of supernatural approval, or disapproval, the jongleur implies that the Raoul personages are not exemplary, in either a positive or negative sense. Rather, by omitting supernatural intervention from the Raoul, the jongleur moves his personages

towards the mimetic pole of characterization where there exist no clear-cut norms of evaluation.

When a personage expects support from God and doesn't get it, his view of the world and of himself changes. Towards the end of battle Bernier expresses his bitterness over the fact that it has been impossible to achieve peace and that he feels God has done nothing to help matters.

> Qant ne plaist Dieu qe nos nos acordons,
> Et tant les truis orguillous et felons,
> Qant nos vers aus plus nos umelions
> Plus les trovons orguillous et felons;
> Et qant ostaiges volentiers lor ofrons,
> Et li lor homes volentiers devenons,
> Plus nos manacent, par Dieu et par ces nons.
> Il ne nos prisent vaillant .ij. esperons.
> Or n'i a plus: de bien faire pensons. (4175-83)
>
> (When it doesn't please God that we should make peace; when the more we humble ourselves before them, the more arrogant and traitorous they become; and when we voluntarily offer them hostages and offer to become their men, the more they threaten us, by God and His name--they don't consider us worth two spurs--then there's nothing else to do: we must think to do well by ourselves.)

Here, at the end of the chanson, the Raoul jongleur represents the feelings of a personage confronted by a world in which principles of order seem to have gone awry (because, in fact, they don't exist at all). Confronted by such a world, Bernier feels frustrated and bitter. His realization that he cannot count on God for anything induces Bernier to throw over the Christian ethic for one of self-reliance. The jongleur makes clear that Bernier is not replacing one exemplary ethic

with another by having Bernier say "or n'i a plus" ("now there's no other choice"). That remark makes clear that Bernier is moving away from an exemplary pole of characterization to a mimetic one: he changes his attitude solely in order to cope with the situation in which he finds himself, not in response to any ideal.

The passage further marks Bernier as a mimetic personage by illustrating a drastic, though plausible, change in his personality. In generalizing about this phenomenon, we could say that the personality of an exemplary personage will change very little during the course of a narrative, but that the personality of a mimetic personage will most likely undergo changes, which appear plausible in view of the context in which the personage is placed. That is, in view of the fact that the Raoul jongleur represents God as absent from the world, it is plausible that Bernier should reach a point where he turns from reliance on God to self-reliance.

CHAPTER III

SPACE AND TIME

Space

In the Roland the action takes place on a terrain with which the jongleur and his audience were probably not very familiar: Saragossa and Roncevaux in particular, and northern Spain in general. Space is not represented as localized; it is distant and indefinite. Space in the Roland has moral connotations associated with the theme of the conflict between good and evil: Christian France is symbolically good ("dolce," l. 722), and pagan Spain is symbolically evil ("tenebros," l. 1830). The moral connotation associated with Saragossa changes, of course, when the city converts to Christian law. In several instances (ll. 814-15, 1830-31, 3125-28), the description of the Spanish landscape could be called expressionistic: through the jongleur's choice of adjectives, an emotional state is projected onto the landscape, as in the following example.

> Halt sont li pui e li val tenebros,
> Les roches bises, li destreit merveillos. (814-15)
>
> (High are the hills and the valleys dark and deep,
> the rocks are grey and the straits awful.)

This description makes us perceive the landscape as frightening. This and similar descriptions are present in the narrative when Charlemagne's army crosses the mountains into Gascony, when Charlemagne hears Roland's horn and turns back, and when Charlemagne continues into Spain to fight Baligant. Each time the description occurs, it serves to make the Saracen milieu seem sinister. The Roland personages are more exemplary than mimetic. It makes sense, therefore, that the Roland jongleur should choose to situate them in a symbolic spatial framework in which Spain and France reflect the moral qualities of the personages who inhabit the two countries rather than in a representation of actual space.

In The Old French Epic of Revolt, William Calin discusses the accurate representation of geography in Raoul de Cambrai. He notes that all of the action in the Raoul takes place within a small localized area and that no city or area assumes symbolic significance.

> The poem's early scenes take place alternately in Paris and Cambrai, with Louis hatching his various schemes at court and Raoul awaiting the outcome at home. When war comes he invades the Vermandois, ravaging the country around Sainte-Origny-la Benoite. Bernier escapes to Ribemont, hastens with his father to Roye, and the armies join battle again at Origny. The second war is prosecuted first under the walls of Saint-Quentin, then near Cambrai, and finally at Louis' court in Paris. Thus, with the exception of occasional trips to Beauvais (v. 51, 5), Arras (v. 368, 3726), and of course the court scenes in Paris, the entire action of Raoul de Cambrai takes place in or near the towns of

> Cambrai, Origny, and Saint-Quentin, i.e., a small area in the North of France, included today in the Departments of the Aisne and Nord. The topography includes the Church of Saint-Géri-de-Cambrai, which really did exist in the twelfth century; and designated among the combatants are lords of the surrounding towns--Ribemont, Roye, Hirson, Laon, Douai, Arras. (p. 184)
>
> Raoul's action, although concentrated in a small part of France, is nevertheless diffused among four distinct cities. A convent is ravaged and a battle fought at Origny, a second battle takes place at Saint-Quentin, a third battle and a pre-arranged duel near Cambrai, and still another duel and various council scenes in Paris. Thus no one city or field can claim pre-eminence as with Roncevaux, l'Archamp, and Cayeux. The total effect is one of realism. Like Gormond et Isembard, the action takes place within a carefully defined region in France, giving an effect of authenticity which would otherwise be lacking. And by having the major episodes occur consecutively at several different locations, the poet increases the general aura of credibility by eliminating too great a concentration on any one symbolic battlefield. As in real life, events take place at different locations, no one of which overshadows the others. (p. 185)

By situating his personages in a representation of actual localized space, the Raoul jongleur establishes an appropriate setting for mimetic personages.

In the Raoul, the jongleur gives us some idea of the layout of various cities. For example, when a messenger returns from Louis' court at Paris to Cambrai,

> Par la grant porte en la cité entra
> Au grant mostier de saint Geri torna
> La gentil dame en la place trova. (158-60)
>
> (He entered the city through the main gate. He went to the large church of St. Geri where he found the noble women [Aalais] in the public square.)

When Raoul is preparing for battle, the jongleur describes the preparations from the point of view of Aalais, who is inside a chapel near one of the city gates.

> Droit a Cambrai fu Aalais la bele
> Par mi la porte Galerans de Tudele.
> La voit venir tant destrier de Castele,
> Tant bon vasal et tante bele cele.
> La dame estoit dedens une chapele;
> A l'issir fors son fil Raoul apele. (1176-81)
>
> (The beautiful Aalais was right in Cambrai. There she saw coming in through the gate of Galeran de Tudele many good knights and many Castilian war-horses bearing fine saddles. The woman was inside a chapel. On coming out, she called to her son Raoul.)

We get some idea of the topography of Origny in the following description.

> En Origni, le borc grant et plaingnier,
> Li fil Herbert orent le liu molt chier,
> Clos a palis qu'entor fisent fichier;
> Mais por desfendre ne valoit .j. denier.
> .l. pré avoit mervillous et plagnier
> Soz Origni, la on sieut tornoier.
> Li gués estoit as nonnains del mostier;
> Lor buef i paissent dont doivent gaaingnier.
> (1388-95)
>
> (The sons of Herbert had a palisade set up around Origny, the large, prosperous town, which they valued so highly. But it wasn't worth a penny for defense. Below Origny there was a wonderful, vast meadow where tournaments were held. The lowlands belonged to the nuns of the convent; their cattle, which brought in their livelihood, grazed there.)

When Raoul's men attack Origny, the jongleur shows them crossing all the protective barriers surrounding the city.

> Vers Origni commencent a broichier;
> Es focez entrent por le miex esploitier:
> Le paliz tranchent a coignies d'acier,

Desous lor piés le font jus trebuchier;
Le fosé passent par delez le vivier.
De ci as murs ne vossent atargier. (1431-36)

(They begin to spur towards Origny. They enter the moat to get there more quickly. They cut down the palisade with their steel hatchets and make it fall down beneath their feet. They cross the moat next to the fishpond. They have no desire to delay between there and the walls.)

Following is part of the Raoul jongleur's rendering of the burning of Origny.

Ardent ces loges, ci fondent li planchier;
Li vin espandent, s'en flotent li celier;
Li bacon ardent, si chiéent li lardier;
Li sains fait le grand feu esforcier,
Fiert soi es tors et el maistre cloichier.
Les covretures covint jus trebuchier;
Entre .ij. murs ot si grand charbonier,
Les nonains ardent: trop i ot grant brasier;
Totes .c. ardent par molt grant encombrier. (1483-91)

(The houses burn; the roofs cave in; wine flows through the cellars; hams burn; pieces of fat fall; the grease increases the intensity of the great fire. It strikes the towers and the main belfrey; the hangings fall to the ground. Between two walls there is such a great blaze that the nuns burn. The fire is too great; all one hundred burn in great torment.)

When Bernier, Guerri, and Gautier join forces against Louis and set fire to Paris, the jongleur indicates the extent of the damage by referring to familiar landmarks.

Crient le fu, ci fu lues alumez,
Et en Paris par les rues bo̤utez
Jusqu'au palais dont vos oi avez;
Dès le Grant Pont ou avalent les nez
Jusqu'au Petit qui tant est renommez
N'i a le jor de toz a̤voirs remez
Dont .j. vilains poist estre encombrez. (5482-88)

(They cried out "fire." Then it was lit right up and faggots were spread through the streets of Paris as far as the palace which you have heard of; from the Grand Pont where ships anchor to the Petit which is so renowned, that day there were not enough goods remaining to load the back of a peasant.)

Because the Raoul jongleur is exact in his description of space, we are given the impression of personages operating in actual space. In four of the six examples above (when the messenger returns to Cambrai, when Aalais observes the battle preparations, in the attack on Origny, and in the burning of Paris), the jongleur represents personages moving through space. In so doing, he emphasizes further their location in actual space.

The only time the Roland jongleur gives us a description of the layout of any city is when Baligant's messengers to Marsile enter Saragossa.

Passent .x. portes, traversent .iiii. ponz,
Totes les rues o li borgeis estont.
Com il aproisment en la citét amont
Vers lo palais odirent grant fremor. (2690-93)

(They pass through ten gates and cross four bridges, and travel through the streets where the burghers live. When they get near the summit of the city, they hear loud cries near the palace.)

About Aix, we learn only that there is a field below the city where Ganelon's trial by combat takes place (l. 3873) and that he is hanged in a public square (l. 3945).

Following is a list of spatial references describing the topography of the Roncevaux battlefield in the Roland.

Tot l'abat mort e·l pret sor l'erbe drude. (1334)
([Roland] strikes [Chernubles] dead on the grassy plain.)

Li quens Rodlanz parmi lo champ chevalchet. (1338)
(Count Roland goes riding through the field.)

Marsílies vient parmi une valede. (1449)
(Marsile comes riding through a valley.)

Par lo champ vait Turpins li arcevesques. (1605)
(The archbishop Turpin goes riding through the field.)

Rodlanz s'en tornet, par lo champ vait toz sols,
Cerchet les vals e si cerchet les monz. (2184-85)

(Roland departs and goes alone through the field. He searches the valleys and the mountains [for the dead].)

Amont un tertre desoz .ii. arbres bels
Quatre pedrons i at de marbre fait:
Sor l'erbe verte la est chadeiz envers. (2267-69)

(On top of a hill beneath two beautiful trees, there are four marble stones. There [Roland] falls face downward on the green grass.)

Desoz un pin i est alez corant
Sor l'erbe verte si est colchiez adenz. (2357-58)

([Roland] rushes under a pine tree and lies down on the green grass.)

Despite the number of spatial references, we really don't get a very clear idea of the layout of the battlefield. Usually it is described as a field or plain, but Roland searches the valleys and mountains when he looks for the dead. The hill on which Roland dies is described in detail, but where the hill is located in relationship to any other spatial reference is not at all clear.

Thus, although the Roland jongleur provides us with spatial references in describing the Roncevaux battlefield, his representation of space is fluid: it would be impossible to pinpoint any of these spatial references.

By contrast, the Raoul jongleur provides fewer topographical references in describing battlefields, but those he does provide unambiguously define actual space. The passages which follow describe the countryside just outside of St. Quentin in Vermandois.

> Or fu Guerri lez l'oriere del bos,
> O lui .vij. .xx. de chevaliers cortois,
> Et vit Bernier d'autre part le marois,
> Et Loeys el destrier castelois,
> Le conte Ybert qui tenoit Vermendois.
> Wedon de Roie et trestos lor feois. (3384-89)
>
> (Now Guerri has reached the edge of the wood with seven score of his noble knights. On the other side of the marsh he spied Bernier, and Louis on his Castilian steed, Count Ybert who held Vermandois, and Wedon de Roie, with all their vassals.)
>
> Isnelement issent de Cambrisis;
> De l'autre part en Vermendois sont mis.
> En .j. bruellet ont lor agait tremis. (3850-52)
>
> A S. Quentin en est levez li cris.
> Devant la porte ont .j. borgois ocis. (3856-57)
>
> Qant Bernier est fors de la porte issus,
> Et ci dui oncle et Ybert le chenus,
> Bien sont .D. les blans haubers vestus. (3877-79)
>
> L'agait paserent sor les chevals crenus
> .XIIII. arpent, nes ont mie veüs.
> Li sors Guerri et Gautiers li menbrus
> Par grant vertu lor est seure corus. (3881-84)
>
> (Quickly [Gautier, Guerri, and their men] rode out of Cambrai. Into Vermandois they rode and placed their ambush in a small wood. . . . At St. Quentin the cry was raised, for one of the city dwellers was killed before the main gate. . . . Bernier,

his two uncles, and the white-haired Ybert rode out the main gate. With them were 500 armed men. . . . They passed by the ambush on their long-maned horses and rode fourteen furlongs before they were ever seen. Then Guerri the red and the strong Gautier charged them.)

At one point the Raoul jongleur describes the physical condition of a battlefield after the battle has gone on for some time.

La terre est mole, si ot .j. poi pleü:
Li brai espoisse del sanc et del palu.
Bien vos sai dire des barons comment fu,
Li qel sont mort et li qel sont venchu.
Li bon destrier sont las et recreü;
Li plus corant sont au pas revenu.
Li fil Herbert i ont forment perdu.

Il ot pleü, si fist molt lait complai;
Trestuit estanchent li bauçant et li bai. (2774-82)

(The earth is soft, for it has rained a bit. The mud is thick with blood and slime. I can tell you which knights were dead and which overthrown. The good horses are tired and worn out; the swiftest of them have slowed down to a walk. The sons of Herbert have suffered great losses. It has rained so that the ground is like a swamp. Everywhere the dappled and the bays lose their footing.)

The Raoul jongleur accurately describes the way an actual battlefield would look after battle.

Here, on the other hand, is how the Roland jongleur describes the physical condition of the Roncevaux battlefield after the fighting is over.

Quant l'emperedre vait querre son nevot.
De tantes herbes e·l pret trovat les flors
Ki sont vermeilles de·l sanc de noz barons. (2870-72)

(When the emperor goes to seek his nephew, how many flowers in the field he finds vermillion with the blood of our barons.)

The Roland jongleur's description is stylized; it serves to glorify the dead French rather than to depict any actual battlefield.

In the following passage, the Raoul jongleur describes a crowded battlefield:

> Li quens Raoul sist desor l'auferrant;
> Il et ces oncles vont lor gent ordenant.
> Si serré vont li baron chevalchant,
> Se getissiés sor les hiaumes .j. gant
> Ne fust a terre d'une louée grant.
> Desor les crupes des destriers auferant
> Gisent li col et deriere et devant. (2410-16)
>
> (Count Raoul was seated on his iron-grey steed; he and his uncle put their men into battle array. The knights go riding so closely that if you threw a glove on their helmets, it would not fall to the ground in the space of a good league. The necks of the horses behind lie on the croups of those in front.)

The Raoul jongleur, in this battlefield description, gives us enough information to envisage the location of personages in space.

The Roland jongleur describes the field where Charlemagne and Baligant fight very generally: "Grant est la plaigne e large la contrede." ("The field is large and the land is vast." l. 3305). His description of the army on this battlefield is impressionistic.

> Luisent cil elme as piedres d'or gemmedes,
> E cist escut e cez brónies safredes,
> E cist espiét, cez enseignes fermedes,
> Sonent cist graisle, les voiz en sont molt cleres,
> De·l olifant haltes sont les menedes. (3306-10)
>
> (With jewels set in gold, the helmets shine, as do the shields and the golden byrnies and the pennoned spears. The horns sound clearly; high are the blasts from the olifant.)

Although the flashing of armor and the sounding of horns conveys the impression of an army, the positioning of personages on the battlefield is not at all clear; the Roland jongleur does not clearly situate the army in space.

Occasionally in the Roland the jongleur does show personages moving through actual space, as in the following example where the French are returning home.

> Passent Nerbonne par force e par vigor
> Vint a Bordeles la citét de renom,
> Desor l'alter saint Séverin lo baron
> Met l'oliphant plein d'or e de mangons:
> Li pelerin lo veident ki la vont.
> Passet Gironde a molt granz nés qu'i sont,
> Entresqu'a Blávie at conduit son nevot,
> Ed Olivier son noble compaignon,
> E l'arcevesque ki fut sages e proz.
> En blans sarcous fait metre les seignors,
> A saint Romain la gisent li baron:
> Franc les comandent a Deu ed a ses nons.
> Charles chevalchet e les vals e les monz,
> Entresqu'ad Ais ne volt prendre sojorn;
> Tant chevalchat qu'il descent a·l pedron. (3683-97)
>
> (They pass through Narbonne by force and come to Bordeaux, the city of renown. There, on the altar of St. Severin they lay the olifant, filled with gold mangons--pilgrims who go there see it. They cross the Gironde on the great ships there and go to Blaye, where [the emperor] has brought his nephew and Olivier, his noble companion, and the archbishop, who was wise and valiant. He has these noble men laid in white tombs. They lie in St. Romayne's. The French commend them in the name of God. Charles rides through the valleys and over the mountains. He does not wish to stop until he reaches Aix; he rides until finally he dismounts there.)

But what we are more likely to find in the Roland is something like this:

Par grant iror chevalchet Charlemagnes,
Desor sa brónie li gist sa barbe blanche.
Poignent ad ait tuit li baron de France,
Nen at icel ki ne demeint irance
Qued il ne sont a Rodlant lo chataigne,
Ki sei combat as Sarrazins d'Espaigne. (1842-47)

(Charlemagne rides on in great ire, his white beard lying over his byrny. All the barons of France spur beside him. There is not one who is not upset that they are not with Roland who is leading combat against the Saracens in Spain.)

In this passage the jongleur indicates twice that Charlemagne and his army are moving along, but because he does not provide us with any spatial references nor any indication of the positions of individual personages with regard to each other, the effect created is of an amorphous mass of men floating along, Charlemagne somewhere in the midst of the mass.

To illustrate better what I mean, I shall contrast the example of Charlemagne riding with his men with one where Raoul is riding with his.

Congié demande Raoul de Cambresis;
Part de sa mere Aalais au cler viṣ,
Passe Aroaise, ce est li siens païs,
Ensamble o lui s'en va li sors Guerri:
Bien sont armé sor les chevals de pris.
En Vermendois d'autre part ce sont mis:
Prennent les proies; mains hom en fu chatis;
Ardent la terre, li maisnil sont espris.
Et Bernier fu mornes et pensis;
Qant vit la terre son pere et ces amis
Ensi ardoit, por poi n'enraige vis.
Ou que cil voisent, Bernier remeist toz dis;
De lui armer ne fu mie hastiz. (1216-28)

(Raoul takes leave of his mother Aalais. He goes through Arrouaise, which is his own territory. Guerri the red rides with him. They are well-armed and riding good horses. Then they cross the boundary of Vermandois. They take booty and prisoners and

> burn the crops and houses. Bernier was gloomy and pensive; when he saw the land of his father and friends burning thus, he could hardly contain his anger. Wherever they went, Bernier stayed behind; he was in no hurry to put on arms.)

The Raoul jongleur indicates that Raoul and his men leave Cambrai, pass through Arrouaise, and ride into the farmland of Vermandois. Furthermore, he indicates the spatial relationship of three individual personages: Raoul and Guerri ride side by side; Bernier lags behind. The Raoul jongleur locates personages in space here both through territorial references and by indicating the positions of personages in relationship to each other.

Sometimes, in order to suggest that movement through space has occurred, the Roland jongleur will mention that a personage passes a tree. As Ganelon and Blancandrin ride to Saragossa, for example, the jongleur indicates that they pass "soz une olive halte" ("under a tall olive tree," l. 366) and when they arrive, they "descendent soz un if" ("dismount under a yew," l. 406). These two trees are the only landmarks we are provided with. They are not really a representation of actual topography; rather, they serve as a signal to the audience that personages have, in fact, moved from one place to another. We realize this, not because the jongleur has actually represented the movement of personages through space, but because he has provided us with these signals. The representation of movement

in such instances is static: first a personage is in one place; then he is in another.

In both the Roland and the Raoul, the jongleur uses a device I call "indirect viewpoint": he switches momentarily from his own viewpoint to the viewpoint of one of the personages, but, by keeping the narrative in the third person, he expresses the personage's viewpoint indirectly. In the Roland indirect viewpoint works like this: a personage at one point in space sees an action at another point in space.

> Baliganz veit son gonfanon chadeir
> E l'estandart Mahomet remaneir:
> Li amirailz alques s'en aparceit
> Qued il at tort e Charlemagnes dreit. (3551-54)
>
> (Baligant saw his banner fall, the standard of Mahound. The emir then perceived that he was wrong and Charlemagne right.)
>
> Si veit venir cele gent paienor,
> Si•n apelat Rodlant son compaignon:
> "Devers Espaigne vei venir tel brunor,
> Tanz blans osbers, tanz elmes flambeios!
> Icist feront noz Franceis grant iror.
> Guenles li fel out faite tradison,
> Ki nos jugat devant l'emperedor." (1019-25)
>
> ([Olivier] saw the Saracens coming and called to Roland his companion: "Coming from Spain I see such a press: so many bright hauberks, so many gleaming helmets! They will give the French a fierce battle. Ganelon the false, who named us before the emperor, has committed treason.)

In both instances the Roland jongleur situates personages in space by implying two points in space, one for the perceiver and the other for the thing perceived.

At one point in the Raoul the jongleur alternates between his point of view and Bernier's: when Bernier discovers his mother in the fire.

> Espée traite est venus au mostier,
> Parmi les huis vit la flame raier;
> De tant com puet .j. hom d'un dart lancier
> Ne puet nus hon ver le feu aproichier.
> Bernier esgarde dalez .j. marbre chier:
> La vit sa mere estendue couchier,
> Sa tenre face estendue couchier.
> Sor sa poitrine vit ardoir son sautier. (1499-1506)
>
> (With his sword drawn [Bernier] came to the convent. He saw the flames leaping between the doors. No man can get closer than the distance of a lance-throw to the fire. Bernier looks near a marble slab: there he sees his mother with her tender face lying stretched out. On her breast he sees her psalter burning.)

Here, as in the examples from the Roland, the Raoul jongleur uses the device of indirect viewpoint to situate Bernier in space, but not to represent movement through space.

But consider this example. When Raoul and his men arrive in Paris, the jongleur describes their approach to the palace; then the point of view shifts to Louis who watches their approach.

> Li baron vinrent a la cort a Paris,
> A pié descendent par desoz les olis:
> El palais montent, ja iert li rois requis.
> Loeys truevent el faudestuef asis.
> Li rois regarde, vit venir les marchis;
> Devant venoit Raoul o le cler vis. (826-31)
>
> (The barons arrive at the court at Paris; they dismount beneath the olive trees. They ascend to the palace to find the king. They find Louis seated on his throne. Louis looks and sees the nobles coming, headed by the eager Raoul.)

By shifting the point of view to Louis, the jongleur reinforces the movement of Raoul and his men through space. We first see them moving from the jongleur's point of view; then we are encouraged to envisage the same progression of movement from Louis' point of view.

From Aalais' viewpoint, we see Raoul's men, carrying the dead Raoul on his shield, returning from battle.

> La gentix dame vit le duel engraigner.
> Parmi la porte entrent li bon destrier,
> Les arçons frais: n'i a qu peçoier.
> Ocis i furent li vaillant chevalier
> Sargant i querent, vaslet et esquier.
> Parmi la porte eiz vos entrer Guerri
> Qi Raoul porte sor son escu plegnier.
> Si le sostienent li vaillant chevalier,
> Le chief enclin soz son elme a or mier. (3532-40)
>
> (The noble woman perceives the mourning increasing. The good battle horses enter the gates with saddles broken beyond repair. The valiant knights were killed. Sergeants, grooms, and squires are running around. Entering the gates, here is Guerri who bears Raoul on his broad shield. The valiant knights support him, his head bowed beneath his gold helmet.)

The jongleur situates Aalais inside the city gates. He suggests a procession through the gates, by describing first the riderless horses, then the sergeants, grooms, and squires, and finally the entrance of Guerri who bears the dead Raoul. From Aalais' point of view, we envisage the procession coming in through the gates towards her. The Raoul jongleur uses the device of indirect viewpoint, not only to situate personages in space, but

to illustrate the movement of personages through space as well, something the Roland jongleur does not do.

In two instances, the Raoul jongleur establishes spatial reference through style. In a passage depicting Guerri slashing away in battle, for example, the rhythm imitates his sword strokes.

> Qi li veist son maltalent vengier
> Destre et senestre les rens au branc serchier,
> Et bras et pis et ces testes tranchier. (2565-67)
>
> (You should have seen him avenge his rage, right and left search the ranks with his sword, and slash through arms and chests and heads.)

The rhythmic suggestion of a swiping sword implies movement in space, thereby creating an image of Guerri moving in space.

In the opening lines of the following passage, the Raoul jongleur suggests, through paratactic syntax and the staccato effect of repetitio, the chaotic action of the battle preceding the aftermath he describes.[1]

> Tant hanste fraindre, tante targe troée,
> Et tante broigne desmaillie et fausée,
> Tant pié, tant poing, tante teste colpée,
> Tant bon vasal gesir goule baée.
> Des abatus est joinchie la prée,
> Et des navrez est l'erbe ensanglentée. (2980-85)
>
> (Broken lances, torn shields, hauberks stripped of mail and ruined, feet, fists, chopped-off heads, good knights lying mouth open. The field is strewn with the defeated, and the grass is bloodied from the wounded.) (See also ll. 3471-76 and 4040-45.)

---

[1]In this instance, form reinforces the theme of the Raoul world as disordered and chaotic.

Coupled with the spatial reference which follows it, the style in this passage reinforces our impression of personages moving in space.

Let us contrast these two stylistic imitations of battle in the Raoul with a representation of battle in the Roland.

> Ki donc vedist ces escuz si malmis!
> Ces blans osbers ki donc odist fremir!
> E ces espedes sor cez helmes croissir!
> Cez chevaliers ki donc vedist chadir!
> Ed homes braire, contre tere morir:
> De grant dolor lui podust sovenir. (3483-88)
>
> (He who saw those battered shields, who heard the clashing of hauberks and of swords striking against helmets, who saw these knights falling, crying out as they lay dying, would well remember the terrible suffering.)

In the examples from the Raoul, single lines break into fragments to suggest movement back and forth, but in the example from the Roland the stylistic effect is static: none of the lines are fragmented to suggest movement back and forth, and the syntax is hypotactic, the six lines together forming a single thought unit.[1] Because the style in this description of battle in the Roland is static, it lacks the spatial implications found in the examples from the Raoul.

In generalizing about the matters we have considered so far, we can say that in the Raoul space is represented as localized, and it is described objectively

---

[1]Here, also, form supports theme: the Roland world is an ordered one.

and in considerable detail. In the Roland, on the other hand, the geography represented is vast (from Saragossa to Aix), and the representation of space is often fluid and indefinite. The representation of space is not objective: Christian France and pagan Spain are imbued with moral connotations; the Roncevaux battlefield is described in stylized terms in order to glorify the French heroes. In the Raoul the jongleur situates personages in a representation of actual space and shows them moving through space. In the Roland spatial references are sometimes lacking where we might expect to find them; consequently, personages are not always clearly situated in space. The Roland jongleur represents the movement of personages through space less often than does the Raoul jongleur; sometimes he represents such movement statically, as when he signals the fact that a personage has moved from one place to another by saying that the personage passes beneath a tree.

In short, and to reiterate what I suggested at the beginning of the chapter, each jongleur provides his personages with a spatial context appropriate to their nature. In the Raoul mimetic personages are situated and move in a representation of actual space. In the Roland, where personages are essentially exemplary, the jongleur situates them in a symbolic spatial framework analagous to their natures. The Roland jongleur

represents actual space to a lesser extent than does the Raoul jongleur, the implication being, it seems to me, that the exemplary may transcend the limitations of space.

In the Roland relationships between personages occasionally are portrayed in spatial terms. For example, on several occasions (laisses 2, 8, 31, 54, 191) Marsile or Charlemagne is portrayed seated in a field or in an orchard, generally with some kind of tree behind his seat (in laisse 54 the tree is replaced by a tent), surrounded by his men. These stylized, unchanging scenes illustrate the fact that Marsile and Charlemagne are both leader figures in ordered social structures. The spatial analogies are used to illustrate the exemplary nature of the relationships.

In the Raoul a spatial analogy will illustrate the mimetic nature of a relationship. For example, in laisse 59, when Raoul and his men are attacking Vermandois, Guerri and Raoul ride side by side, but Bernier lags behind. The fact that Bernier rides behind Raoul illustrates nothing intrinsic about their relationship, as does the fact that Charlemagne and Marsile sit enthroned in the center of their men; it illustrates that Bernier, at that particular moment, is angry at Raoul and reluctant to attack the lands of his relatives. The jongleur tells us that Bernier is "mornes et pensis"

("sad and pensive," l. 1224), that "por poi n'enraige vis" ("he can hardly contain his anger," l. 1226), and that "De lui armer ne fu mie hastiz." ("He was in no hurry to put on arms." l. 1228). Charlemagne's spatial relationship to his men illustrates its essential and exemplary nature; Bernier's spatial relationship to Raoul is a manifestation of Bernier's psychological state at a particular moment.

Time

The representation of time in the Roland is not a representation of extended calendar time. Through the indications the jongleur gives us of the rising and setting of the sun (ll. 157, 162, 607, 717, 737, 1002, 1807, 2459, 2512, 2569, 2646, 3345, 3560, 3658, 3675, 3731, 3743, 3991), all of the events of the chanson take place within a four-day period of time,[1] much too short a time for the action of the Roland to have actually transpired.[2]

---

[1] In "Time in The Song of Roland," Romance Notes, XIII (1972), pp. 550-55, Roberta Kunkle figures a seven-day period of time. While I still figure four, I submit that what is most significant is that the chanson takes place in a comparatively short span of time.

[2] Jenkins notes, for example, the statement by Baligant's messenger--"Li emperedre fut ier as porz passer," l. 2772--and says in a footnote to that line, "If ier here and at v. 2791 is literally 'yesterday' and not 'lately' events are developing rapidly."

At certain points the Roland jongleur represents time as suspended. When Charlemagne returns to Spain to attack the Saracens, for example, the jongleur informs us that through the power of God, time stops: "Por Charlemagne fist Deus vertuz molt granz / Car li soleilz est remés en estant." ("God performed a great wonder for Charlemagne, for the sun stood still in the sky." ll. 2458-59). Here the jongleur is not representing the time of actuality, but rather a state of timelessness.

At certain points in the chanson the jongleur represents the suspension of time stylistically, through the use of laisses similaires. The laisses similaires may occur in pairs--laisses 5 and 6, 41 and 42, 43 and 44, 48 and 49, 80 and 81, 128 and 129, 145 and 146, 205 and 206, 271 and 272--or in groups of three--laisses 83-85, 132-34, 170-72, 173-75, 207-09. Generally, they occur at a high point of the chanson. For example, in laisses 83-85, Olivier asks Roland to blow the olifant and Roland refuses; in laisses 132-34, Roland blows the olifant and Ganelon or Naimon interpret the significance of the horn; in laisses 170-72, Roland attempts to destroy Durendal to prevent it from falling into the hands of the Saracens. In each of these cases, the action is repeated three times, with variations. But we are not to believe that the action was actually repeated three times; rather we are somehow viewing three times the same moment in time.

In the Roland, then, time is represented either as very compressed or as suspended altogether. In the Raoul, however, we always have a sense of actual time passing, of personages living and acting in marked time. For example, the jongleur tells us that three years pass (l. 95) between the birth of Raoul and the resumption of the narrative. Then many years pass in peace ("Puis passa molt et des ans et des dis / Qe il n'ot noise ne plait en cel pais." ll. 369-70). When Raoul turns fifteen, he becomes seneschal of the king, and continues to function as such for some time ("Une grant piesce remeist la chose ensi." l. 520). After Louis offers Raoul the land of the next vassal of his to die, as well as forty hostages to back up his promise, the jongleur tells us that Raoul holds the hostages from Louis for one year and fifteen days (l. 806).

When the war between the Cambrésiens and the Vermandois begins, the jongleur tells us that Raoul plans to reach Origny by nightfall ("Ains l'anuitier," l. 1233). The next day he plans to burn Origny by nightfall ("ainz q'il soit anuitié," l. 1466). That same day, after the burning of Origny, while Bernier is kneeling before Raoul waiting for Raoul to recognize him, the jongleur expresses the passage of time in a colloquial manner: "Bien peust on estanchier .j. roncin / Ains qu'il desist ne roumans ne latin." ("You could

rub down a horse in the time it took him to say anything either in Latin or the Romance language." ll. 1603-04). Bernier leaves Raoul's camp that evening and arrives at Ybert's just before vespers (l. 1826). That very evening, Ybert and his men set off, riding all night without stopping in order to reach Roye before dawn (1946-47). When Raoul's men return from battle, the jongleur informs us that Aalais has neither slept nor eaten in the three days since she cursed Raoul (l. 3512); this lets us know that this initial battle has lasted for three days.

Before the war between the Cambresiens and the Vermandois resumes, Guerri is at home in Arras for seven years (l. 3788) while his wounds heal. When the war does resume, Bernier assembles 3,000 men before Tuesday's sunset (l. 4166), and they arrive at Cambrai the following morning (l. 4186).

After the burning of Paris takes place, Bernier, Gautier, Guerri, and their men ride all night (l. 5494) to St. Quentin where they stay most of a month (l. 5549) in order to let their wounds heal. Here the narrative ends.[1]

---

[1]Although I have not included the Raoul jongleur's references to liturgical time in my enumeration of references to marked time--see Chapter II, pp. 37-38, for an enumeration of liturgical time references in the Raoul--references to liturgical time do, of course, contribute to the jongleur's representation of time as marked and extended.

By situating his personages in actual, extended time, the Raoul jongleur makes plausible the personality changes which he represents in his personages: in time, Raoul becomes increasingly rash and aggressive; Bernier turns bitter; Guerri grows irascible in his old age. Such changes, on the other hand, would seem implausible in the compressed time of the Roland; it would not seem plausible for personages to change so much in a four-day time period. It does not seem inappropriate, though, for the Roland jongleur to situate exemplary personages in compressed and suspended time, as he does. The exemplary should transcend time; the mimetic is grounded in time.

In the Raoul more than in the Roland personages recall the past and fantasize about the future; more than the Roland jongleur, the Raoul jongleur represents the fluid time of the human psyche.

In the Roland fantasy projections into the future are limited to the standard epic gab (boast). For example, in each laisse from laisse 70 to laisse 78, one of the Saracen personages boasts that if he encounters Roland, he will kill him. In laisses 93-95, Roland pledges to overthrow the Saracens. In laisse 142, Roland promises that Charlemagne will find fifteen dead Saracens for each of the French. In laisse 235, Baligant boasts that Charlemagne will lose his head in battle.

We note that the Christians realize their speculations, while the pagans don't. That fact reinforces the jongleur's premise that "paien ont tort e chrestiën ont dreit" (l. 1015): Christian speculation about the future is realized; pagan speculation about the future is not.

We also find examples of the epic gab in the Raoul. For example, when Bernier and Gautier duel, both brag that they will kill the other.

> "Glous," dist Gautier, "près iés de trebuchier:
> N'en partirés sans la teste trenchier."
> --Voir!" dist Bernier qi le coraige ot fier,
> "Dame Aalais, qi tant vos avoit chier,
> Doinst a autrui sa terre a justicier
> Qe ja de vos ne fera iretier." (4499-4504)
>
> ("Scoundrel," said Gautier, "you're ready to fall:
> you will not leave without your head chopped off."
> "Indeed," said Bernier who had a proud heart, "Lady
> Aalais, who loved you so, must give her land to
> another to govern for she will never make an heir
> of you.")

Neither, however, manages to kill the other. This pattern is typical in the Raoul: each of two enemies boasting to kill the other speaks with conviction, but neither ever realizes his threat. Because gabs are rarely realized in the Raoul, they don't work, as they do in the Roland, to show the moral superiority of one side over the other, to illustrate polarity between two sides. Rather, they illustrate solely mimetic psychological fantasy projection in any personage who pronounces a gab.

Sometimes in the Raoul a gab is complicated by a personage wagering his self-esteem that a certain event will occur in the future. For example, Ernaut says to Raoul: "S'a cest espée n'est de toi li chiés pris / Je ne me pris vaillant .ij. parisis." ("If I don't take your head with this sword, I will not consider myself worth two sous." ll. 2804-05). Aliaume threatens Guerri: "Se de ta char ne fas vilain maisel / Je ne me pris .j. arondel." ("If I don't carve up your flesh, I will not consider myself worth a swallow." ll. 4661-62). When the speculation is not realized, the effect, even more than in a simple gab, is ironic, reducing the personage in stature, locating him at the mimetic pole of characterization.

We find represented in the Raoul the Sartrian notion that you are what you were, that it is sometimes impossible to retract past actions, that they continue to influence the present. The jongleur illustrates this phenomenon at one point by having Raoul offer to carry Bernier's saddle and to announce to the public whose it is as recompense to Bernier for the burning of Origny and the slap he once gave him, and then having Bernier refuse to accept Raoul's offer in saying: "N'aiés en moi fiance: Ceste colée n'iert ja mais sans pesance." ("Don't put your faith in me: that blow [you gave me] will never be without weight [pain]." ll. 1796-97).

This incident illustrates the ever potential impact of the past on the present; Raoul can do nothing to mitigate the effect of his past action on the present situation. We see the same kind of phenomenon illustrated in this instance: Raoul once called Guerri a coward when Guerri wished to avoid war; Guerri reminds Raoul of that incident from the past and refuses to cease fighting when Raoul decides he wants to make peace with Bernier (ll. 2299-2305). Again, one of Raoul's past actions affects the present to his disadvantage.

I call this pattern in the Raoul "involuntary determinism." The term might seem paradoxical. But the phenomenon it describes is paradoxical: the personage himself, through his own action, produces the determining factor which, because of his ignorance at the moment, will work against him at some point in the future; only at that future point (the narrative present), when the action is then past, does the jongleur show the personage realizing the results of what he has done. The personage has involuntarily determined his present misfortune. When involuntary determinism operates in the Raoul, it always works to the personage's disadvantage; in effect, it reduces the personage in stature.

There is no clear-cut example of involuntary determinism in the Roland. The situation which most closely approximates that phenomenon begins with Roland's

refusal to blow the olifant. At that time Roland does not expect that his refusal will result in the fall of the rearguard. When it becomes clear that the rearguard will fall, Olivier then reproaches Roland for his earlier refusal to summon Charlemagne. The sequence works like involuntary determinism in that Olivier calls up a moment from the past in order to reproach Roland in the present. However, despite Olivier's reproach, the jongleur does not imply that Roland's past action necessarily works against him. Despite the fact that the rearguard falls, in the three laisses similaires (132-34) in which the jongleur depicts Roland belatedly sounding the olifant, Roland is represented as an exemplary martyr: the jongleur glorifies Roland's pain and suffering. Thus, although Olivier attempts to link the past (Roland's refusal to blow the olifant) with the present (the fall of the rearguard), the jongleur nevertheless, by depicting Roland as an exemplary martyr when he does finally sound the olifant, shows Roland transcending that moment from the past.

Involuntary determinism in the Raoul illustrates the Sartrian notion that you are what you were, that men can be limited in the realization of their potential at a present moment because of the impact which their past actions continue to exert on that present moment: at the two points in the Raoul which we have examined, when

Raoul expresses a desire to make peace, his desire is frustrated because another personage recalls the past and holds Raoul's past actions against him. In the Raoul the kind of intrusion of the past into the present which we see in the phenomenon of involuntary determinism forces the personage concerned towards the mimetic pole of characterization. The sequence which we have examined in the Roland, on the other hand, represents Roland as transcending the effects of his past action: his potential is actualized; he becomes an exemplary martyr.

In instances of involuntary determinism in the Raoul, the past intrudes into the present as if in spite of the personage concerned. Another phenomenon represented in the Raoul operates in practically the opposite manner: in order to avoid facing up to a situation in the present, a personage retreats into the past.

For example, when Raoul tells Aalais that he is going to attack the sons of Herbert because she fears the possibility of his death and because Raoul's father was a friend of the sons of Herbert, she relentlessly tries to dissuade him. Finally, Raoul ceases to contain his anger and orders her to go to her room. Frustrated by Raoul's command, Aalais retreats to the past: a time when Raoul depended upon her, a time when he would not have had the audacity to humiliate her in this way, a time when she always held the upper hand.

"Biax fils," dist ele, "ci a grant destorbier.
Ja vi tel jor qe je t'oi grant mestier,
Qant li François te voisent forjugier:
Donner me vosent le felon pautounier,
Celui del Maine, le felon soldoier:
Je nel vos prendre ne avec moi colchier,
Ainz te norri, qe molt t'avoie chier,
Tant qe poïs monter sor ton destrier,
Porter tes armes et ton droit desraisnier;
Puis t'envoiai a Paris cortoier
A .iij c., sans point de mençoingier,
De gentils homes, chascuns ot le cuer lié,
N'i ot celui n'eüst hauberc doublier.
Li emperere te retint volentiers;
Il est mes freres, ne te vost abaisser,
Ains t'adouba et te fist chevalier,
De tote France te fist confanonier
Et seneschal, por t'onnor essauscier." (1108-25)

("Dear son," she said, "this greatly disturbs me. There once was a day when I was of great use to you: when the French wanted to deprive you of your land, they wanted me to marry that traitorous scoundrel from Mans, but I refused and wouldn't sleep with him; instead, I raised you--I loved you dearly--until you could ride, bear arms, and maintain your rights. Then I sent you to court at Paris with 400 faithful nobles; there was none who did not wear a well-lined hauberk. The emperor engaged you gladly. He is my brother and did not wish to hold you in low esteem so he knighted you. To heighten your honor, he made you standard bearer and seneschal of all of France.")

The jongleur shows Aalais, in her retreat to the past, perceiving the past very selectively; she focuses on the positive and eliminates the negative. It is true that she raised Raoul and sent him to court, and it is true that her brother the king knighted Raoul and made him seneschal of France. But the jongleur has also made clear before this point that the brother whom she eulogizes was ultimately responsible for Raoul's inheritance being taken from him, and that Aalais

might have been able to prevent the permanent transference of Cambrai to Gibouin of Mans had she married him. Thus, when she says to Raoul "Ja vi tel jor qe je t'oi grant mestier." ("There once was a day when I was of great use to you."), her assertion is really only partially true. What the Raoul jongleur is representing here is the phenomenon of psychological accommodation: in recalling the past, Aalais omits what she would rather not remember; she perceives the past as she wishes it had been. To the extent that she selects the facts which comprise her past, she creates it. At a time when she cannot deal effectively with the present (when Raoul orders her to retire to her room), she retreats to this past of her own creation.

We see another instance of the representation of psychological accommodation in regard to the past in the Raoul when Bernier, bleeding from the blow Raoul gave him on the face, arrives at Ybert's. Ybert at first expresses sympathy for his son and anger at the man who struck him (laisse 89). But when he learns that it was Raoul who struck the blow and that furthermore Raoul has burned the convent at Origny (killing Marcent, Bernier's mother) and plans to attack the sons of Herbert (Ybert and his three brothers), Ybert turns on Bernier and reproaches him by recalling the past.

Tant qe tu fus petiz en ma baillie,
Te norresimes par mot grant signorie;
Et qant fus grans, en ta bachelerie,
Nos guerpesiz par ta large folie:
Raoul creis et sa losengerie;
Droit a Cambrai fu ta voie acoillie.
Tu l'as servi; il t'a fait cortoisie:
Tant t'a batu comme vielle roncie. (1873-80)

(As long as you were young and in my protection, we brought you up well; and when you grew up, old enough to be a squire, you foolishly deserted us: you believed Raoul and his fine words and went straight to Cambrai. He certainly rewarded you courteously for your service: he beat you like an old work horse.)

Ybert is not simply selecting facts from the past which are to his advantage, as Aalais did; rather, he is completely distorting what actually happened. The jongleur has made clear before this point that Ybert impregnated Bernier's mother and then left her to marry another woman (laisse 83). Bernier's mother joined a convent soon after his birth and Bernier was raised by Aalais (laisse 18). Thus, in actuality, Bernier did not desert Ybert; Ybert deserted Bernier. The fact that Ybert insists that the past was completely other than it was suggests that he feels guilty about what actually did happen: Ybert deserted Bernier; Ybert deserted Marcent. Marcent has just burned in the fire at Origny, and Bernier has been struck by Raoul. Rather than admit that he was at least partially responsible for both of them being in the situations they were in, Ybert attempts to escape the present by returning to a past

of his own creation where he perceives himself as guiltless and Bernier as the one to be reproached.

In both of these instances, where the Raoul jongleur represents a personage retreating to the past in order to avoid dealing with a situation in the present, he illustrates the fluidity of psychological time: the personage isn't simply recalling the past; he is attempting in his mind to fuse the circumstances of the past with those of the present; he is attempting to revive the past. Because in each instance the jongleur shows the personage concerned creating the past, either through a limited selection of available facts (as Aalais does) or through a complete distortion of what happened (as Ybert does), he represents the personage as psychologically complex and, consequently, at the mimetic pole of characterization.

In the Roland, by contrast, the jongleur never represents the phenomenon of psychological accommodation, a personage retreating to the past in order to avoid dealing with a present situation. In laisse 171, he shows Roland, in an address to Durendal, recalling the past just before he dies.

> Jo l'en conquis ed Anjou e Bretaigne,
> Si l'en conquis e Peitou e lo Maine;
> Jo l'en conquis Normendie la franche,
> Si l'en conquis Provence ed Equitaigne,
> E Lombardie e trestote Románie.
> Jo l'en conquis Baiviere e tote Flandre,
> E Honguerie e trestote Poillánie,
> Costentinnoble dont il out la fidance,

> Ed en Saisónie fait a ço qu'il demandet.
> Jo l'en conquis ed Escóce ed Islande,
> Ed Engletere qued il teneit sa chambre. (2322-32)
>
> (With Durendal, I conquered [for Charlemagne] Anjou and Brittainy, Poitou and Maine, fair Normandy, Provence and Aquitaine, Lombardy and Romania, Bavaria and Flanders, Hungary and Poland, Constantinople where he received homage, Saxony, Scotland and Iceland, and England which he held as part of his private domain.)

Roland could not conceivably have conquered a territory stretching from Iceland to Constantinople in actual time during his lifetime (the jongleur portrays Roland as a young man at the time of his death), but within the context of the compressed time of the Roland, such an exemplary feat would indeed be possible. The jongleur has Roland recall the past at this point, not to show him avoiding facing up to death, but to glorify him. Thus, Roland's recollection of the past at the time of his death serves to locate him at the exemplary pole of characterization.

As we have seen, representations of fluid psychological time--unrealized speculation about the future, involuntary determinism, retreating to a past of one's own creation--in the Raoul locate personages at the mimetic pole of characterization. In the Roland, where such representations are lacking, personages locate at the exemplary pole of characterization.

CHAPTER IV

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PERSONAGES

The only relationships in the Roland which are significantly developed are these: Charlemagne-Roland, Charlemagne-Ganelon, Roland-Ganelon, and Roland-Olivier. Roland and Turpin interact somewhat, but not much. The relationships between Blancandrin and Marsile and between Naimon and Charlemagne are strictly functional: Blancandrin and Naimon both function as counselors to their kings.

In the Raoul the following pairs of personages interact: Aalais-Bernier, Aalais-Gautier, Aalais-Guerri, Aalais-Louis, Aalais-Raoul, Bernier-Gautier, Bernier-Guerri, Bernier-Louis, Bernier-Raoul, Bernier-Ybert, Gautier-Guerri, Gautier-Louis, Guerri-Louis, Guerri-Raoul, and Louis-Raoul. In other words, the Raoul has six principle personages--Aalais (Raoul's mother), Bernier (Raoul's friend and grandson of Herbert), Gautier (Aalais' nephew and Raoul's cousin), Guerri (Raoul's uncle), Louis (king of France and Aalais' brother), and Raoul--each of whom interacts with the

other five. (There is only one exception: Gautier and Raoul do not interact because Gautier enters the narrative after Raoul's death.)

By representing relationships between personages, the Roland jongleur illustrates the exemplary natures of the personages involved in them; the Raoul jongleur, on the other hand, represents relationships between personages in order to portray psychologically complex personalities. If we view the relationships in the Roland and the Raoul as lying somewhere on a continuum between an exemplary pole and a mimetic pole, we find that the Roland relationships lie near the exemplary pole though, at times, they may move a bit towards the mimetic and that the Raoul relationships lie near the mimetic pole though, at times, they may move a bit towards the exemplary. In order to illustrate this principle, I will examine the three relationships in the Roland in which Roland is involved and the five relationships in the Raoul in which Aalais is involved. In addition I will compare the two central friendship relationships in the two works, the Roland-Olivier relationship in the Roland with the Raoul-Bernier relationship in the Raoul. With these two relationships especially, we observe the phenomenon of a relationship shifting position on a continuum between exemplary and mimetic poles.

Roland-Charlemagne

For the most part, during the Roland Roland and Charlemagne are separated from each other, Roland in the rearguard and Charlemagne with the main body of his army. Consequently, what we know about the nature of their relationship, we learn from what they say about and how they respond to each other when apart, as well as from what other personages say about them: twice, personages in the chanson refer to Roland as Charlemagne's "right arm" (ll. 597, 1195).

During battle, Roland speaks about his duty of service to Charlemagne: "Bien devons ci ester por nostre rei; Por son seignor, deit hom soffrir destreiz." ("We must fight for our king; a man must be willing to suffer in the service of his lord." ll. 1009-10). (See also l. 1117.) Roland believes that Charlemagne esteems him because he performs well in battle.

> Por bien ferir l'emperedre nos aimet. (1092)
> (It is for striking well that the emperor loves us.)
>
> Por itels cols nos aimet l'emperedre. (1377)
> (It is for such blows that the emperor loves us.)
>
> Por itels cols nos at Charles plus chiers. (1560)
> (It is for such blows that Charles holds us dear.)

Soon after Charlemagne leaves Roland behind in the rearguard, he says to Naimon, "Deus! se jo·l pert ja n'en avrai eschange." ("God! if I lose him, I will

never be able to replace him." l. 840). In his lament for Roland at his death, Charlemagne expresses grief over the loss of an invaluable soldier.

> Amis Rodlanz, de tei ait Deus mercit,
> Onques nuls hom tel chevalier ne vit
> Por granz batailles joster e defenir!
> La meie honor est tornede en declin. (2887-90)
>
> (Roland, friend, may God have mercy on you. No man ever saw such a knight for jousting and winning great battles. My honor will diminish [as a result of your death].)
>
> Jamais n'iert jorz de tei n'aie dolor.
> Com dechadrat ma force e ma baldor!
> Nen avrai ja ki sostienget m'onor;
> Soz ciel ne quit aveir ami un sol,
> Se ai parenz, nen i at nul si prot. (2901-05)
>
> (There will never be a day that I won't sorrow for you. How my might and my joy will diminish. I will have no one to sustain my honor. I feel as if I have no friend left. Though I have kinsmen, none is as valiant as you.)

Both Roland and Charlemagne speak about friendship (amistié) in terms of service: Roland feels that he earns Charlemagne's friendship by performing well in battle, and Charlemagne clearly esteems Roland and calls him "amis" because he is an incomparable soldier. In an article on personal relationships in medieval France, William A. Stowell explains the implications of the term amistié within the feudal context; his explanation helps to clarify the Roland-Charlemagne relationship.

> Amistié, the personal bond between seigneur and follower, is radically different from the tie of friendship; amis used as a term for the follower of a seigneur does not mean "friend." Friendship is a mutual relation. If amistié were friendship, the follower would be the amis of his seigneur and the

> seigneur would be the amis of his follower; furthermore, the follower would address his seigneur as amis and the seigneur would address his follower as amis. Amistié is not a mutual relation. The follower stands in a relation to the seigneur different from that in which the seigneur stands to the follower. The follower is the amis of his seigneur; the seigneur is never the amis of his follower. The seigneur addresses his follower as "amis." The follower never thus addresses his seigneur.[1] Friendship is a relation which presumes mutual equality. Amistié is the relation between seigneur and follower, between whom there was not mutual equality. Friendship is an informal bond, arising spontaneously, unconsciously, because the persons concerned happen to be temperamentally congenial. No ceremonies mark its inception and the extent of its duties is unlimited and undefined. Amistié was a more formal bond than friendship. It was formally granted by the seigneur and accepted by the follower, the ceremony often taking place before witnesses. In case the bond was broken, it was formally recalled by the seigneur or returned by the follower.
>
> Amistié imposed upon the contracting parties certain well defined duties and obligations. The seigneur should arm, support and equip his amis, should trust him, listen to his counsel, and avenge his death. The amis should be faithful to his seigneur, honor and trust him, counsel him, serve him and fight for him in time of need, and avenge his death.[2]

Because both Roland and Charlemagne link amistié with service in this formal sense, their lord-vassal relationship appears exemplary.

---

[1] On one occasion, Roland does address Charlemagne as "amis"--"E! reis amis, que vos ici nen estes." ("O! king, friend, if only you were here." l. 1697)--but, as Stowell pointed out earlier in his article (p. 392), "amis" was a term which could also be used as an appellation for a relative (charnels amis), and Charlemagne is Roland's uncle.)

[2] William A. Stowell, "Personal Relationships in Medieval France," PMLA, 28 (1913), 393-96.

While Roland may express sympathy and concern for his own men (ll. 1162-63, 1630-31), he is singularly emotionless towards Charlemagne. Charlemagne's emotional response towards Roland, on the other hand, is generally intense. When Roland is consigned to the rearguard, Charlemagne weeps out of concern for him (l. 773).[1] On arriving at Gascony, "Sor toz les altres est Charles angoissos / As porz d'Espaigne at laissié son nevot / Pitét l'en prent, ne poet muder n'en plort." ("Over all the others, Charles anguishes, for he has left his nephew at the gates of Spain. Pity overtakes him; he can't keep from weeping." ll. 823-25). (See also l. 841.) When he discovers Roland's dead body, he weeps (l. 2873), takes Roland in his arms and faints (ll. 2879-80). When he revives, Charlemagne, tearing his hair (ll. 2906, 2930-31), laments Roland's death (laisses 205-09). At one point during the lament Charlemagne says: "Si grant doel ai que jo ne voldreie estre." ("My sorrow is so great that I wish I might cease to be." l. 2929).

In the Charlemagne-Roland relationship, it is striking that Charlemagne's emotional response towards

---

[1]Why, if he realizes from his dreams the night before that Roland's life will be in danger, Charlemagne does not refuse to let Roland remain behind or why he does not at least insist that Roland take more men with him than he wishes to is not made clear. Occasionally, plot concerns preempt plausibility in the Roland: Roland must head the rearguard with a small group of men in order to heighten the tragic quality of his death.

Roland is so strong and that Roland's emotional response towards Charlemagne is practically nonexistant. We can account for this fact if we agree with Dorothy Sayers that the jongleur has singled out Charlemagne to portray grief on a heroic scale (p. 15), that Charlemagne is represented as an exemplary "man of feeling" (p. 16) rather than a mimetic personage.

Roland-Ganelon

During the course of the Roland we see Roland and Ganelon responding to each other, both when together and apart. The ways in which they respond to each other help to characterize them, to locate them on a continuum between exemplary and mimetic poles of characterization.

When Marsile makes a peace offer to Charlemagne, Roland, recalling Marsile's duplicity in the past, suggests that Charlemagne refuse the offer. Ganelon, in turn, advises Charlemagne to accept the offer. He concludes his speech with a personal attack on Roland.

> Ki ço vos lodet que cest plait degetons,
> Ne li chalt, sire, de quel mort nos morjons.
> Conseilz d'orgoeill n'est dreiz qued a plus mont;
> Laissom les fols, as sages nos tenons! (226-29)
>
> (He who advises you to reject this offer cares not, my lord, what death we die. It is not right to heed further the counsel of pride. Let's discount the foolish and hold to the wise.)

Ganelon's speech illustrates the hostility he already feels (since before the commencement of the narrative) towards Roland; Roland's advice per se (laisse 14) is

neither prideful nor unwise: Roland's wariness over the possibility of Marsile's duplicity turns out to have been completely warranted. Roland does not respond in kind, nor at all, to Ganelon's accusation. Nearly always in the Roland-Ganelon relationship, Roland will not engage in personal argument when provoked by Ganelon. Consequently, Roland does not move towards the mimetic pole of characterization, which he would do if he did respond emotionally to Ganelon; he remains located at the exemplary pole of characterization.

When Roland nominates Ganelon, his step-father, as messenger to Marsile (l. 277), the jongleur gives no indication that Roland wishes Ganelon harm. In fact, he makes clear that Roland considers the position an honor since earlier he expressed the wish to go himself (laisse 18). The French are not at all critical of Roland for nominating Ganelon; rather, they support Roland: "Diënt Franceis: 'Car il lo poet bien faire / Se lui laissiez, n'i trametrez plus sávie.'" ("The French say: 'He will do well. If you pass him over, you will not find a better man.'" ll. 278-79).

Here is how Ganelon reacts to Roland's nomination.

> Dist a Rodlant: "Tot fol, por quei t'esrages?
> Ço set hom bien que jo sui tis padastre.
> Śi as jugiét qu'a Marsílie m'en alge?
> Se Deus ço donet que jo de la repaidre
> Jo t'en movrai une si grant contrárie,
> Ki durerat a trestot ton edage!" (286-91)

> (He said to Roland: "You're crazy. What has got into you? Everyone knows I'm your father-in-law, and you name me to go to Marsile? If God grants that I return home, I will bring about such vengeance against you as to last all your life!")

In terms of the information the jongleur has given us, Ganelon's hostility towards Roland seems inappropriately excessive.

Roland's response to Ganelon's threats is to simply dismiss them: "Orgoeill oi e folage. / Ço set hom bien n'ai cure de manace." ("What I hear is prideful and foolish. Men know I fear no threats." ll. 292-93). Roland insists that he nominated Ganelon solely because he feels Ganelon would perform the mission well: "Mai sávies hom il deit faire message." ("The messenger must be a capable man." l. 294). Roland then offers to go in Ganelon's place (l. 295). Because Roland's speech illustrates his exemplary good faith towards his step-father, it locates him at the exemplary pole of characterization. Because Roland refuses to argue with Ganelon, he does not move towards the mimetic pole of characterization.

Ganelon turns down Roland's offer to go in his place. Again he threatens him.

> Guenles respont: "Por mei n'iras tu mie.
> Tu n'iés mis hom ne jo ne sui tis sire.
> Charles comandet que face son servísie,
> En Sarragoce en irai a Marsilie.
> Ains i ferai un poi de legerie
> Que jo·n esclair ceste meie grante ire. (296-301)

(Ganelon answered: "You will not go in my place. You are not my vassal nor I your lord. Charlemagne commands that I perform his service, and I will go to Marsile in Saragossa. I will play some trick on you there in order to vent my rage.")

In view of the jongleur's representation of Roland's good faith, Ganelon's threat seems unreasonable.

Roland's response to Ganelon's repeated threat is to laugh: "Quant l'ot Rodlanz si commençat a ridre." ("When Roland heard this, he began to laugh." l. 302). Laughter as a sign of heroic self-confidence is a commonplace in the Old French chanson de geste. Roland's laughter might also be a manifestation of surprise and incredulity at Ganelon's threat, for even after Ganelon has nominated him to the rearguard, Roland denies to Olivier that Ganelon might wish to betray him (ll. 1026-27). Roland's laughter, as a sign of heroic self-confidence and of Roland's complete faith in the bond of family loyalty, serves to locate Roland at the exemplary pole of characterization.

In response to Roland's laughter, Ganelon becomes furious and formally breaks his bond with Roland.

Quant ço veit Guenles qu'ore s'en rit Rodlanz
Donc at tel doel por poi d'ire ne fent,
A bien petit qued il ne pert lo sens.
E dist a·l conte: "Jo ne vos aim nient:
Sor mei avez tornét fals jugement!" (303-07)

(When Ganelon sees Roland laughing, he becomes so angry he can hardly contain himself; he's on the verge of fainting. He said to the count: "I break off my ties with you; you have chosen me unfairly.")

Roland does not respond at all to Ganelon's declaration. Rather, the jongleur has Charlemagne address Ganelon: "Trop avez tendre coer." ("You're too sensitive." l. 317); "Trop avez maltalent." ("You're too vindictive." l. 327). Thus, the jongleur makes clear that Ganelon's emotional response towards Roland is inappropriately exaggerated.

The jongleur repeatedly avoids permitting Roland to participate in argument with Ganelon: when Ganelon first threatens Roland, Roland offers to go as messenger in his place; when Ganelon threatens Roland again, Roland simply laughs; when Ganelon formally breaks his bond with Roland, Roland does not respond at all. By not permitting Roland to engage in argument, the jongleur keeps him from moving towards the mimetic pole of characterization. By representing Roland's good faith towards Ganelon throughout the exchange, despite Ganelon's hostility, the jongleur locates Roland at the exemplary pole of characterization: Roland is exemplary in believing in the irrevocability of the bonds of kinship. By illustrating Roland's heroic self-confidence in the face of Ganelon's threats, the jongleur also locates Roland at the exemplary pole of characterization.

Throughout the exchange, Ganelon responds antagonistically to anything Roland says or does. His emotional response appears inappropriately excessive;

Charlemagne accuses Ganelon of being "too sensitive" and "too vindictive." In her introduction to her translation of the Roland, Dorothy Sayers suggests that in Ganelon the jongleur represents a psychological type: "The twentieth century has found a word for Ganelon: he is a paranoiac. The eleventh-century poet did not know the word, but he has faithfully depicted the type" (p. 12). Ganelon is single-minded to the point of paranoia in his fear that Roland is perpetrating injustices against him. As a psychological type, he locates at the exemplary pole of characterization; because he is not psychologically complex, he does not locate at the mimetic pole.

When Ganelon nominates Roland to head the rearguard, Roland responds "a lei de chevalier" ("according to the standards of knighthood," l. 752).

> Sire padrastre, molt vos dei aveir chier:
> La riedreguarde avez sor mei jugiét;
> Nen i perdrat li réis ki France tient,
> Mien esciëntre, palefreit ne destrier,
> Ne mul ne mule que deiet chevalchier;
> Nen i perdrat ne roncin ne somier
> Qued as espedes ne seit ainz eslegiez. (753-59)
>
> (My noble stepfather, I am grateful to you; you have named me to head the rearguard. The king of France will not lose, I promise, either palfrey or steed, mule, pack-horse, or sumpter, which is not acquired by sword.)

Ganelon responds ironically: "Veir dites, jo·l sai bien." ("I know well that what you say is true." l. 760).

In the following laisse, the jongleur presents another response by Roland.

> Quant ot Rodlanz qu'iert en la riedreguarde
> Iredement parlat a son padrastre:
> "Ahi! culverz, malvais hom de put aire,
> Quidas li guanz me chadist en la place,
> Com fist a tei li bastons devant Charle?" (761-65)
>
> (When Roland heard that he would be in the rearguard, he spoke angrily to his step-father: "Ah! cowardly wretch, wicked scoundrel, did you think the glove would fall from my grasp as the bow did from yours before Charlemagne?")

Jenkins points out in a footnote to l. 761 that this laisse (60) is "of doubtful authenticity." (See that footnote for an elaboration of his reasons.) Whatever the case may be, whether laisse 60 is the work of an interpolator or not, as the text now stands, Roland's first response, "a lei de chevalier" is exemplary; his second, an emotional outburst, is mimetic. If originally the chanson contained only laisse 59, then the jongleur would be representing Roland strictly as exemplary. If it contained both laisses, then, it seems to me, the jongleur was juxtaposing the exemplary response and the mimetic response of a single personage, Roland, in a given situation. There is no reason why we should try to reconcile the two, by suggesting, for example, as some critics have, that in light of the content of laisse 60, Roland's earlier declaration to his stepfather--"Sire padrastre, molt vos dei aveir chier." (l. 753)--must be

ironic. Rather, in this instance, Roland is represented simultaneously as exemplary and as mimetic.

The responses of Roland and Ganelon to each other when apart are consistent with their characterizations in direct interaction. Up through the point where Roland nominates Ganelon as messenger to Marsile, the jongleur gives us no indication as to why Ganelon reacts so negatively towards Roland. But then when Ganelon meets with Blancandrin, Ganelon tells him a story which gives us a clue.

> Ermain sedeit li reis Charles soz l'ombre,
> Vint i sis niés, out vestude sa brónie
> Ed out predét dejoste Carcasónie.
> En sa main tint une vermeille pome.
> --Tenez, bel sire, dist Rodlanz a son oncle,
> De trestoz reis vos present les corones.
> Li soens orgueilz lo devreit bien confondre,
> Kar chascun jorn de morir s'abandonet.
> Seit ki·l ocidet, tote pais puis avromes. (383-91)
>
> (Yesterday morning Charles the king was sitting in the shade. His nephew, dressed in his byrny, came up to him. He had brought back booty from Carcassonne and he held a vermillion apple in his hand. "Take it, dear lord," Roland said to his uncle. "To you I present the crowns of all kings." His pride will surely do him in, for each day he leaves himself open to death. If he were killed, we would all have peace.)

By having Ganelon tell this story, the jongleur illustrates the jealousy Ganelon feels over Roland's military success.

At Ganelon's trial, we learn that Ganelon is jealous not only of Roland's military success; he feels that Roland has cheated him of material wealth as well.

> Rodlanz sorfist en or ed en aveir
> Por que jo quis sa mort e son destreit.
> Mais tradison nule nen i otrei. (3758-60)
>
> (Roland wronged me in gold and wealth. For that I plotted his death and disgrace. But I will not concede that I committed treason.)

Ganelon's statement that Roland had cheated him in the past is not supported by the jongleur elsewhere. The implication seems to be that Ganelon feels cheated due to his own jealous covetousness, that Roland did not in fact cheat him. Ganelon's belief that Roland has somehow cheated him because Roland is more successful than he can be seen as related to his suspicion that Roland nominates him as messenger to Marsile out of malice; both beliefs are typical of the fabrications of a paranoid mind.

As soon as Olivier spies the Saracen army, he suspects Ganelon of having betrayed them: "Guenles li fel out faite tradison / Ki nos jugat devant l'emperedor." ll. 1024-25). But Roland is represented as refusing to believe that his step-father might have done such a thing: "Tais Oliviers!" li quens Rodlanz respont / "Mis padrastre est, ne voeill que mot en sons." ("Quiet Olivier," Count Roland responded, "he is my step-father. I don't want to hear another word about it." ll. 1026-27). Roland when apart from Ganelon, just as in direct interaction with Ganelon, refuses to suspect Ganelon's loyalty--Roland reasons that because he and Ganelon are

kinsmen, Ganelon would never betray him; Roland's faith in that family bond is exemplary.[1]

Throughout the Roland-Ganelon relationship, both personages locate at the exemplary pole of characterization, Roland as exemplary kinsmen and Ganelon as typical paranoiac and example of how a kinsman should not act. At one point only (laisse 60) does Roland locate at the mimetic pole and in this instance the jongleur represents Roland's exemplary response (laisse 59) simultaneously with his mimetic one.

Roland-Olivier

In examining interaction between Olivier and Roland, I find three different types of dialogue exchange: nonreciprocal, static, and organic. In nonreciprocal exchange, Roland speaks to Olivier, but Olivier does not respond. For example, after Olivier asks Roland to sound the olifant and Roland refuses, Roland says to Olivier:

---

[1]Eventually (laisses 90 and 112), Roland concedes that Ganelon must have been responsible for engineering the attack on the rearguard, but even then he attributes Ganelon's motive to avarice rather than a determined breaking of their bond.

> Sire compaing, molt bien lo saviiez,
> Guenles li quens nos at toz espiiez,
> Pris en at or ed aveir e deniers. (1146-48)
>
> (My noble companion, you were right. Ganelon the count deceived us for gold and goods and wealth.)

> Por son seignor deit hom soffrir granz mals,
> Ed endurer e forz freiz e granz chalz,
> Si·n deit hom perdre de·l sanc e de la charn.
> Fier de la lance e jo de Durendal,
> Ma bone espede qui li reis me donat;
> Se jo i moer dire poet ki·l avrat
> Qued ele fut a nobilie vassal. (1117-23) (See laisse 112 for a similar example.)
>
> (A man must endure great hardships for his lord and bear for him great cold and burning heat, and lose blood and flesh. You strike with your lance and I will strike with Durendal, my good sword which the king gave me; and if I die, he who gets it may say that it belonged to a noble knight.")

Olivier says nothing in response. His silence may or may not be reproachful--that is ambiguous. Reproach may be one effect of his silence. There is another: Olivier is someone the jongleur can have Roland talk at with a speech which illustrates Roland's exemplary qualities. The pattern is never reversed; Olivier never initiates an address to Roland without Roland responding to him. The momentary effect is to emphasize Roland's presence and worth; Olivier's presence is to a certain extent negated. (See laisse 139 for another example.)

In static dialogue the viewpoints of both Roland and Olivier are illustrated. Olivier may speak, then Roland (laisses 83-86), or vice-versa (laisses 127-28). Static dialogue is not a representation of a discussion; there is no give-and-take beyond one exchange. It is a means by which personages may speak the points of view they illustrate. Static dialogue generally occurs at a high point in the chanson in a series of laisses similaires. In laisses 83-86, for example, Olivier, in view of the

fact that the French rearguard is greatly outnumbered by the Saracen army, entreats Roland to sound the olifant; each time, Roland, confidant that the French can defeat the Saracens nevertheless--"Jo·l vos plevis, tuit sont jugiét a mort." ("I promise you they will all be killed." l. 1058)--refuses for fear of damaging his reputation--"En dolce France en perdreie mon los." ("In fair France I would lose my reputation." l. 1054). The jongleur then says: "Rodlanz est proz ed Olivier est sages: Ambedui ont merveillos vasselage." ("Roland is valiant and Olivier is wise: both are admirably loyal." ll. 1093-94). The jongleur's comment suggests that both positions are exemplary, though different.

In the next laisse (87), Olivier speaks about Roland's refusal to blow the olifant as a fait accompli: "Vostre olifant soner vos ne·l deignastes: Fust i li reis, n'i oüssom damage." ("You would not deign to sound your olifant: had the king been here, we would have been all right." ll. 1101-02). Olivier's words are recriminating as is Roland's response: "Ne dites tel oltrage! Mal seit de·l coer ki e·l piz se codardet." ("Your words are outrageous! Cursed be the heart which is cowardly." ll. 1006-07). In this exchange, a restatement of the viewpoints expressed in laisses 83-86, we feel the potential for an argument. But the jongleur does not permit the two friends to argue: at this point Turpin intervenes as peacemaker.

> Seignors barons, Charles nos laissat ci;
> Por nostre rei devom nos bien morir.
> Chrestientét aidiez a sostenir. (1127-29)
>
> (My lords, Charles left us here. We must be ready to die for our king. You must help to sustain Christianity.)

Turpin's statement, illustrative of his viewpoint in any situation, does not really speak to the original dilemma; it overrides it. But both Roland and Olivier heed what he says. In laisse 92, Olivier says "N'ai cure de parler. . . . Kar chevalchiez a quant que vos podez." ("I have no more to say. . . . Ride then and do as well as you can." ll. 1170, 1175).

In an earlier exchange (not a series of laisses similaires), we also see the jongleur squelching a potential conflict between Roland and Olivier. In laisse 18, Roland volunteers to go as messenger to Marsile. Olivier responds directly to Roland and indirectly to Charlemagne.

> "Non ferez, certes," dist li quens Oliviers,
> "Vostre corages est molt pesmes e fiers,
> Jo me crendreie que vos vos meslissiez.
> Se li reis voelt, jo i puis aler bien." (255-58)
>
> ("You certainly won't," said Olivier the count. You are too proud of heart. I would be afraid that you would get into a quarrel. If the king wishes, I would certainly go.")

Rather than permit Roland to respond to Olivier's charge, the jongleur has Charlemagne make a statement which renders the potential argument irrelevant.

Respont li reis: "Ambdui vos en taisiez!
Ne vos ne il n'i porterez les piez.
Par ceste barbe, que vedez blancheier,
Li doze per mar i seront jugiét." (259-62)

(The king responded: "Quiet, both of you!
Neither you nor he will go. By my beard, as
you see it white, none of the Twelve Peers
shall go.")

There are few examples of what I would call "organic" dialogue between Olivier and Roland in the Roland: laisses 129 and 130, which I will treat immediately, and laisse 148 (where Olivier strikes Roland), which I will treat in due course. In these instances, we see Roland and Olivier responding to each other mimetically: they react to each other rather than just speak to each other. Organic dialogue, preceded by static dialogue in laisses 127 and 128, begins in laisse 129. By comparing the two kinds of dialogue perhaps I can make more clear what I mean by "static" and "organic."

In laisse 127, Roland mourns for the dead, regrets that Charlemagne is not there, and asks Olivier what he thinks they should do; Olivier's answer illustrates his ethical viewpoint: "Mielz voeill morir que honte seit retraite." ("I would rather die than that shame should come upon us." l. 1701)--Olivier feels that it would have been in good form to call for help before beginning battle, but not once the battle has begun. In laisse 128, the dialogue pattern is similar. This

time Roland specifically suggests blowing the olifant. Olivier is more elaborate in his ethical condemnation of the proposition.

> Dist Oliviers: "Vergoigne sereit grant
> E reproviers a trestoz voz parenz:
> Iceste honte durreit a·l lor vivant.
> Quant jo·l vos dis nen feistes niënt,
> Mais ne·l fereiz par lo mien lodement.
> Se vos cornez, n'iert mie hardemenz.
> Ja avez vos ambsdous les braz sanglanz." (1705-11)
>
> (Olivier said: "It would be shameful and to your kinsmen the reproach would be great. The shame would last their lifetime. When I asked you to do it, you did nothing. You will get no praise from me for blowing it now. If you do blow now, you will hardly be brave. For both of your arms are covered with blood.")

Roland's response to Olivier is remarkable in that it ignores the implications of what Olivier has said; it is a non sequitur. When Olivier comments that Roland's arms are covered with blood, the implication is that it would therefore be shameful to blow the olifant. In response, Roland says "Cols i ai fait molt genz." ("I have struck good blows today." l. 1712). What Olivier views as potentially shameful--it would be shameful to call for help when one's arms are already covered with blood--Roland sees as something to be proud of. In these two laisses, Roland and Olivier are not communicating; each expresses his own viewpoint, but it is clear that they don't really hear, i.e. comprehend, each other--this is more true of Roland than of Olivier.

But then in laisse 129, which begins with a similar exchange--Roland declaring his intent to sound the horn and Olivier reproaching him for not having done so earlier--static dialogue turns organic. Olivier's speech, beginning with an ethical condemnation of Roland's intent, shifts to a very personal level: "Se puis vedeir ma gente soror Alde / Vos ne jerreiz ja mais entre sa brace." ("If I live to see my sister Aude, you will never lie between her arms." ll. 1720-21). Roland's response is: "Por quei me portez ire?" ("Why are you angry with me?" l. 1722). This is the first time in the dialogue sequence that Roland appears to have actually heard what Olivier has been saying to him, the first time that a statement by Olivier precipitates a response from Roland, sequential to what Olivier has said. Although it was clear to the audience during static dialogue, in laisses 127 and 128, and earlier in laisses 83-86, that Olivier had grounds for anger at Roland, Roland never responded to Olivier as if he felt Olivier were angry with him. Here, in laisse 129 where Olivier attacks Roland at a very personal level, Roland finally responds with recognition of Olivier's anger: "Por quei me portez ire?" He does not reflect back to the static dialogue (as we in the audience do) where Olivier had already stated the grounds for his anger; Roland needs to be told once more why Olivier is angry.

At Roland's direct question, Olivier articulates his negative feelings about Roland. Olivier sermonizes--thus, in the first part of Olivier's speech there is an element of the illustrative personage as well as the mimetic--and reproaches Roland for his past conduct. Then he announces a rift in their friendship.

> E cil respont: "Com proz vos lo feïstes,
> Kar vasselages par sens nen est folie:
> Mielz valt mesure que ne fait estoltie.
> Franceis sont mort par vostre legerie,
> Jamais reis Charles de nos n'avrat servisie,
> Se·m credissiez venuz i fust mis sire,
> Ceste bataille oüssom faite e prise,
> O pris o morz i fust li reis Marsilies.
> Vostre prodece, Rodlanz, mar la vedimes,
> Charles li magnes de vos n'avrat aide;
> N'iert mais tels hom desiqu'a·l Deu judisie,
> Vos i morreiz e France en iert honide.
> Oi nos defalt la leial compaignie,
> Ainz la vesprede iert grief la departide." (1723-36)
>
> (And he responded: "You acted rashly, for it is not folly to mix good sense with bravery. Prudence is better than recklessness. Frenchmen are dead due to your imprudence. Never again will we be able to render service to Charlemagne. If you had heeded my words, he would have been here. We would have conquered in this battle. Marsile would have been killed or taken. Your prowess was in vain, Roland. Charlemagne will no more receive help from you. There will never be another man like him until Judgment Day. Now you will die and France will be shamed. Today our loyal friendship will come to an end; before vespers we will be parted to our grief.[1])

In these two laisses (129 and 130) Roland and Olivier interact mimetically: Roland discerns and

---

[1]It seems to me that there is some ambiguity about whether Olivier is deliberately terminating their friendship or simply predicting that they will both be dead before vespers--I would think the latter since the jongleur represents their friendship as continuing.

inquires about Olivier's anger; Olivier's emotions surface and generate conflict between Roland and himself. But then the jongleur recalls, so to speak, this mimetic representation. Once more Turpin intervenes.

> Li arcevesques les ot contrariier,
> Lo cheval brochet des esporons d'ormier,
> Vint tresqu'ad els si·s prist a chastiier:
> "Sire Rodlanz, e vos sire Oliviers,
> Por Deu vos pri, ne vos contraliiez.
> Ja li corners ne nos avreit mestier,
> Mais neporquant si est il asez mielz:
> Veignet li reis si nos podrat vengier." (1737-44)
>
> (When the archbishop heard them arguing, he spurred his horse, drew near to them, and began to rebuke them: "Lord Roland, and you lord Olivier, for God's sake I beg of you, don't argue. Sounding the horn will be of no use to you, but nevertheless it is better to do so, so that the king may come to avenge us.")

Turpin's intervention here, as before, introduces a resolution which in effect overrides the argument, and the argument comes to a halt.

Each of Turpin's interventions advances the plot. In laisse 89, his intervention precludes further discussion about the blowing of the olifant. Thus, the plot moves on its way towards the realization of Ganelon's treachery. Here, his intervention is necessary in order for the plot to move into the Baligant episode. Through Turpin's interventions, the jongleur reveals his priorities: structure and advancement of plot take precedence over the development of a mimetic personality in any personage.

It seems as if the jongleur carefully controls the extent to which he will allow a personage to be represented mimetically so as not to reduce too much the exemplary natures of those personages. Plot concerns aside, the jongleur could not permit Roland and Olivier to engage in prolonged vindictive argument without undermining their exemplary stature.

The Roland jongleur uses nonreciprocal dialogue in order to illustrate the exemplary nature of Roland alone. Through static dialogue, he represents the exemplary natures of both Roland and Olivier with speeches which parallel each other in content but which do not interact. At a point where static dialogue shows the potential for turning organic (laisse 87), the jongleur has a third party, Turpin, intervene to cut off and divert the dialogue; thus, Roland and Olivier remain at the exemplary pole of characterization. When static dialogue does turn organic (laisses 129-30), Roland and Olivier definitely move towards the mimetic pole of characterization. But the jongleur never permits organic dialogue to continue for more than a few laisses; during that time personages locate momentarily near the mimetic pole of characterization but when the organic dialogue is cut off they relocate at the exemplary pole. Because we tend to accommodate the representation of contraries in a given personage, when

organic dialogue does appear in the Roland narrative, the accumulative effect is to locate the personage midway between the exemplary and mimetic poles of characterization.

For the most part, the Roland-Olivier relationship is an exemplary friendship between peers. As Charlemagne esteems Roland's valor, Roland, in turn, esteems Olivier: "Ço dist Rodlanz: 'Or vos receif jo fredre / Por itel cols nos aimet l'emperedre.'" ("Roland said this: 'Now I'll call you brother. It is for such blows as those that the emperor loves us.'" ll. 1376-77; see also ll. 1558-60). Roland sees Olivier and himself as a team in battle: "Jo i ferrai de Durendal m'espede / E vos, compaign, ferreiz de Halteclere." ("I will strike with my sword Durendel, and you, comrade, will strike with Hauteclaire." l. 1462).

In a recent article, "Ambivalence and Anger: The Human Center of the Chanson de Roland," Joseph Donohoe argues that there is a latent hostility underlying Olivier's friendship for Roland and that there is some question as to whether Olivier's blow to Roland is really accidental. (See the entire article[1] for an elaboration of Donohoe's interpretation.) In laisse 130

---

[1]Joseph Donohoe, "Ambivalence and Anger: The Human Center of the Chanson de Roland," The Romanic Review (1971), pp. 251-61.

Olivier does vent anger at Roland, and his expression of anger is cut off when Turpin intervenes; we might view this instance as a representation of anger repressed. But I don't think that it necessarily follows that the scene in which Olivier strikes Roland is a representation of suppressed anger breaking out.

Immediately before Olivier strikes Roland, Olivier, wounded, calls Roland, "son ami e son per" ("his friend and his peer," l. 1975). Feeling that he will soon die, Olivier asks Roland to stand by him: "Sire compaign, a mei car vos jostez / A grant dolor ermes hui desevrét." ("Comrade, stand by me, for we shall be parted today in great sorrow." ll. 1976-77). Roland laments that he will lose Olivier: "'Deus!' dist li quens, 'or ne sai jo que face. . . . Ja mais n'iert hom vostre cors contrevaillet.'" ("'God!' said the count, 'now I don't know what to do. . . . Never shall another man be equal to you.'" ll. 1983-84). In his sorrow, Roland faints. At this point, the Roland-Olivier relationship is exemplary.

In laisse 148, the jongleur explains that Olivier is "a mort naffrez" ("wounded to the point of death," l. 1990). He then explains how Olivier happens to strike Roland.

> Tant at saigniét li oeil li sont troblét
> Ne loinz ne pres ne poet vedeir si cler
> Que reconoistre poisset home mortel;
> Son compaignon com il l'at encontrét

> Si·l fiert a mont sor l'elme ad or gemét,
> Tot li detrenchet d'ici josqu'a·l nasel;
> Mais en la teste ne·l at mie adesét. (1991-97)
>
> (He has bled so much that his eyes are clouded over. He cannot see clearly enough, either far or near, to recognize any man alive. So when he encounters his comrade, he strikes him on top of his gold helmet, cutting down as far as the nasal, but without touching his head at all.)

Because the jongleur makes a point of saying that Olivier cannot see well enough to recognize anybody, I think we must view Olivier's blow to Roland as accidental--an accident which, ironically, could be used as a pretext to illustrate once more, before Olivier's death, the exemplary nature of the friendship between Olivier and Roland.

Roland speaks to Olivier "dolcement e soëf" ("tenderly and softly," l. 1999) and asks if he struck the blow on purpose (l. 2000). He then says: "Ja'st ço Rodlanz ki tant vos soelt amer; Par nule guise ne m'avez desfidét." ("It's Roland, who always loved you. In no way did you offer challenge to me." ll. 2001-02). Donohoe argues that Roland takes Olivier's intent for granted and that the focus of his speech is the reproach to Olivier for having departed from sanctioned procedure in not offering Roland a challenge (p. 253); I believe the whole of Roland's speech is an expression of his incredulity that Olivier might possibly have struck him on purpose. Olivier responds to Roland thus:

> Dist Oliviers: "Or vos oi jo parler
> Je ne vos vei, veiet vos Damnesdeus!
> Ferut vos ai? car lo me pardonez." (2003-05)
>
> (Olivier said: "I hear you speaking. I cannot see you; may God see and save you! Did I strike you? Please pardon me.")

Donohoe argues that Olivier is hedging: "To say that he does not see him at the moment he is talking is not the same as saying he did not see him before the blow was struck" (p. 253). I do not see how it can be argued that Olivier is being devious when the jongleur himself makes a point of saying that Olivier cannot recognize any man (ll. 1991-93). It seems to me that Olivier is genuinely surprised at having struck his friend. Roland assures Olivier that he has not been harmed and then pardons him (ll. 2006-07). Then the jongleur says:

> Ad icel mot l'uns a·l altre at clinét.
> Par tel amor as les vos desevrez. (2008-09)
>
> (At that word [Roland's pardon], they lean towards each other. With such love then they separate.)

Just before Olivier dies, "Si prïet Deu que paredis li donget / E benedist Charlon e France dolce / Son compagnon Rodlant sor toz les homes." ("He prayed to God to grant him salvation and to bless Charlemagne and fair France and his companion Roland over all other men." ll. 2016-18). Roland weeps at Olivier's death. The jongleur says: "Ja mais en tere n'odreiz plus dolent home." ("Never on this earth will you hear such a sorrowful man." l. 2023). In his lament for Olivier, we see how Roland perceived their relationship.

> Ensemble avom estét ed anz e dis,
> Ne•m fesis mal ne jo ne•l te forsis.
> Quant tu es morz dolor est que jo vif. (2028-30)
>
> (We have been together for days and years. You never harmed me nor did I ever wrong you. Since you are dead, I grieve to be alive.)

These hardly seem the words of a man who suspected his friend of striking him on purpose; they seem to be the expression of regret over the loss of an ideal friendship.

In the three relationships in which Roland is involved in the Roland, the jongleur locates Roland, as well as the other personage involved in each relationship, for the most part, at the exemplary pole of characterization. The fact that Roland is represented as exemplary in each of the relationships in which he is involved serves to emphasize his location at the exemplary pole of characterization. In considering the five relationships in which Aalais is involved in the Raoul, I hope to show that, similarly, by means of these relationships, the Raoul jongleur locates Aalais, as well as the other personage involved in each relationship, for the most part, at the mimetic pole of characterization. Furthermore, I hope to show that by representing Aalais' interaction with five different personages, the jongleur portrays her as more psychologically complex than if he had simply shown her in interaction with a single personage.

Aalais-Louis

We first learn that Aalais is the sister of Louis, the French king, early in the Raoul when Louis speaks to a messenger.

> Di ma seror o le simple visaige,
> Droit a Cambrai le sien riche eritaige,
> Le Mancel pregne a l'aduré coraige . . .
> Toute la terre le doin en mariaige.
> Vaigne a ma court sans nesun arestaige
> Et si ameint o soi tot son barnaige,
> S'i manderai le plus de mon lignaige;
> Et s'ele i faut, trestot par son outraige,
> S'irai saisir la terre et l'eritaige. (142-44, 147-52)
>
> (Tell my fair sister at Cambrai, her rich heritage, that she must take as husband the valiant knight of Mans. . . . I give him all her land in marriage. Tell her to come to my court immediately and to bring her escort with her, and I will summon many of my kinsmen; and if she fails me because of her arrogance, I will seize both the land and the inheritance.)

Louis' speech indicates that he is familiar with his sister's "outraige" ("arrogance"), that he expects Aalais may attempt to defy him. Twice, previously, in regard to the responsibilities she assumes after her husband's death, the jongleur has said about Aalais' personality: "Dame Aalais n'ot pas le cuer frarin." ("Lady Aalais was not faint-hearted." ll. 52, 96). The jongleur's remark supports Louis' perception of Aalais as bold.

When Aalais receives Louis' message, she does refuse to do his bidding: "Ains me lairoie en .j. feu bruïr / Que il a viautre face gaingnon gesir!" ("I would rather burn in a fire than let him make a greyhound [Aalais] lie with a watchdog [Gibouin]." ll. 332-33).

Instead, she risks gambling on the future, on the time when Raoul will be old enough to win back Cambrai: "Diex me donra de mon effant norrir / Tant qe il puist ces garnements tenir." ("God will allow me to raise my child until he is old enough to bear arms." ll. 334-35). In her response to Louis' message, in her defiance of traditional feudal bonds, Aalais is portrayed as strong-willed.

Louis carries out his threat, granting Cambrai to Gibouin. At this point in their relationship, Aalais and Louis are clearly estranged.

Nevertheless, when Raoul turns fifteen, Aalais sends him to Louis to be trained as a knight. In a dialogue with Raoul after he has returned home from Louis' court, Aalais speaks about Louis as follows.

> Li emperere te retint volentiers;
> Il est mes freres, ne te vost abaissier,
> Ains t'adouba et te fist chevalier,
> De tote France te fist confanonier
> Et seneschal, por t'onnor essauscier. (1121-25)
>
> (The emperor gladly retained you; he is my brother and did not wish to hold you in low esteem so he knighted you and made you standard-bearer over all of France and seneschal in order to increase your honor.)

Over the course of time (approximately fifteen years), Aalais seems to have altered her feelings about Louis. At Raoul's funeral, Aalais speaks of Louis in similar terms of praise. Addressing her dead son, she says, "Li miens chiers frere qi France a a garder / Te donna

armes, presis les comme ber." ("My dear brother who governs France gave you your arms and you bore them like a noble man." ll. 3561-62).

The fact per se that Aalais sends Raoul to Louis' court for training does not necessarily signify any mitigation in her anger: where else could Aalais send Raoul but to her brother's court? Even if her husband had been alive, the procedure would have been to send the child to the maternal uncle. She has no older brothers, and to send him to a stranger would be an insult to Louis. Rather, it is specifically when she calls her brother "li miens chiers frere" that the change in her emotional response to Louis is evidenced.

It is important to note that this change in Aalais' feelings occurs over a fifteen-year time period. While the personality of an exemplary personage will remain constant, that of a mimetic personage is likely to change, especially over a period of time. The change may be surprising as long as it seems plausible. It is not implausible that Aalais' anger against Louis should have mitigated after fifteen years, especially since she has not seen him at all during this time.

Aalais and Louis never encounter each other face to face in the narrative until near the end of the chanson when Aalais comes to court after the judicial duel between Bernier and Gautier has been held. Louis greets

Aalais courteously and wishes to kiss and embrace her, but Aalais shoves him away ("Il la salue belement, sans targier; Après la vost acoler et baissier; La gentix dame l'en a bouté arier." ll. 5223-25), saying:

> Fui de ci, rois, tu aies encombrier!
> Tu ne deüses pas regne justicier.
> Se je fuse hom, ains le sollelg couchier,
> Te mosteroie a l'espée d'acier
> Q'a tort iés rois, bien le pues afichier,
> Qant celui laises a ta table mengier
> Qe ton neveu fist les menbres trenchier. (5226-32)
>
> (Get away from me, king, what a bother you are! You should never have ruled over a kingdom. If I were a man, before sunset, I would show you with a steel sword that you are wrongly king. You can see that well enough by the fact that you let that man [Bernier] who had your nephew's limbs chopped off eat at your table.)

The jongleur makes clear through Aalais' speech that her contempt for Louis is triggered when she sees Bernier, who killed Raoul, at Louis' table; the change in Aalais' emotional response towards Louis is well motivated.

Louis does not respond at all to Aalais' allegations. His silence does not serve, as is the case when Roland stands silent before Ganelon's accusations, to illustrate heroic reserve; rather, because Louis is generally represented as weak-willed in the chanson, his silence here serves to reinforce the jongleur's general portrayal of him. Aalais' speech is intimidating, and Louis is intimidated by it.

In the Aalais-Louis relationship, both personages locate at the mimetic pole of characterization. Both

change over an extended period of time. Louis, at first domineering and decisive, recalling Cambrai from Aalais and Raoul, is finally represented as intimidated by Aalais. Aalais, who in her youth defies Louis, fifteen years later speaks of him fondly; then, when she sees him at the end of the chanson, she reacts to him with contempt. These plausible changes in the personalities of Aalais and Louis serve to make the two personages appear psychologically complex. For the most part, the Aalais-Louis relationship is characterized by conflict; it is certainly not an exemplary relationship between kinsmen or between king and subject.

Aalais-Guerri

The first dialogue exchange between Aalais and Guerri, Aalais' brother-in-law, comes just after Louis has granted Raoul's lands to Gibouin. Louis stipulates that the land should revert to Raoul when he comes of age, and Gibouin agrees on condition that Aalais marry him. Aalais has learned from a messenger only that Louis wishes her to marry Gibouin.[1] When the narrative recommences, Guerri is at court trying, on Aalais' behalf, to dissuade Louis from disinheriting Raoul. He fails and returns to Cambrai. Aalais asks him what he has learned: "Sire Gueris, ne me devez faillir / La verité

[1]There is a gap in the manuscript of about 100 lines at this point; in the original the message may have been more extensive.

me savez vos gehir?" ("Guerri, you mustn't fail me. Can you tell me the truth?" ll. 324-25). In response to her query for the truth, Guerri tells Aalais he would not wish to lie to her ("ne vos en qier mentir," l. 326) and then informs her that her inheritance has been granted to Gibouin. He then urges her to marry Gibouin in order to regain Louis' favor ("Pren l'a mari, por tant porras garir / Vers Loeys qi France a a baillir." ll. 329-30). Aalais protests vehemently.

> "Diex!" dist la dame, "com puis de duel morir!
> Ains me lairoie ens en .j. feu bruir
> Qui il a viautre face gaingnon gesir!
> Diex me donra de mon effant norrir
> Tant qe il puist ces garnemens tenir." (331-35)
>
> ("God!" said the woman, "I could die of sorrow!
> I would rather burn in a fire than let him make a
> greyhound lie with a watchdog! God will allow
> me to raise my child until he is old enough to
> bear arms.")

Then Guerri exclaims that he's happy Aalais feels as she does: "Buer l'osastes gehir." ("Happily you dared to say that." l. 336).

It is striking that while Guerri urges Aalais to do one thing, he expresses approval when she says she will do just the opposite. Apparently what we see here is the fact that Guerri is of two minds on the matter: Aalais should marry Gibouin in order to retain hold on Cambrai, if only indirectly--this would be the most pragmatic course of action; but, on the other hand, for her to do so would be to confirm the injustice

perpetrated against her--that thought arouses Guerri's moral indignation. We cannot say that Guerri illustrates a particular ethical point of view in this dialogue exchange, as Roland and Olivier often do; Guerri's feelings are represented as ambivalent.

Though Guerri tells Aalais he would not lie to her, he nevertheless suggests at first that she marry Gibouin, a proposition he does not wholeheartedly believe in. Only after Aalais vehemently refuses does Guerri express his other feelings on the matter. In this exchange, then, Aalais works as a catalyst, her vehement response evoking from Guerri the complete articulation of his feelings. Their interreaction is mimetic.

Guerri's suggestion to Aalais to marry Gibouin serves to reinforce the jongleur's general representation of Aalais' personality as strong-willed and independent: when Aalais refuses to marry Gibouin, she acts against the expressed desires of both Louis and Guerri.

Because Guerri realizes that Aalais' decision will probably mean warfare in the future, he promises to stand by her: "Al grant besoign ne puis de vos partir." ("I will not part from you in time of need." l. 337); "Ne vos faurai tant com soie vivant." ("I will not fail you as long as I am alive." l. 340). Guerri's declaration of absolute loyalty to his sister-in-law is

exemplary; at this moment it seems that he should move towards the exemplary pole of characterization. However, at the same time, his declaration implies intent to rebel against the wishes of his king. That fact works against Guerri's moving towards the exemplary pole of characterization.

Fifteen years later, Guerri joins Raoul to fight against the sons of Herbert. In this battle Raoul is killed by Bernier, and many others, including Guerri's own two sons, are killed too. Guerri, on the battlefield, thinks of Aalais and laments that he has such bad news to bring her: "Aalais dame, qel duel vos noncerai! Jamais a vos parler nen oserai." ("Lady Aalais, what bad news I have to tell you! I will never dare speak to you about it." ll. 3173-74). (See also l. 3493.) Guerri's response towards the absent Aalais illustrates a desire to protect her from the suffering he knows she will go through when she learns of Raoul's death.

When Guerri does arrive in Cambrai and tells Aalais the bad news, she reproaches him ("le prist a ranprosner," l. 3571), blaming him for Raoul's death.

> Sire Guerri, on vos en doit blasmer:
> Je vos charchai mon effant a garder:
> En la bataille le laissastes sevrer.
> Qex gentils hom s'i porra mais fier,
> Puisqe tes niés n'en i pot point trover? (3572-76)

(Guerri, my lord, you are much to blame: I put my son in your charge and you let him get separated from you in battle. What man of worth will ever be able to trust in you again since your own nephew was not able to get help from you?)

Aalais' response illustrates a psychological reaction under stress: her criticism of Guerri is irrational, ungrounded in fact.

Guerri turns furious at her accusation. His feelings are made clear in his speech, his appearance, and his inner thoughts as revealed by the omniscient jongleur.

Guerri l'oï, le sens quida derver;
Les ex roelle, sorciux prent a lever;
Par contenance fu plus fiers d'un sengler.
Par maltalent la prist a regarder,
C'ele fust hom ja se vossist mesler:
"Dame," dist il, "or revuel je parler.
Por mon neveu qe j'en fis aporter,
Me covint il mes .ij. fils oublier
Qe vi ocire et les menbres colper.
Bien me deüst li cuers el cors crever." (3577-86)

(When Guerri heard her, he became almost mad with anger. He rolled his eyes and raised his eyebrows; he looked more fierce than a wild boar. He stared at her in anger. If she had been a man, he would have felt like striking her. "Woman," he said, "now I want to speak. For my nephew whom I carried here, I had to forget my two sons who lost life and limb before my eyes. Well might my heart break.")

Thus, Guerri's emotional response towards Aalais has shifted from sympathy to outrage at her accusation.

Aalais, seemingly indifferent to Guerri's own grief, appears not to have heard anything Guerri said.

Je vos charchai Raoul de Cambrisis;
Fix ert vo frere, bien estoit vos amis:
En la bataille con fel le guerpesis. (3588-90)

> (I charged you with Raoul of Cambrai. He was the son of your brother and he loved you very much. You deserted him like a traitor in battle.)

Guerri can hardly restrain his anger ("a poi n'enraige vis," l. 3591). Exhausted from his grief, he says to Aalais: "Je n'en puis mais, tant sui je plus maris / Qe Bernier li bastars l'a ocis." ("I can't go on with this any longer; I'm so upset that Bernier the bastard killed [Raoul]." ll. 3593-94). At this point Aalais abruptly changes the subject; she begins to wonder who will take the place of Raoul as her heir. The argument between Aalais and Guerri is over.

In this exchange between Aalais and Guerri, communication only goes one way, from Aalais to Guerri: "Guerri l'oi"; "Guerri l'entent." Aalais never responds directly to anything Guerri says. The jongleur uses the whole exchange and Aalais' abrupt change of subject at the end of it to illustrate her state of mind: under stress, she is irrational and easily distracted. The exchange illustrates as well the changes in Guerri's state of mind as he moves from sympathy for Aalais to outraged defensiveness to a resigned collapse.

Because Aalais appears not to hear anything Guerri says, this exchange invites comparison with static dialogue in the Roland where Roland seems not to hear what Olivier says. In the Roland, when static dialogue is represented, the speeches of Roland and Olivier often

illustrate two different ethical viewpoints, the interest being thematic rather than psychological. Here, although Aalais berates Guerri in ethical terms, what her speeches illustrate is her psychological state at a given moment. Guerri's speeches do not represent an ethical viewpoint at all; they are solely emotional responses. In the Roland, the viewpoints of the two participants in static dialogue remain constant. Here, Aalais is psychologically disoriented, changing abruptly from one subject to another at the end of the dialogue, and Guerri's state of mind changes during the course of the dialogue.

Because Aalais is single-minded in her reproach of Guerri, she invites comparison with Ganelon. The difference is this: Ganelon is constantly single-minded, but Aalais' single-mindedness is a momentary mental aberration.

Soon after this exchange, Guerri returns home to Arras to recuperate from his battle wounds. Aalais and Guerri don't see each other for the next seven years. They meet again when Aalais sends for Guerri just after she has incited Gautier to recommence the war against the sons of Herbert. When Guerri arrives, Aalais greets him warmly.

> Li sors Guerri descendi au degré;
> Dame Aalais, qi l'ot en grant chierté,
> Ala encontre, s'a le conte acolé:
> "Sire," dist ele, "por sainte charité,
> Ne vos vi mais, molt a lonc tans pasé." (3775-79)

> (Guerri the red dismounted at the step; Lady Aalais who loved him dearly, went to meet him and embraced the count: "My lord," she said, "for pity's sake, I never see you; so much time has passed.")

In Aalais' response to Guerri, we see, as we did in her emotional response towards Louis, the mitigating effects of time on a strong negative emotion.

While the jongleur makes clear that Aalais and Guerri are generally on good terms with each other, he nevertheless focuses on conflicts between them, which, when considered together, serve to illustrate the psychological complexity of Aalais and Guerri and, therefore, to locate them at the mimetic pole of characterization. In the final scene of reconciliation between the two, the jongleur shows Aalais' emotional response towards Guerri as readjusted. While the change is great, it is plausible, having occurred over a seven-year time period.

Aalais-Raoul

When Taillefer dies, he leaves his wife Aalais pregnant with Raoul. Raoul is three years old at the time Louis grants Cambrai to Gibouin. Then there is a time lapse in the narrative to the time that Raoul is fifteen. At this point we see Raoul through the eyes of his mother: "Son effant voit grant et gros et formé." ("She sees her son tall and broad and well-formed." l. 375); "Dame Aalais voit son fil enbarnir / Bien voit

qu'il puet ses garnemens soufrir." ("Lady Aalais sees her son grown up; she sees that he is now able to bear arms." ll. 402-03). Aalais asks Raoul to summon his men and then sends him to Louis' court to be knighted. At this point in the narrative the psychological relationship between Aalais and Raoul is hardly developed.

Aalais does not see Raoul again until after Louis has granted him the lands of Herbert. Then Raoul returns home eager to tell his mother the news. Aalais kisses him, then greets him as follows, not knowing about Raoul's agreement with Louis.

> "Biax fix," dist ele, "grant vos voi et forni;
> Seneschax estes de France, Dieu merci.
> Molt m'esmervel des fort roi Loeys;
> Molt longuement l'avez ore servi,
> Ne ton service ne t'a de rien meri.
> Toute la terre Taillefer le hardi,
> Le tien chier pere qe je pris a mari,
> Te rendist ore, par la soie merci,
> Car trop en a Mancel esté servi.
> Je me mervelg qe tant l'as consenti,
> Qe grant piece a ne l'as mort ou honni." (969-79)
>
> ("Dear son," she said, "I see you tall and well-built; you are seneschal of France, thank God. King Louis amazes me; you have served him for a long time and he has rewarded your service with nothing. He should now return to you all the land of Taillefer the bold, your dear father whom I married, for the knight of Mans has held possession of it too long. I'm amazed that you have consented to it for so long without killing him or bringing dishonor upon him.")

Aalais begins by praising Raoul, but then her praise turns to criticism, and in the presence of so many other people: "Maint baron l'ont oï." ("Many knights heard her." l. 968).

In effect, Aalais puts Raoul on the defensive, as we see in his response to her.

> Merci, ma dame, por Dieu qui ne menti!
> Tout mon service m'a Loeys meri:
> Mors est Herbert, ice saichiés de fi,
> De sa grant terre ai le don recoilli. (981-84)
>
> (Have mercy on me, woman, for God's sake! Louis has rewarded my services. Herbert has died, you may know this for certain; I have received the rights to his great estate.)

Aalais does not receive Raoul's news well: "souspirant respondi" ("she responds with a sigh," l. 985). She perceives correctly what Raoul in his youth fails to see.

> Qi te donna Peronne et Origni,
> Et S. Quentin, Neele et Falevi,
> Et Ham et Roie et la tor de Clari,
> De mort novele, biax fix, te ravesti. (987-90)
>
> (He who gave you Péronne and Origny, St. Quentin, Nesle and Falévy, Ham and Roie and the tower of Clairy, dear son, has invested you with a deadly gift.)

And she reminds Raoul that his father and Herbert were friends.

> Raoul, tes peres, cil qui t'engenui,
> Et quens Herbert furent tos jors ami:
> Maint grant estor ont ensamble forni;
> Ainc n'ot entr'ax ne noise ne hustin. (992-95)
>
> (Raoul, your father and Count Herbert were always friends. They fought many great battles together. There was never any quarrel nor strife between them.)

Aalais urges Raoul not to fight for the lands of the sons of Herbert: "Laisse lor terre, por amor Dieu t'en pri." ("Let their land be, I beg of you, for the love of God." l. 991); "Se te m'en croiz, par les s. de Ponti / Non

aront ja li effant envers ti." ("If you believe me, by the saints of Ponti, you won't allow the sons of Herbert to be against you." ll. 996-97).

Raoul's response is negative: "Nel lairai pas ensi / Qe toz li mons m'en tenroit a failli / Et li mien oir en seroient honni." ("I will not abandon it thus, for everyone would think that I was faulting, and my heirs would be shamed for it." ll. 998-1000). In effect, Raoul defies his mother by indicating that public approbation is more important to him than hers.

Aalais then tries to make Raoul feel guilty for disobeying her: "Je te norri del lait de ma mamele; Por quoi me fais dolor soz ma forcele?" ("I nourished you with the milk from my breast; why do you hurt me so in my heart?" ll. 1002-03). From this point on, the responses of Aalais and Raoul to each other illustrate not a logical evaluation of the situation but a psychological battle: Raoul is hurt when Aalais does not approve of his plan to attack the sons of Herbert, and Aalais is hurt when Raoul refuses to follow her advice; now each turns vindictive.

Aalais warns Raoul that he would need a good army to win against the sons of Herbert, the implication being that he doesn't have one: "Molt doit avoir riche lorain et cele / Et bon barnaige qi vers tel gent revele." ("Anyone who stirs up war against such men certainly

needs a considerable number of well-equipped steeds and good soldiers." ll. 1007-08). In her next remark she implies that Raoul will be defeated and even forced to retreat.

> De moi le sai, miex vosisse estre ancele,
> Nonne velée dedens une chapele.
> Toute ma terre iert mise en estencele. (1009-11)
>
> (Know it from me, I would rather be a maidservant or a veiled nun in a convent [than to attack the sons of Herbert]. All my land will be burned.)

Aalais' remarks show her lack of confidence in Raoul's capability as a soldier.

The jongleur first shows Raoul's response to Aalais' remarks through Raoul's posture: "Raoul tenoit sa main a sa maissele." ("Raoul held his head in his hand." l. 1012). Raoul's posture seems to indicate that he is depressed by Aalais' comments and/or that he is deliberating about what to do. Raoul resolves not to give in.

> Il jure Dieu qi fu nez de pucele,
> Q'il nel lairoit por tout l'or de Tudele,
> Ains qu'il le lait en iert traite boele
> Et de maint chief espandue cervele. (1013-16)
>
> (He swears to God that he would not give it up for all the gold in Toledo before it was strewn with entrails and the brains of many a head.)

Once more Aalais casts aspersions on Raoul's men. The jongleur says she does this "par contraire" ("in order to frustrate [Raoul]," l. 1019). She first says sarcastically: "Biax fix Raoul, qant ce deviés faire /

Car mandissiés les barons d'Arouaise." ("Dear son Raoul, if you plan to do this, call up the barons of Arrouaise." ll. 1020-21). She continues:

> Cil d'Arouaise sont malvais et felon:
> Se tu fais proie de buef ou de mouton,
> La seront il si fier comme lion;
> Se fais bataille, maint plait en orra one,
> Car au ferir s'en fuiront li glouton. (1048-52)
>
> (The men of Arrouaise are mean and cowardly: if you're going after oxen or sheep, then they will be as fierce as lions; but if you make battle, you'll hear complaints; when the fighting starts, the scoundrels will flee.)

She then tries to make Raoul afraid by suggesting a hypothetical situation: Raoul alone on the battlefield, after the men of Arrouaise have fled, in the face of the formidable sons of Herbert.

> En la bataille seras a grant friçon.
> Li filg Herbert ne sont mie garçon;
> Qant te verront si seul sans compaingnon.
> Trencheront toi le chief soz le menton. (1053-56)
>
> (Then you will be shaking on the battlefield. The sons of Herbert are hardly boys; when they see you alone without your companions, they'll cut off your hear below the chin.)

Aalais seems to be trying to psychologically castrate Raoul. She then appeals to the emotional bond between Raoul and herself, trying to make Raoul feel guilty for the suffering he would inflict upon his mother if he were killed: "Et je, biax fix, foi que doi s. Simon / Morrai de duel, n'en avrai garison." ("And I, dear son, by the faith I owe St. Simon, I will die of sorrow; I won't be able to help it." ll. 1057-58).

But Raoul stubbornly refuses to give in to her appeal.

Et dist Raoul: "Vos parlez en pardon,
Qe, par celui qi vint a paission,
Je nel laroie por tot l'or d'Avalon,
Qe je n'i voise, qant g'en ai pri le don. (1059-62)

(Raoul said: "You speak in vain, because, by God, for all the gold in Avalon I would not give up going when I have received it as a gift.")

Finally Aalais presents her most convincing argument yet.

Laisse lor tere, il t'en aront plus chier,
Si t'aideront t'autre guere a baillier,
Et le Mancel del pais a chacier. (1094-96)

(Leave their land alone; they will love you the better for it and will help you wage another war to drive the knight of Mans from your own land.)

Here the balance of the Aalais-Raoul relationship shifts. Up until this point, Aalais has been the aggressor in the argument and Raoul has been on the defensive, but now Raoul explodes in a burst of invective directed at Aalais.

Maldehait ait, je le taing por lanier,
Le gentil homme, qant il doit tornoier,
A gentil dame qant se va consellier!
Dedens vos chambres vos alez aasier:
Beveiz puison por vo pance encraissier,
Et si pensez de boivre et de mengier;
Car d'autre chose ne devez mais plaider. (1100-06)

(Let the knight be cursed--I hold him for a coward--who takes council of a woman when he is going into battle! Go take your ease in your rooms; drink draughts to fatten your belly and think about food and drink; because henceforth you must never meddle in any other matter.)

Rather than responding aggressively, as she has up until this point, Aalais begins to cry ("si prist a larmoier," l. 1107) and to recall the days when Raoul needed her: "Ja vi tel jor qe je t'oi grant mestier." ("There used to be a day when I was of great use to you." l. 1109). (See ll. 1110-28 for a continuation of Aalais' recollection of the past.) By recalling a "golden past," Aalais tries to psychologically escape her present situation. (See Chapter III, pp. 87-89, for an elaboration of this point.)

Immediately afterwards, Aalais curses Raoul.

> Et qant por moi ne le viex or laisier,
> Cil Damerdiex qi tout a a jugier,
> Ne t'en remaint sain ne sauf ne entier. (1131-33)
>
> (And since for me you do not wish to abandon your plan, may the Lord God Who judges all not bring you back safe and sound.)

It seems to me that Aalais' curse is really an example, unlike the episode in the Roland where Olivier strikes Roland, of repressed hostility breaking out.

Aalais tries one more time to dissuade Raoul from going, when he is already assembling his army, by ridiculing his army (ll. 1182-87). This is how Raoul responds to her:

> Raoul l'oï: li cuers soz la mamele
> Li fremist toz et saut jusq'a l'aissele;
> Par irour tint sa main a sa maissele:
> "Dame," dist il, "ci a longe favele,
> Qe, par la dame que l'on qiert a Nivele;
> Miex volroie estre toz jors cers d'une ancele,
> Qe ne conquiere Perone et Peronnele,
> Et Ham et Roie et le borc de Neele. (1188-95)

(When Raoul heard her, his heart jumped; in anger, he held his head in his hand. "Woman," he said, "your speech is long. By our Lady of Nivele, I would rather be the serf of a maidservant than not to conquer [the lands of the sons of Herbert].")

The jongleur has Raoul, apparently remembering the time Aalais said she would rather be a maidservant than to fight the sons of Herbert (l. 1009) in order to intimidate Raoul, give her phrase a different twist at this point--"I would rather be the serf of a maidservant the rest of my days than not to conquer [the lands of the sons of Herbert]." (ll. 1193-95)--in order to defy Aalais.

Just as Aalais' remark once put Raoul on the defensive, Raoul's remark now puts Aalais on the defensive.

Biaus fix Raoul, se g'en fuse creüe,
Por ce ce sui toute vielle et chenue
Ne sui je pas de mon cens esperdue,
Iceste guerre ne fust awam meue! (1203-06)

(Dear son Raoul, if you had believed me--just because I am old and my hair is white does not mean I have lost my senses--this war would never have begun.)

Raoul's comments in response to Aalais are the most deprecating yet.

Raoul l'oï, toz li cors li tressue;
Guerri apele a la fiere veüe:
"Gardez tost soit nostre gens esmeüe.
Sor Vermendois soit telx guere creüe
Dont mainte eglise soit arse et confondue!
Laissiés ma dame: vielle est et ramasue.
La gens me blasme qi est a moi venue;
En maint estor a esté combatue,
Ainc ne pot estre en bataile vainchue." (1207-15)

> (Raoul heard her; his whole body shook. He called to Guerri with the fierce demeanor: "See that our men set off soon. May such a war be unleashed on the Vermandois that many churches be burned and leveled. Don't pay any attention to my lady: she's old and past her prime. The men who have come to me are holding this against me; they have fought in many battles and can't be defeated.")

Raoul explicitly suggests that his mother's counsel is no longer worth anything. His commands to Guerri go against all her previous advice, even to the extent that Raoul orders the churches of Vermandois to be burned because she asked him not to do so (l. 1034). He refuses to give credence to her assertion that the men of Arrouaise will be defeated in battle, insisting even that they can't possibly be defeated. On this basis, after denying Aalais' worth, Raoul leaves his mother for battle.

By means of this extended argument between Aalais and Raoul, both personages are revealed as psychologically complex and, consequently, locate at the mimetic pole of characterization. The changes which occur in both personages during the course of their conflict are plausible: Aalais, initially browbeating in her aggressiveness, breaks down when Raoul orders her to her room; Raoul, at first defensive in the face of Aalais' attempts to intimidate him, finally explodes in a burst of invective directed against Aalais and henceforth holds the upper hand in their psychological power struggle. Theirs is certainly not an exemplary mother-son relationship.

The next time Aalais sees Raoul is when Guerri brings him home dead on his shield so that a reconciliation between Aalais and Raoul is no longer possible. But Aalais seems to have already repressed their terrible quarrel; what she now expresses about their relationship is solely how much she loved Raoul: "Biau fix," dist ele, "je te poi molt amer!" ("Dear son," she said, "how much I loved you." l. 3559). The jongleur tells us that her grief on account of Raoul's death is great: "Son fil regrete, ne se pot conforter." ("She laments her son, and cannot be comforted." l. 3558). At this moment the jongleur illustrates Aalais' capacity for psychological accommodation, her ability to repress what was undesirable in the past and to remember only the rest. This is not the first time we have seen this complex psychological operation in Aalais; witness her relationships with Louis and Guerri as well.

Aalais-Gautier

Soon after Aalais learns of Raoul's death, she abruptly breaks off an argument with Guerri, in which she is accusing him of traitorously deserting Raoul in battle, to ask: "Qui lairai je ma terre et mon païs?" ("To whom will I leave my land?" l. 3599).

> Or n'i a oir, par foi le vos plevis,
> Fors Gautelet; ces pere ot nom Henris;
> Fix est ma fille et molt par est gentis. (3603-05)

(Now I have no heir, I swear to you, except little Gautier; his father is named Henry; he is the son of my daughter and very valiant.)

Thus, Aalais introduces into the narrative the young man who will become her surrogate son now that Raoul is dead.

Just then Gautier and his mother arrive at Cambrai for Raoul's funeral. Beside Raoul's bier, Gautier promises to avenge Raoul's death.

Se Dex se done q'aie tant de durée
Qe je eüse la ventaille fermée,
L'iaume lacié, enpoignie l'espee,
Ne seroit pas si en pais la contrée.
La vostre mort seroit chier comparée. (3641-45)

(If God grant that I live long enough to have my visor closed, to lace my helmet and to grasp my sword, the country will not be long in peace. Your death will be dearly paid for.)

Guerri and Aalais are so impressed by the young Gautier that Guerri offers to knight him ("je vos saindrai l'espée." l. 3648) and Aalais makes him her heir ("Biax sire niés, vos arez ma contrée." l. 35550).

After the funeral is over, Aalais has Gautier continue to stay with her. Some time ("une grant piece," l. 3741) afterwards, we see Aalais "qi li cuer ot iré" ("who was upset," l. 3745) leaving church. Aalais finds Gautier playing with his friends in the square and signals him over to her.

"Biax niés," dist ele, "or sai de verité
Raoul vostre oncle aveiz tout oublié,
Son vaselaige et sa nobilité." (3752-54)

("Dear nephew," she said, "now I know for sure that you have forgotten Raoul your uncle and his noble courage.")

In this speech, Aalais attempts to goad Gautier into resuming battle against the Vermandois. Gautier feels shamed by Aalais' words as we can tell by his posture: "si a le chief cliné." ("he hung his head." l. 3755). Aalais' remark puts Gautier on the defensive.

> "Dame," dist il, "ci a grant cruauté;
> Por ce se j'ai o les effans joé,
> S'ai je le cuer dolant et trespensé.
> Mi garnement me soient apresté:
> A Pentecoste, qe ci vient en esté,
> Volrai penre armes, se Diex l'a destiné." (3756-61)
>
> ("Lady," he said, "you are very cruel. Although I was playing with my friends, nevertheless I am still sorrowful and upset [on account of my uncle]. Let my armor be got ready: at Pentecost, when summer draws near, I will take up my arms, if God has so destined.")

In response to Gautier's statement, Aalais kisses and embraces him; he has responded as she wished him to.

The way in which Aalais approaches Gautier above is similar to the way in which she approaches Raoul when he returns home from Louis' court: instead of asking Raoul directly if Louis has rewarded him, she assumes that he hasn't and criticizes Raoul for putting up with such treatment; instead of simply asking Gautier if he is ready to avenge his uncle she accuses him of having entirely forgotten the matter. As a consequence, both Raoul and Gautier are put on the defensive because Aalais appears to be underestimating them. Aalais' psychological maneuver works with Gautier, where it didn't with Raoul: Gautier quickly complies with Aalais' will so

that a potential quarrel between them, as developed between Aalais and Raoul, is averted.

Gautier, who is to avenge Raoul, becomes more and more in the eyes of Aalais a second Raoul; avenger and avenged merge. When Gautier prepares to leave for battle everyone says "S'i a bel chevalier!" ("What a handsome knight he is!" l. 3824).

> Dame Aalais commence a larmoier
> Tout por son fil qe ele avoit tant chier;
> En liu de lui ont restoré Gautier. (3825-27)
>
> (Lady Aalais begins to cry on account of her son whom she loved so much; Gautier stands in place of him.)

It is ambiguous whether the statement "en liu de lui ont restoré Gautier" is simply a comment by the jongleur or whether it is an omniscient view of Aalais' thoughts. Since it is fused with ll. 3825-26, it works as an omniscient view of Aalais' thoughts.

When Gautier returns from battle, Aalais addresses Guerri and asks, "Qe vos resamble des nouvel adoubé?" ("What do you think of the new knight?" l. 4107), then adds "A il mon fil de noient restoré?" The latter question can mean two different things, either "Has he avenged my son in any way?" or "Does my son in any way live again in him?" Again we find a certain ambiguity in Aalais' perception of Gautier--supported in Guerri's response to her question in which he focuses

first on Gautier's prowess as comparable to Raoul's (ll. 4110-15) and then on the fact that Gautier has wounded Bernier (ll. 4116-17).

In the Aalais-Gautier relationship, Aalais appears psychologically complex and, therefore, locates at the mimetic pole of characterization: she psychologically manipulates Gautier, and she psychologically merges the identity of her dead son with Gautier's. In terms of the Aalais-Gautier relationship, however, we are hardly given enough information to locate Gautier on the continuum of characterization.

Aalais-Bernier

When Bernier's mother, Marcent, entered a convent after being deserted by Ybert, the jongleur tells us that "Dame Aalais, par debonaireté / Avoit l'enfant nourri de jone aé." ("Lady Aalais, out of the goodness of her heart, raised the child from his youth." ll. 384-85). As a result of accident and circumstance, Bernier, once Raoul's close friend, is forced to become his enemy, and he ends up killing Raoul. Then, Aalais' affection for Bernier turns sour, as we see in her statement on Bernier at Raoul's funeral: "Qant moi remembre del traitor Bernier / Qi vos a mort, j'en quit vive erragier!" ("When I think about that traitor Bernier who killed you, I just about go mad with anger." ll. 3553-54).

Aalais is further angered when she thinks of the irony in the fact that Bernier had been knighted by Raoul: "Malvaisement le seit gueredonner." ("He ill knows how to pay one back." l. 3566).

Time does not temper Aalais' hostile feelings towards Bernier. After the duel between Bernier and Gautier, both are at Louis' court recuperating. Aalais arrives there and rebukes Louis for harboring Bernier: "Q'a tort iés rois, bien le pues afichier / Qant celui laises a ta table mengier / Qi ton neveu fist les menbres trenchier." ("You are wrongly king; you can see that well enough by the fact that you allow to eat at your table the man who had your nephew's limbs chopped off." ll. 5230-32). She sees Gautier, who tells her that he has chopped off Bernier's ear. Aalais' reaction is to rejoice: "La dame l'ot, ces mains tent vers le ciel: 'Biaus sire Dex, vos en doi mercier.'" ("When the woman heard him she raised her hands to the sky: 'Dear Lord God, I have to thank you for this.'" ll. 5241-42). Then Aalais spies Bernier.

> D'autre part garde, si voit gesir Bernier,
> Seure li cort, si saisi .j. levier:
> Ja l'eüst mort sans autre recovrier,
> Mais li baron ne li laissent touchier. (5243-46)
>
> (She looks in the other direction and sees Bernier lying there. She seizes a crowbar and rushes at him. She would have killed him outright but the barons do not let her get near him.)

Here is how Bernier responds to Aalais' attack.

Et Bernier prent fors del lit a glacier,
Tot belement, sans plus de l'atargier.
Dame Aalais cort la gambe enbracier,
Et le souler doucement a baisier:
"Gentix contesce, plus ne vuel delaier.
Vos me nouristes, se ne puis je noier,
Et me donnastes a boivre et a mengier.
E! Gautelès, por Dieu le droiturier,
S'or ne te viex por Jhesu apaier,
Vois ci m'espée: de moi te pues vengier.
Car plus ne vuel envers toi gueroier." (5247-57)

(Bernier slipped out of bed, then courteously, without hesitation, ran to raise Lady Aalais' foot, and to gently kiss her slipper: "Noble countess, I can wait no longer. You raised me--this I cannot deny--and gave me food and drink. Oh Gautier, for God's sake, if you do not wish to make peace now for Christ's sake, here is my sword: you can avenge yourself on me, because I no longer wish to make war against you.")

At that, Aalais' feelings towards Bernier completely reverse: "Dame Aalais commence a larmoier; Ne s'en tenist por les menbres trenchier / Qant Bernier voit si fort humelier." ("Lady Aalais began to cry; she could not keep from doing so for anything, when she saw Bernier humbling himself so." ll. 5258- 0). What we see here is the fact that Aalais' feelings for Bernier are extremely ambivalent: she raises and loves Bernier in his youth; she hates Bernier for killing Raoul. At one moment we see her rushing to attack Bernier with a crowbar; then we see her weeping at Bernier's expression of penitence. Through Aalais' reaction to Bernier's action, the jongleur shows Aalais' love for Bernier, repressed when Bernier killed Raoul, surfacing. Thus,

Aalais appears psychologically complex, locating at the mimetic pole of characterization. We are not given enough information through the Aalais-Bernier relationship alone to locate Bernier on the continuum of characterization.

By means of Aalais' relationships with five other personages in the Raoul, three of the other personages--Louis, Guerri, and Raoul--appear psychologically complex. In Aalais' relationships with Louis, Guerri, and Raoul, the jongleur focuses on situations of conflict. We might generalize and say that the complexity of a mimetic personality is more likely to be revealed in a situation of conflict than in a static one. While Aalais' relationships with Gautier and Bernier serve to make her appear psychologically complex, we do not really learn enough about Gautier or Bernier to situate them on the continuum of characterization.

By having Aalais interact with five different personages, the jongleur heightens Aalais' psychological complexity; she acts and responds differently with different personages. For example, she successfully defies and acts independently of Louis and Guerri. But when she attempts to domineer Raoul and he finally blows up at her, Aalais breaks down crying--neither Louis nor Guerri ever responded to Aalais' aggressiveness with a direct verbal counterattack. In two different

relationships, Aalais reacts differently to stress: when Raoul blows up at her and orders her to go to her rooms, Aalais psychologically avoids dealing with the present by retreating to the past; when Guerri informs her of Raoul's death, Aalais irrationally blames Guerri for Raoul's death.

While the jongleur sometimes shows Aalais responding differently to different personages, he will also show a complex psychological operation in Aalais repeated in different relationships so as to establish it as a psychological pattern. For example, Aalais uses the same psychological ploy with both Raoul and Gautier: in order to get the other personage to act as she wishes, she forces him into a defensive position, insinuating that the personage lacks the resolve to do the deed she wants accomplished. Aalais accommodates psychologically, represses what was unpleasant in the past and remembers only the desirable, in her relationships with Louis, Guerri, and Raoul. In two relationships we see in Aalais a repressed emotion surfacing and breaking out: after Raoul orders Aalais to her rooms, she first represses the hostility she feels towards him by retreating to the past, but then she curses him; after Bernier kills Raoul, Aalais represses her love for Bernier and, near the end of the chanson, almost kills him, but when

Bernier then expresses his penitence, Aalais' repressed love for Bernier surfaces and she begins to weep.

Raoul-Bernier

The Roland-Olivier relationship, for the most part, locates at the exemplary pole of characterization, occasionally moving towards the mimetic pole of characterization. The Raoul-Bernier relationship, by contrast, locates primarily at the mimetic pole of characterization, but, at times, moves towards the exemplary. What is perhaps most important to note in a consideration of these two relationships is that neither jongleur locates the central friendship relationship in his chanson exclusively at one pole of characterization; each relationship moves back and forth on a continuum between two poles of characterization though it may generally lie closer to one pole than the other. Because each relationship moves back and forth between two poles which are not reconcilable, it is not possible to logically reconcile all representations, the mimetic and the exemplary, of either of these relationships.

Early in the Raoul the jongleur speaks of the Raoul-Bernier friendship as exemplary: "Li quens Raoul le tint en grant chierté." ("Count Raoul loved [Bernier] dearly." l. 383). But he then adds: "Son escuier en fait a bandon; Mais un lui ot estrange compaignon."

("[Raoul] gladly made [Bernier] his squire, but they turned out to be ill-mated friends." ll. 400-01). Thus, while speaking of the Raoul-Bernier relationship as exemplary, the jongleur suggests at the same time that it won't remain so.

Raoul knights Bernier. After Bernier has performed exceptionally well in exhibition, Raoul says "Or ne plain pas, ja mar le mescrerez / Les garnemens qe je li ai donez." ("I don't lament--never doubt it--the arms that I gave him." ll. 595-96). But then the jongleur adds: "Mais puis en fu Raoul grains et irez." ("But later Raoul became aggrieved and angry as a result [of the knighting of Bernier]." l. 598). Again, through foreshadow, the jongleur undercuts the exemplary nature of the friendship he describes.

When Louis grants the lands of the sons of Herbert to Raoul, Bernier finds himself torn between two loyalties, to his lord (Raoul) and to his family (the sons of Herbert). Bernier says to Raoul "Je sui vostre hom, ja nel vos celerai / Mais endroit moi ja ce ne loerai / Qe vos lors terres prenés." ("I am your man--I don't deny it--but, for my part, I will never advise you to take their land." ll. 934-36). Raoul, however, refuses to back down. Bernier then says "Sire, a tant m'en tairai / Tant qe lor force au desfendre verrai." ("My lord, I will say no more on this until I see their defense."

ll. 944-45). At this point, Bernier appears to be an exemplary vassal, remaining loyal to his lord even when it will mean fighting against his own family.

But then in the next two laisses, the jongleur reveals that while the relationship is ostensibly exemplary, Bernier can maintain it only by repressing the anger he feels: "Por poi Bernier ces chevos n'en detrait." ("Bernier can hardly keep from tearing his hair." l. 949); "L'enfes Bernier tenoit le chief enbrun." ("Bernier held his head low." l. 956).

> Ains dormira qu'il boive de puison,
> Ne qe il voist n'en palais n'en donjon,
> Qe vers sa dame ne vieut movoir tençon. (958-60)
>
> (Now he will sleep before drinking anything or before going to the palace or the tower, because he does not wish to quarrel with his lady.)

Here, Bernier is a mimetic personality. The negative feelings which Bernier feels for Raoul but attempts to repress serve to undercut the jongleur's representation of Bernier as exemplary vassal.

In speaking to his mother, before the burning of Origny, Bernier says about Raoul:

> Raoul mesires est plus fel que Judas:
> Il est mesires; chevals me done et dras,
> Et garnemens et pailes de Baudas:
> Ne li fauroie por l'onnor de Damas,
> Tant que tuit dient: "Bernier, droit en as."
> (1381-85)
>
> (Raoul, my lord, is more wicked than Judas. But he is my lord; he gives me horses and coverings and arms and material from Bagdad. I would not fail him for all the wealth in Damascus until all should say: "Bernier, you are right in doing so.")

In this speech the jongleur illustrates simultaneously Bernier's exemplary loyalty to Raoul and his mimetic emotional response towards Raoul.

After the burning of Origny, in which Bernier's mother is killed, Bernier declares that he wishes to break off his allegiance with Raoul.

> E! Raoul fel, Dex te doinst encombrier!
> Le tien homaje avant porter ne qier.
> Se or ne puis ceste honte vengier,
> Je ne me pris le montant d'un denier. (1513-16)
>
> (Raoul, you wicked man, may God curse you. I wish to do you homage no longer. If I do not avenge this shame, I will not consider myself worth a penny.)

Soon afterwards, while serving Raoul in his tent, Bernier accuses Raoul of not being an exemplary lord. He announces his intent to break off his feudal ties with Raoul and to avenge the burning of Origny.

> Je sui vostre hom, a celer nel vos qier,
> De mon service m'as rendu mal loier:
> Ma mere as arce la dedens cel mostier,
> Dès q'ele est morte n'i a nul recovrier.
> Or viex mon oncle et mon pere essillier!
> N'est pas mervelle s'or me vuel corecier:
> Il sont mi oncle, je lor volrai aidier,
> Et près seroie de ma honte vengier. (1644-51)
>
> (I do not deny that I am your man, but you have paid me ill for my service. You burned my mother in her convent. Nothing can help her for she is dead. Now you wish to drive my uncle and my father into exile. It's no wonder if I am angry now. They are my uncles. I wish to go help them and to avenge my shame.)

At this moment the once exemplary lord-vassal and friendship relationship dissolves.

At Bernier's accusation, Raoul accuses Bernier of having previously switched sides, of being in his tent as a spy. He calls Bernier a "fix a putain" ("son of a whore," ll. 1655, 1661) and says "Preis va n'en praing le chief soz le menton!" ("I have a mind to chop off your head below your chin." l. 1662), expressing explicitly a desire to kill Bernier. Bernier's response, ironically understated, to Raoul's comment shows the bitterness he feels towards Raoul: "'Diex!' dist Bernier 'con riche gueredon! De mon service m'ofr'on ci molt bel don.'" ("'God!' said Bernier 'what a noble reward! You offer me such a fine gift for my service.'" ll. 1663-64).

At this point a quarrel develops between Raoul and Bernier, revealing the anger and hostility each feels towards the other. Bernier accuses Raoul of having sinned in killing his mother (ll. 1695-96). Raoul accuses Bernier of being a traitor (l. 1699) and suggests that he could have Bernier killed if he wished (l. 1702). Bernier remarks that their friendship has turned sour ("Ci a male amistié." l. 1703). He adds that if he were armed for battle, he would fight to prove false Raoul's charge that Bernier is a bastard (ll. 1706-09) and suggests that in battle Raoul would not be able to strike him (ll. 1710-11).

Oit le Raous, si a le front haucié:
Il a saisi .j. grant tronçon d'espié
Qe veneor i avoient laissié:
Par maltalent l'a contremont drecié,
Fiert Bernier, qant il l'ot aproichié,
Par tel vertu le chief li a brisié
Sanglant en ot son ermine delgié.
Voit le Bernier, tot a le sens changié:
Par grant irour a Raoul enbracié;
Ja eüst molt son grant duel abaissié.
Li chevalier i qeurent eslaissié:
Cil les departent, q'il ne ce sont touchié. (1712-23)

(When Raoul heard this, he raised his eyebrows. He seized the large staff of a lance that hunters had left there. Out of anger, he raised it and struck Bernier with such force that his head was broken open, staining with blood his fine ermine. When Bernier saw this, he lost his temper completely and in great anger seized Raoul. He would have avenged his great sorrow, but the knights ran up to them and parted them before any harm was done.)

When the two are finally separated, Bernier announces his intent to depart "san congié" ("without taking leave of Raoul," l. 1727). This intense emotional interreaction between Raoul and Bernier is mimetic.

In the following laisse (85), when Raoul sees the blood running from Bernier's head, he feels intense sorrow ("Or a tel duel le sens quida changier." l. 173). He asks his men for advice. They tell Raoul that he was in the wrong and must offer Bernier recompense. Raoul does so. But Bernier refuses his offer.

Ja enver vos ne me verrés paier,
Jusqe li sans qe ci voi rougoier
Puist de son gré en mon chief repairier. (1750-52)

(I will never make peace with you until my blood, which you see running red, returns to my head of its own accord.)

In laisse 86 Raoul persists in his overture to restore friendship with Bernier.

> Li quens Raoul belement l'en apele;
> Il s'agenoille; vestue ot sa gonnele,
> Par grant amor li a dit raison bele:
> "E! Bernier," ce dit li quens, "chaele!
> N'en viex pas droit? s'en pren amende bele,
> Noient por ce qe je dot rien ta guere.
> Mais por ice qe tes amis vuel estre." (1756-62)
>
> (Count Raoul addressed [Bernier] courteously. Dressed in his tunic, he knelt down. Out of great love, he spoke courteously to him: "Hey, Bernier," said the count, "come now. Don't you want to make this right? Then accept reparation. I don't say this at all because I fear you but because I want to be your friend.")

By way of penitence, Raoul offers to walk fourteen leagues, from Origny to the fortress of Nesle, bearing Bernier's saddle on his head, while announcing to all he passes whose it is. The French say: "Ceste amendise est bele; Qi ce refuse vos amis ne vieut estre." ("This is a fair offer; he who refuses this has no desire to be your friend." ll. 1778-79). In laisse 87 the jongleur says that Raoul speaks with great humility ("par grant humeliance," l. 1780): "Bernecon frere, molt iés de grant vaillance: Pren ceste acorde, si lai la malvoillance." ("Bernier, brother, you are very noble. Accept this reconciliation and forget about hatred." ll. 1781-82). But Bernier refuses to be reconciled with Raoul.

> "Voir," dist Bernier, "or oi je plait d'enfance!
> Je nel feroie, por tot l'or d'Aqilance
> Dusqe li sans dont ci voi la sanblance
> Remontera en mon chief sans doutance.
> Dusq'a cele eure n'en iert faite acordance
> Ou je verrai s'avoir porrai venjance. (1783-88)

("Indeed," said Bernier, "what I hear are the words of a child. I would not agree for all the gold of Aquila until this blood without hesitation returns to my head. Until the time that I have taken vengeance, there can be no accord between us.")

Soon afterwards, Bernier rides out of Raoul's camp.

It is striking that Raoul changes so drastically from laisse 84, where Raoul and Bernier are arguing and fighting, to laisse 85, where Raoul penitentially pleads for reconciliation. At this point, Raoul moves from the mimetic pole of characterization towards the exemplary, from personal emotional and psychological motivation to motivation by an ideal--"This is what I should be like." While Raoul moves towards the exemplary pole at this moment, Bernier remains at the mimetic. Thus, their relationship moves only partially towards the exemplary pole.

The next time we see Raoul and Bernier interacting, both personages are represented mimetically. The sons of Herbert, wishing to avoid warfare, send a messenger to Raoul with a peace offering. After Bernier promises not to dishonor them (l. 2233), Ybert allows him to go as messenger to Raoul. But when Bernier arrives in Raoul's camp, the first thing he does is to curse Raoul and declare again his desire for vengeance (ll. 2237-49). In response, Raoul slanders Bernier.

"Voir," dist Raoul, "fol mesaigier a ci.
Est ce Bernier, fix Ybert le flori?
Fix a putain, or te voi mal bailli,
En soignantaige li viex t'engenui." (2250-53)

("Indeed," said Raoul, "there's a mad messenger here. Is this Bernier, son of Ybert the white? Son of a whore, you were ill-born; the old man engendered you in concubinage.")

Raoul continues; the jongleur says Raoul can't restrain himself ("il ne s'en pot tenir," l. 2254).

Cuivers bastars, je ne t'en qier mentir,
A mon quartier te covient revenir,
As escuiers te covient revertir. ..
De si haut home ne pues si vil veir. (2255-58)

(Low-born bastard--I don't wish to lie to you--you should return to my quarters as serving-man again. I've never seen such a vile man born of one so noble.)

At that, Bernier becomes so angry he can hardly contain himself ("del sens quida issir," l. 2259). He responds curtly.

Le vostre boivre ne le vostre mangier,
Se Dex m'ait, nen ai je gaires chier:
N'em mengeroie por les menbres tranchier. (2262-64)

(Your food and drink, may God help me, I don't care for. I would not partake of it if my life depended on it.)

In this emotional exchange, Bernier responds hostilely to Raoul; Raoul responds to Bernier in kind. But then the Raoul-Bernier relationship moves for a moment towards the exemplary pole of characterization. In laisse 112 Bernier cuts off his attack on Raoul, saying "Ne je ne vuel folie commencier." ("I don't wish to commit any folly." l. 2265) and "En droit de moi nel volroie empirier." ("I wouldn't want [the peace settlement] to be jeopardized on my account." l. 2270). He says finally "Et pardonrai trestot par s. Richier / Mais

qe mes oncles puisse a toi apaier." ("I will pardon everything, by St. Richier, if my uncles may be at peace with you." ll. 2284-85). Here is how Raoul responds to Bernier's overture.

> Li quens Raoul la parole entendi:
> Ou voiṭ Bernier, si l'apela: "Ami,
> Si m'ait Diex, grant amistié a ci;
> Et par celui qi les paines soụfri.
> Ja vo concel n'en seront mesoi." (2286-90)
>
> (When Raoul heard these words, he called Bernier to him and said "Friend, may God help me, there is great friendship here and, by the One Who suffered, your words will not be taken amiss.)

At this point, the Raoul-Bernier relationship once more moves in the direction of exemplary friendship.

Raoul and Bernier are not able to achieve a reconciliation, however, because Guerri refuses to agree to a peace settlement (ll. 2298-2305). Guerri's refusal precipitates a hostile reaction from Bernier, which he directs at Raoul.

> Dist Bernier: "Damerdieu en merci:
> Sire Raoul, je voi cest plait feni
> Por .j mesfait dont m'avez mal bailli." (2306-08)
>
> (Bernier said: "I thank God for this. Raoul, sire, because of your evil deed against me, this was bound to happen.")

The Raoul-Bernier relationship moves back to the mimetic pole of characterization here. Bernier formally challenges Raoul to a duel in which, Bernier claims, he would prove Raoul wrong in fighting for the lands of the sons of Herbert (ll. 2332-33). Raoul reacts emotionally to Bernier's change.

Raoul l'oï, d'ire fu tressuans,
Grant honte en ot por les apartenans.
Bien sot q'estoit Bernier ces max vuellans.
Desarmeis ert, s'en fu mus et taisans. (2334-37)

(When Raoul heard him, he began to sweat from anger. He felt ashamed because his men were present. He well knew that Bernier wished him harm. But he wasn't armed so he had to remain silent.)

Then, Bernier impulsively attempts to strike Raoul.

Raoul le comte vost ferir par esfors.
En son tref ert, ci n'ert mie defors.
L'enfes Bernier lait corre les galos:
Plus tost li vient que chevrieus parmi bos;
.I. chevalier qi molt avoit grant los
Entre Raoul et Bernier se mist fors.
Et Bernier le fiert parmi le cors. (2341-47)

([Bernier] wanted to strike Raoul the count. They were in his tent; they hadn't even gone out yet. Bernier set off at a gallop, faster than a deer in the woods. A knight of good repute jumped between Raoul and Bernier, and Bernier struck through his body.)

Raoul orders his men to chase after Bernier, but Bernier escapes.

In the next, and last, exchange between Raoul and Bernier, the two argue and then Bernier kills Raoul. But before the argument begins, Bernier once more offers to make peace with Raoul.

Se or le m'ofres ja refuzer nel qier,
Et pardonrai trestout, par s. Richier,
Mais que mes oncles puisse a toi apaier;
Ceste bataille feroie je laissier,
Vos ne autrui ne querroie touchier,
Toutes nos terres vos feroie baillier. . . .
Laissiés les mors, n'i a nul recouvrier.
E! Raoul sire, por Dieu le droiturier,
Pitié te pregne: laisse nos apaissier. (3069-74, 3076-78)

> (If you should offer [to make peace with me] now, I would not refuse you. I would pardon everything, by St. Richier, if my uncles might be at peace with you. I would abandon this battle, not seek to attack you nor any other, and turn over all our lands to you. . . . Forget about the dead; we can't bring them back. Oh Raoul, my lord, by God, take pity: let us make peace.)

Bernier moves towards the exemplary pole of characterization in his peace overture. But Raoul's emotional, irrational response is mimetic.

> "Bastars," dist il, "bien savez plaidoier;
> Mais vos losenges ne vos aront mestier:
> N'en partirés sans la teste tranchier." (3084-86)
>
> ("Bastard," he said, "you well know how to plead.
> But your subterfuges will be of no use to you now.
> You won't leave without your head being chopped off.")

At that, Bernier turns mimetic, reacting bitterly to Raoul's refusal to accept his peace offering: "'Voir,' dist Bernier, 'bien me doi corecier: Or ne me vuel huimais humelier.'" ("'Indeed,' said Bernier, 'I have reason to be angry. I don't wish to humiliate myself like this any more.'" ll. 3087-88). The two then fight until Bernier kills Raoul.

In the Roland, the Roland-Olivier relationship generally locates at the exemplary pole of characterization. Each time the relationship does move towards the mimetic pole, when the jongleur develops organic dialogue between Roland and Olivier, the jongleur never permits the organic dialogue to continue for more than several laisses. Similarly, while the Raoul jongleur shows the Raoul-Bernier relationship as moving back

and forth on a continuum between exemplary and mimetic poles of characterization, in various ways he implies that the relationship is primarily mimetic. Early in the chanson when he speaks about the Raoul-Bernier friendship as exemplary, he nevertheless suggests, through foreshadow, that it won't remain so. After Raoul accepts Louis' grant of the lands of the sons of Herbert, the jongleur represents Bernier's loyalty to Raoul as exemplary, but indicates at the same time that Bernier maintains the relationship only by suppressing his anger at Raoul. After a quarrel between Raoul and Bernier in which Raoul strikes Bernier, Raoul is exemplary in his penitential overture to Bernier to restore their friendship, but Bernier's emotional rejection of Raoul's offer is mimetic. At a later point, he represents both Raoul and Bernier as desiring to make peace and restore their friendship, but then shows that circumstance (Guerri's refusal to agree to a peace settlement) prevents them from doing so. In the final exchange between Raoul and Bernier, Bernier is exemplary in his peace offering to Raoul, but Raoul is mimetic in his emotional refusal to make peace. In all of these instances, the Raoul jongleur, while suggesting the possibility of an exemplary friendship between Raoul and Bernier, in one way or another, undercuts that possibility. The implication, then, is the impossibility of an exemplary relationship in a mimetic world.

CHAPTER V

THE CONTINUUM PRINCIPLE AND CHARACTERIZATION

In this chapter I will examine further the continuum principle as it applies to the characterization of personages in the two chansons de geste, La Chanson de Roland and Raoul de Cambrai. As we saw in Chapter IV, in terms of their relationships, we can locate personages in these two works on a continuum between exemplary and mimetic poles of characterization. In this chapter I will examine other ways in which personages locate on an exemplary-mimetic continuum and will show as well how they may locate on three other continuums--collective-individual, generic-individual, and supernatural-natural--which are closely allied with the exemplary-mimetic continuum. The four continuums can be seen as running parallel to each other thus:

exemplary . . . . . mimetic

collective . . . . . individual

generic . . . . . individual

supernatural . . . . . natural

Exemplary-Mimetic

In the Roland a number of the minor Saracen personages are introduced by name. Generally one laisse is devoted to the introduction of each, often before a battle; then they merge back into the collective. In the introduction to her translation of the Roland, Dorothy Sayers says about the names of personages: "I have made no attempt to identify all the outlandish names of places and peoples with which the poet has adorned his tale. Some are probably pure fantasy; others, garbled versions of actual proper names which cannot now be referred with any certainty to their origin" (p. 43). I have found, however, that many of the names of Saracen personages are what could be called cue names;[1] that is, the etymological breakdown of the name gives us a cue to the nature of the personage. We might account for the fact that most of the Saracen personages have cue names, while none of the French do, in this way: the jongleur is familiar with a tradition of French names but knows nothing about Saracen names so must invent them; in inventing names for Saracen personages, he combines French etymological roots to produce names which suggest the natures of the personages described.

---

[1]See Arnold Williams, p. 80, for an explanation of Spenser's use of cue names.

Several of the Saracen cue names are quite general: Escremiz ("warrior," laisse 75); Estorganz ("battle + warrior," laisse 76); and Estramariz ("battle + affliction," laisse 76).

Others have more specific connotations: Falsarons ("false," laisse 70); Malprimes ("evil + first," laisse 72); Torgis ("wrong + way," laisse 74); Margariz ("renegade," laisse 77); Malquidant ("evil + believer," laisse 120); and Gemalfin ("mal - evil + fin - a superlative," laisse 252). The names of this group of men indicate pretty much the same thing: they are all of the wrong faith.

Chernuble's name ("charoi - magic charm + nuble - black," laisse 78) implies that he is a magician in touch with the devil. Jangleu ("gabber," laisse 253) is a seer who correctly predicts Baligant's death. The names of these two personages cue us to the nature of their functions and their powers.

Abisme[1] ("abyss," laisse 113) is the epitome of darkness. His skin is as black as pitch ("Issi est neirs

---

[1]In a footnote to l. 1470, Jenkins points out that V^4 (ll. 1675 and 1705) favors the form Albisme and suggests that the jongleur "may have intended a facetious nickname (Albissimus ?) for this jet-black Saracen." Etymology by contraries was a well-known phenomenon at the time the Roland was composed. In Isidore of Seville's Etymologiae (Book I, xxix) we find the principle described: "Sunt autem etymologiae . . . aut ex contrariis ut a lavando 'lutum,' dum lutum non sit mundum, et 'lucus' quia umbra opacus parum luceat." ("There are moreover etymologies . . . derived from contraries as 'mud' from 'wash' when mud is not clean, and 'wood/grove' because

comme peiz k'est demise." l. 1474), and no man has ever seen him smile ("Onches nuls hom ne·l vit joër ne ridre." l. 1477). He is morally black too.

> Plus fel de lui n'est en sa compaignie:
> Teches at males e molt granz felonies,
> Ne creit en Deu lo filz sainte Marie . . .
> Plus aimet il tradison e mordrie
> Qu'il ne fesist trestot l'or de Galice. (1471-73; 1475-76)
>
> (There is no one more vile than he in all his company. He has committed wicked sins and many felonious crimes. He does not believe in God, the son of holy Mary. . . . He loves treason and murder better than all the gold in Galicia.)

Except for Blancandrin, all the major Saracen personages also have cue names: Marsile ("mar - evil, wrong / sillier - to ravage, to waste"); Malprimes ("evil / first"); Baligant ("baler - to ill-treat / gant - land rights").

Especially with minor personages, who hardly figure in the action of the narrative, the jongleur uses cue names to make personages the embodiment of an idea or function, thereby locating them at the exemplary pole of characterization. The use of cue names is absent from the Raoul.

---

there is too little light in the shade."). Probably, the jongleur of V^4 had this principle in mind when he converted "Abisme" to "Albisme." I don't think, however, that we should read the Oxford Roland "Abisme" as "Albisme" in view of the fact that all other Saracen cue names are quite literal; none are ironic.

In the Roland horses and swords labelled with cue names may signify something of the nature of their owners.[1] For example, the difference in the natures of

---

[1]There is a long tradition in literature as well as art of employing swords and horses as attributes of the natures of their owners. Paul Martin in Armour and Weapons (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1967) remarks about the sword as a weapon: " . . . sanctified by the Church, the sword, the noble weapon par excellence, was placed third in rank in the insignia of kingship, after the sceptre and the orb, a symbol of military power and justice. . . . The sword was to retain its place of honour among all other weapons in the days of chivalry, and alone could confer the rank and dignity of knighthood" (p. 182). In Spenser's Faerie Queen, only knights fight with swords, attributes of their nobility. In the Roland, through the jongleur's use of cue names, swords function as even more specific attributes of their owners' natures.

In Phaedrus Plato tells a story in which he likens two aspects of a person's nature to two horses: "He that is on the more honorable side is upright and clean-limbed, carrying his neck high, with something of a hooked nose; in color he is white, with black eyes; a lover of glory, but with temperance and modesty; one that consorts with genuine renown, and needs no whip, being driven by the word of command alone. The other is crooked of frame, a massive jumble of a creature, with thick short neck, snub nose, black skin, and gray eyes; hot-blooded, consorting with wantonness and vainglory; shaggy of ear, deaf, and hard to control with whip and goad." (In The Collected Dialogues of Plato, ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns [New York: Pantheon Books, 1961], p. 500). In Spenser's Faerie Queen, the immature Red Cross' horse is described thus: "His angry steed did chide his foaming bit / As much disdaining to the curb to yield" (Canto I, i). In both instances, horses function as attributes of their riders' natures. The tradition of the horse as attribute of its rider's nature is one grounded in actuality. In a contemporary horse manual (Margaret Cabell Self, Horses: Their Selection, Care and Handling [New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1943], p. v), we find the following admonition: "But beware of one thing--to a great extent, animals mirror the dispositions and characters of their owners! The master may seek in every way possible to develop and train his dog or horse to be gentle, brave, steady and courageous, but if he himself is nervous, timid, erratic or mean, the animal will, after a comparatively short association, begin to show these same traits."

Charlemagne and Baligant, the pagan emir, is reflected in the names of their swords: Baligant's sword "Préciose" signifies an outward worth appropriate for an idolatrous pagan, while Charlemagne's sword "Joyeuse" signifies an inner quality appropriate for a Christian. Likewise, Durendal functions as an attribute of Roland's inner nature: Roland is "long enduring," the last of the rear-guard to die and, as a Christian martyr, assured of eternal salvation. In three laisses similaries (170-72), Roland bids farewell to Durendal. In praising Durendal's great feats, Roland, in effect, glorifies himself; the effect is actually of Roland praising his own inner nature exteriorized.

Roland's horse is named "Veillantif" ("Vigilant") while Ganelon's is named "Tachebrun" ("Brown Spot"),[1] names which, in signifying something of the moral natures of each personage, serve to polarize Roland and Ganelon.

---

[1]It has long been a popular belief that to own a piebald horse is unlucky. (M. Oldfield Howey, The Horse in Magic and Myth [London: William Rider & Son, Ltd., 1923], p. 220.) A medieval Latin bestiary, for example, in estimating horses by color, says "a piebald or a stripe is the worst." (T. H. White, The Bestiary: A Book of Beasts [New York: Capricorn Books, 1960], p. 87.) In the seventeenth century the reasoning behind this belief was noted: "The Sieur of Solleysell . . . tells us there is a reason why piebalds are 'reputed defective,' which is that the phlegme which is betokened by the White Hair, doth too much predomine and make them weaker than otherwise they would be." (From The Compleat Horseman [London, 1696], cited in Howey, p. 220.) Thus, a piebald horse is deemed to be a "bad mix," just as the make-up of Ganelon's nature is ill-mixed.

In the Raoul swords and horses don't have cue names; they are strictly representational and signify nothing about the natures of their particular owners. Horses in the Raoul, unlike those of the Roland, succumb to fatigue from battle, as horses in actuality do.

> Li bon destrier sont las et recreü;
> Li plus corant sont au pas revenu. . . .
> Il ot pleü, si fist molt lait complai;
> Trestuit estanchent li bauçant et li bai. (2778-79; 2781-82)
>
> (The good horses are tired and fatigued; the fastest have slowed down to a walk. . . . It has rained, making the ground thick with mud; the horses, both the dappled and the bays, are exhausted.)
>
> Par vertu hurte le bon destrier norois,
> Mais ne li vaut la montance d'un pois,
> Car desoz lui li estanche el chamois.
> El sor Guerri nen ot que correcier:
> Il ne sot tant son cheval esforcier
> Ne le passast .j. roncins charuier. (3396-3401)
>
> (With all his might [Guerri] spurs his good northern steed, but his efforts aren't worth a pea, for [his horse] collapses beneath him onto the stubble. Guerri the red could do nothing but get angry: he could not get his horse moving fast enough to keep a plough horse from passing it.)

The fact that Guerri's horse will hardly move signifies nothing in particular about Guerri's nature; the horse is simply tired.

The Raoul personages use swords and lances in battle, but in other situations the jongleur shows them using a number of makeshift weapons, unlike anything represented in the Roland. For example, at a point when Bernier suggests that Raoul would not dare strike him

if they fought together, Raoul in his anger picks up a nearby staff which hunters had left behind and strikes Bernier (laisse 84). Late in the chanson, Louis summons all of his men together at Paris. He warns them to keep order. But when Guerri sees Bernier, he puts his hand to his sword; Gautier restrains him (ll. 4807-08). Then he seizes a large knife and would have thrown it at Bernier, but again Gautier prevents him (ll. 4823-26). Then Guerri is served a dish of venison, the piece containing the large thigh bone.

> Guerri le vit, ne vost plus atargier:
> Ens en la temple en feri ci Bernier,
> De ci a l'os li fist la char percier.
> Tout le viaire li fist de sanc raier. (4833-36)
>
> (When Guerri saw it, he could hold back no longer.
> He seized it and struck Bernier in the temple,
> cutting his flesh through to the bone so that his
> blood ran down his face.)

When Aalais arrives at Louis' court and spies Bernier, she impulsively picks up a crowbar and rushes at him (laisse 237); the barons present prevent her from striking him. Each time a personage uses one of these makeshift weapons, something of his mimetic personality is revealed to us. The weapons per se function as exemplary class attributes: traditionally, it is the personage who is not knightly who uses a club, bar, or large bone as a weapon.[1]

---

[1]In the Morgan 245 manuscript of Le Roman de la Rose, the churl Dangier is pictured wielding a club. (See The Romance of the Rose, trans. Harry W. Robbins

A number of major personages in the Roland operate as figures, "adequating something conceptual."[1] The clearest example is Naimon, who operates as a figure of wisdom. Naimon is always described in superlative terms: "Meillor vassal n'aveit en la cort nul." ("There was no better knight in the court than he." l. 231.) (See also l. 775.) When Charlemagne asks for advice, Naimon is always the last to venture advice, and it is always his advice which Charlemagne follows. Naimon is strictly a functionary personage, the wise counselor; he never appears in the narrative except to function as counselor to Charlemagne. Early in the chanson he speaks in favor of ending the war since Marsile's forces are weak and practically vanquished, saying "Quant il vos mandet qu'aiez mercit de lui / Pecchiét fereit ki donc li fesist plus." ("When he asks for mercy from you, it

---

[New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1962], p. 62.) In La Chançun de Willame the comic Rainouart, a huge, barefoot kitchen servant turned soldier, carries a tree trunk as a club. Guillaume offers to equip him with a sword and armor, but Rainouart will have no other arm than his club. In Havelok the Dane when sixty-one men pound down the door just as he is about to begin a feast with his companions, Havelok seizes the large door bar and kills three with one blow, soon killing twenty more. In the Wakefield play of the Killing of Abel, Cain strikes Abel with a jaw bone. In Hrólfs Saga Kraka, for sport, the king's men throw bones at the peasant boy Hǫtt. When Boðvar Bjarki arrives at the king's court, someone throws a "knuckle bone with the leg bone still attached to it" at Boðvar Bjarki and Hǫtt. Boðvar Bjarki grabs the bone before it strikes him and throws it back at the man, killing him.

[1]See Arnold Williams, p. 81.

would be a sin to persist in war." ll. 239-40.) In this instance, Naimon becomes more specifically a figure of Christian charity, while remaining generally a figure of wisdom. Later, at the sound of the olifant, he denounces Ganelon as a traitor and urges Charlemagne to return to Spain (laisse 134).

Blancandrin, as counselor to Marsile, is the Saracen counterpart to Naimon.

> Blancandrins fut des plus sávies paiens
> De vasselage fut asez chevaliers.
> Prodome i out por son seignor aidier. (24-26)
>
> (Blancandrin was among the wisest of the pagans.
> He was a valiant knight and able in helping his lord.)

Thus, Blancandrin too operates as a figure for wisdom, though the wisdom he illustrates is peculiarly Saracen: Blancandrin's counsel is clever and ruthless. For example, he advises Marsile to deceive Charlemagne by promising to come to Aix to convert after Charlemagne has left Spain and returned there. To assure the success of his plan, Blancandrin advises Marsile to send hostages with Charlemagne--who will surely be killed when Marsile does not arrive in Aix.

> Asez est mielz qued il les testes perdent
> Que nos perdons clere Espaigne la bele
> Ne nos aions les mals ne les soffraites. (58-60)
>
> (It is better that they should lose their heads than
> that we should lose fair Spain and have to suffer.)

In the Raoul none of the personages operate as figures of something conceptual. By way of contrast with

the Roland, we can point to the fact that no personage in the Raoul functions as a wise counselor. After the burning of Origny, for example, Bernier, who is very distressed ("ot molt le cuer mari," l. 1521), goes to Guerri for advice ("por consellier," l. 1522). Guerri expresses his sympathy for Bernier: "Guerri respont: 'Certes, ce poise mi; Por vostre amor en ai le cuer mari.'" ("Guerri answers: 'This weighs heavily upon me indeed. For love of you, I am very distressed.'" ll. 1529-30). But he does not offer Bernier any advice. Aalais attempts to function as counselor to Raoul, Guerri, and Gautier, but her advice is not always good. The implication in both of these instances seems to be that there are no definite answers to the problematic situations of the Raoul world which personages as figures of wisdom might represent.

At one point in the Roland, the jongleur makes Ganelon a type[1] of Judas, by introducing him last after eleven other heroes--"Guenles i vint, ki la tradison fist." (l. 178)--just as Judas was introduced last in Luke 6:16--"and Judas Iscariot who was the traitor."

In the Raoul Bernier, in speaking to his mother, says "Raoul mesires est plus fel que Judas." ("Raoul

---

[1]Arnold Williams differentiates between "figure" and "type" in this way: a figure adequates with something conceptual; a type adequates with another specific personage (p. 81).

my lord is more wicked than Judas." l. 1381). But Bernier's remark does not make Raoul a type of Judas: Raoul may be wicked, but he is not a traitor. Bernier's remark simply reveals how he feels about Raoul. Ganelon as type locates at the exemplary pole of characterization; Bernier's comment about Raoul reveals one aspect of Raoul's mimetic personality.

At one point in the Roland, the jongleur describes Roland going into battle with an augmentative simile, saying "Plus se fait fiers que leons ne leuparz." ("He becomes even fiercer than a lion or a leopard." l. 1111). The augmentative simile serves to elevate Roland in stature, to make him exemplary. In the Raoul the augmentative simile has been reduced to the comparisons of colloquial, almost proverbial, speech. Aalais, in protesting her possible marriage to Gibouin, for example, exclaims: "Ains me lairoie ens en .j. feu bruir / Que il a viautre face gaingnon gesir." ("I would rather burn in a fire than let [Louis] make a greyhound lie with a watchdog." ll. 332-33). In fighting with Aliaume, Guerri strikes his lance through Aliaume's body, then says to him: "Il fait malvais joer a viel chael." ("It's better not to fool with an old dog [like me]." l. 4659). In an argument with Ernaut of Douai, whose left arm Raoul chopped off in combat, Guerri retorts:

> Del poing senestre me resamblez le gai
> Qi siet sor l'arbre ou je volentiers trai;
> Le pié en port et la cuisse li lai. (5031-33)
>
> (Without your left arm, you look like the jay who perches on a tree where I often shoot; I take his foot and leave his thigh.)

At the end of the chanson, when Guerri and Gautier join forces with Bernier and the sons of Herbert to revolt against Louis, here is how the jongleur describes the reaction of the king's men:

> Qi dont veïst ces espées saichier,
> Le sor Guerri la soie paumoier,
> Et les roiax fremir et goupillier. (5428-30)
>
> (You should have seen how they drew their swords, how Guerri the red brandished his, and how the king's men trembled and ran like foxes.)

These diminishing colloquial comparisons serve to locate personages at the mimetic pole of characterization.

In the Roland the appearance of a personage may function as a sign of his identity and exemplary nature. Charlemagne, ancient in age (over 200 years old, l. 524), is venerable in appearance.

> Blanche at la barbe e tot florit lo chief,
> Gent at lo cors e lo contenant fier:
> S'est qui·l demandent, ne·l estoet enseignier.
> (117-19)
>
> (His beard is white and so is his hair. Noble is his body and his countenance fierce. He would not need to be pointed out to anyone seeking him.)

Charlemagne's appearance adequates with his identity and nature: one has only to see him to know that he is a king and noble. Like Charlemagne, Roland is recognizable

on sight even by men who have never seen him before. In battle the Saracen Grandoine encounters Roland; witness his reaction.

> En mi sa veie at encontrêt Rodlant,
> Anceis ne•l vit si•l conut veirement
> A•l fier visage ed a•l cors qu'il at gent,
> Ed a•l reguart ed a•l contenement:
> Ne poet muder qu'il ne s'en espoënt. (1638-42)
>
> (In the middle of his path, he encountered Roland. He only had to see him and he recognized him immediately, by his fierce countenance and his noble body, and by his glance and his bearing. He could not help being overwhelmed.)

As in the case of Charlemagne, Roland's outward appearance works as a sign of his noble inner nature and of his identity.

As we just saw, the Saracen Abisme is "as black as pitch" and morally black too. Turpin, on seeing him, says, "Cil Sarrazins me semblet molt herite." ("This Saracen looks like a heretic to me." l. 1484). Again, the appearance of a Roland personage works as a sign of his nature and identity.[1]

To a limited extent, the Raoul jongleur provides us with a physical description of personages, generally a reference to beard color: Ybert ("a la barbe florie," l. 1866; "o les floris grenons," l. 2026; "o le grenon

---

[1]The appearance-nature adequation does not work with all personages in the Roland. About Ganelon the jongleur says: "Cors at gaillart, e•l vis gente color; S'il fust leials bien resemblast baron." ("His body is comely and his face is fair; he would seem noble if he were only loyal." ll. 3763-64). But, appropriately enough, Ganelon operates as a figure of duplicity.

ferrant," l. 5375) has a grey-white beard, as does his brother Wedon ("qi le poil a chenu," l. 1966; Guerri ("li sors o les floris grenons," l. 638; "qi li poil ot ferrant," l. 2492; "qi le poil ot chenu," l. 3315) is a redhead with a grey-white beard. Aalais ("a la clere façon," l. 962; "o le simple viaire," l. 1017) has a pretty face. Gautier ("Lons fu et grailes, parcreüs et moulez," l. 4326) is tall, lithe, and well-formed when he grows up. In the Raoul general physical appearance has no special significance; it is strictly representational.

There is one interesting exception to this rule: whether the jongleur describes Guerri as "li sors" ("the redhead") or as "o le grenon flori" ("having a white beard") often depends upon Guerri's emotional state. Guerri, in respectfully requesting that Louis return Cambrai to Raoul, is described as having a white beard ("o le grenon flori," l. 641). But when Louis turns down Guerri's request, Guerri becomes angry, challenges Louis and rushes from the room; at this point he is described as a redhead ("li sors," l. 653). Later in the chanson when Guerri, in refusing to fight with Aliaume, speaks for peace, the jongleur describes him as white-haired ("qi le poil ot flori," l. 4596). Aliaume nevertheless goads Guerri into fighting, then strikes him. When Guerri sees the blood running from

his wound, "Li sors Guerri ot le cuer irascu." ("Guerri the red becomes angry." l. 4625). Thus, Guerri's hair color is both representational and iconographic. Guerri actually does have red hair and a white beard. At the same time, the color the jongleur chooses to describe Guerri at a given moment seems to adequate with Guerri's emotional state: Guerri is described as a redhead when he is angry and as white-haired when he is calm.

In the Roland the jongleur often portrays the emotion of a personage in a stylized manner. For example, when Charlemagne is angry, he thrusts his beard outside of his armor, a sign of defiance to the enemy:[1] "Par grant iror chevalchet Charlemagne / Desor sa brónie li gist sa barbe blanche." ("Charlemagne rides in anger, his white beard lying above his byrny." ll. 1842-43). Roland rides into battle laughing: "Cors at molt gent, lo vis cler e ridant." ("His body is noble, his face is bright and he is laughing." l. 1159). Laughter as illustrative of heroic self-confidence is a commonplace in the chanson de geste. (See ll. 1478, 1700, and 2604 in Le Couronnement de Louis for other examples.) After Olivier accidentally strikes Roland and Roland pardons him, out of love for each other ("par tel amor," l. 2009), the two bow to each other ("l'uns a·l altre at clinét." l. 2008).

---

[1]See Jenkins' footnote to l. 829a.

In the Raoul the portrayal of emotions in personages is not exemplary, but representational. Sometimes a personage's face changes color as an expression of emotion in reaction to a situation or to the comments of another personage. When Ybert sees his son Bernier returning home for the first time in years, his face changes color ("s'a la colour muée," l. 1818). Later when Ybert rages at Bernier for having served Raoul, Bernier's face darkens ("s'a la couleur noircie," l. 1883).[1] When the emperor suggests to Guerri that Bernier might conceivably lose in a battle with Guerri, Bernier blushes ("Bernier l'oï, si commence a rougir." l. 4892). Occasionally the jongleur describes a change in facial expression to portray the emotion of a personage. When Aalais accuses Guerri of deserting Raoul in battle, Guerri rolls his eyes and raises his eyebrows in anger ("Les ex roelle, sorciux prent a lever." l. 3578).

Quite often the emotion of a personage is revealed through his posture. Raoul, in good spirits, jumps up ("Il saut en piés," l. 1591); Ernaut lifts up his head ("s'a le chief sozhaucié," l. 3024). Bernier

---

[1]The description "s'a la couleur noircie" could be viewed as either representational or exemplary. "Noircir" can be translated as "to turn livid"; in this sense, the description is representational. But the verb "noircir" also evokes such expressions as a "black look," a "dark scowl"; in this sense, the description is exemplary.

stiffens on his horse when he learns Guerri has broken the truce ("Il se redresse sor l'auferant crenu." l. 3310). Aalais embraces Guerri after not seeing him for a long time ("s'a le conte acolé," l. 3777). Distressed that Raoul intends to attack the sons of Herbert, Bernier hangs his head ("L'enfes Bernier tenoit le chief enbrun." l. 955), as does Raoul ("s'a le chief enbronchié," l. 1698) when Bernier declares that he will desert Raoul to join the sons of Herbert. Gautier lowers his head ("si a le chief cliné," l. 3755) when Aalais accuses him of cowardice. Holding his head in his hand, Guerri laments the fact that his men are losing in battle ("Et Guerri pleure, sa main a sa maissele." l. 3487).

As a rule, the portrayal of emotion in the Roland is exemplary, while that in the Raoul is mimetic. But occasionally the opposite is true. For example, at one point in the Roland the jongleur indicates that Marsile's face changes color ("li reis Marsilies at la color mudede." l. 441) when he is angry. Near the end of the Raoul when Bernier is pleading for peace as a sign of his contrition, he prostrates himself "en croix" ("in the shape of a cross," l. 5265) before Aalais.

At one point in the Roland, Roland expresses the desire to be an example for other men: "Male chancon de nos dite ne seit. . . . Malvaise essample nen serat ja de mei." ("Let no one ever be able to sing a shameful

song about us. . . . No one will ever be able to say that I have set a bad example." ll. 1014, 1016). Like Charlemagne, though to a lesser extent, Roland is portrayed as an exemplary "man of feeling." Roland, singularly emotionless in his personal relationships, nevertheless on a number of occasions displays sympathy and concern for his men.

> Vers Sarrazins reguardet fierement,
> E vers Franceis húmeles e dolcement. (1162-63)
>
> (He gazes fiercely at the Saracens, but for the French his look is meek and mild.)
>
> Bien at odit que Franceis se dementent,
> Si grant doel at que par mi quidet fendre. (1630-31)
>
> (Well has he heard how the French grieve; his sorrow is so great he believes his heart will split in two.)

When Roland laments the many Frenchmen dead on the battlefield, the jongleur indicates that he is responding as he ought to: "Ed il les ploret com chevaliers gentilz." ("And he wept for them as a noble knight." l. 1853). The jongleur is not saying that Roland is "like a noble knight"; Roland is a noble knight and acts as a noble knight should: his sympathetic response is exemplary.

The fact that the jongleur indicates that Roland's emotional response is exemplary suggests emotional control. In the Raoul, by contrast, the jongleur often describes (in a colloquial manner) intense emotional responses which are spontaneous and uncontrollable. In these instances, he editorializes,

interpreting physical appearance rather than describing it. When Guerri charges Raoul with cowardice, for example, "toz le sans li fremi." ("[Raoul] became very agitated." l. 672). When Ybert sees Bernier bleeding, "Tel duel en a le sens quide changier." ("He sorrows so that he's about to lose his mind." l. 1846). When Raoul calls Bernier a bastard, "Berniers l'oï, del sens quida issir." ("Bernier heard him; he just about took leave of his senses." l. 2259). When Louis tells Raoul he isn't going to give him the lands of Herbert (after promising Raoul the lands of the first of his vassals to die), "Raoul l'entent, le cens quide derver: Escharnis est, ne seit mais qe penser." ("When Raoul hears him, he just about goes crazy. Outraged, he no longer knows what to think." ll. 855-56). As spontaneous, confused, and uncontrollable, these emotional responses are mimetic.

Collective-Individual

In a collective, group identity supersedes individual identity. In the Roland we find numerous examples of a collective, Saracen or French, speaking in unison. The collective voice is sometimes a choral affirmation in response to a personage speaking (laisses 4, 5, 13, 16, 20, 180, 245, 276). When Blancandrin, for example, suggests to Marsile that it would be better to sacrifice hostages than to lose Spain, the Saracens say "Issi poet

il bien estre." ("That may well be." l. 61). When Naimon urges Charlemagne to accept Marsile's offering of peace, the French say, "Bien at parlét li dux." ("The duke has spoken well." l. 243). More often a collective comments independently on a personage or situation (laisses 27, 34, 35, 76, 82, 110, 114, 116, 118, 119, 120, 124, 125, 135, 141, 152, 156, 157, 159, 179, 186, 193, 227, 234, 236, 238, 240, 241, 244, 250, 256, 262, 271, 272, 274, 275, 285). For example, when Ganelon refuses to be intimidated by Marsile's anger, the Saracens comment "Noble baron at ci!" ("Here's a noble baron!" l. 467); when Ganelon's representative, Pinabel, is killed in trial by combat, the French exclaim "Deus i at fait vertut! Asez est dreiz que Guenles seit penduz / E si parent ki plaidiét ont por lui." ("God has made manifest his power. It is right that Ganelon and his kinsmen who set their lives in pledge for him be hanged." ll. 3931-33).

In the Roland we also find examples of a collective acting in unison. For example, when the French turn back to Spain after hearing Roland sound the olifant,

> Li emperedre chevalche iriedement,
> E li Franceis coroços e dolent,
> Nen i at cel n'i plort e se dement,
> E priënt Deu qu'il guarisset Rodlant
> Josqued il veignent e·l champ comunement. (1834-38)
>
> (The emperor rides in anger, as do the sorrowful French. There is not one who does not weep and grieve and pray to God to protect Roland until they arrive as a group at the battlefield.)

(See also ll. 819-22.) When Charlemagne and the French arrive at Ronceval and see the battlefield strewn with the dead, the entire army falls to the ground in a faint (l. 2416).

In the Raoul the jongleur never shows a collective acting in unison and rarely does a collective speak in unison. The only examples are these: when Raoul is knighted, the French comment: "Ci a molt bel enfant! L'onnor son pere ira bien chalengant." ("What a noble young man. He will do well in challenging his father's land rights." ll. 515-16); the French collective praises Bernier when he is knighted (ll. 591-93); when Raoul offers to make amends to Bernier, the French approve of his gesture: "Ceste amendise est bele; Qi ci refuse vos amis ne vieut estre." ("That's a fair recompense. He who refuses this does not wish to be your friend." ll. 1778-79).

The collective voice is not representative of actuality; in actuality no group of people is ever of a single mind or speaks in unison unrehearsed. We find very few instances of the collective voice in the Raoul where major personages are represented as mimetic; in the Raoul identity for all personages is primarily individual. In the Roland where major personages are exemplary, we find numerous examples of the collective voice; for all personages in the Roland association with a collective is a significant determinant of identity.

Generic-Individual[1]

Charlemagne, Roland, and Olivier operate as generics of the French-Christian collective whereas Raoul and Bernier don't. Consequently, we would locate Charlemagne, Roland, and Olivier somewhere near the generic pole on a continuum ranging from the generic to the individual, though not right at it since their identities remain distinct. We would locate Raoul and Bernier near the individual pole since each is a psychologically complex personality, but somewhat removed from it since each, to a certain extent, functions as a generic of his family group, the Cambrésiens and the Vermandois, respectively.

Supernatural-Natural

In the Roland the jongleur gives us very little information as to why Ganelon feels hostility towards Roland and consequently initiates the attack on the rearguard. Not until the end of the chanson, at his trial, does Ganelon say to Charlemagne:

> Rodlanz sorfist en or ed en aveir,
> Por que jo quis sa mort e son destreit,
> Mais tradison nule nen i otrei. (3758-60)

---

[1]It might be argued that a generic would locate somewhere in the middle of the collective-individual continuum. However, a pure generic like John Bull (the English people) or Jacques Bonhomme (the French peasantry) is no more individualized than the collective he represents.

> (Roland wronged me in gold and wealth. For that I plotted his death and disgrace. But I will not concede that I committed treason.)

Whether Roland actually did take more than his share of the spoils from battle or not, we don't really know, but what is important at this point is that Ganelon feels he did, that Ganelon expresses here a natural motivation for initiating the attack on the rearguard.

Earlier in the chanson when Ganelon nominates Roland for the rearguard, Charlemagne says to him: "Vos est vis diables / E·l cors vos est entrede mortel rage." ("You are the devil incarnate: mortal madness has entered your body." ll. 746-47).

In these two instances, the jongleur represents Ganelon's vengeance against Roland as both naturally and supernaturally motivated. Jealous covetousness is a natural motivation; possession by the devil is supernatural. Thus, at different points in the chanson, on a continuum ranging from the supernatural to the natural, Ganelon locates at both poles.

In the Raoul we find no instances of supernatural motivation. But natural (psychological) motivation is clearly portrayed. For example, before Raoul attacks the Vermandois, we see him involved in a number of situations which cumulatively produce his motivation.

On behalf of Raoul and Aalais, Guerri speaks to Louis, requesting that Cambrai be returned to them.

When Louis turns down his request, Guerri strides from the room in anger. He encounters Raoul playing chess "si com li hom qi mal n'i entendi" ("like one who is not expecting to hear any bad news," l. 658). Guerri grabs Raoul by the arm with such force that he tears his tunic and shouts:

> Malvais lechieres! por quoi joes tu ci?
> N'as tant de terre, par verté le te di,
> Ou tu peüses conreer .j. ronci. (662-64)
>
> (You wastrel! Why are you playing here? I tell you the truth, you don't have enough land to graze a work horse.)

Guerri's words make Raoul angry and defensive, as we can tell by his actions and the volume of his voice: Raoul jumps up ("desor ces piés sailli," l. 665), then shouts so loud that the palace resounds and many men hear him "Si haut parole qe li palais fremi / Qe par la sale l'a mains frans hon oï." ll. 666-67). Raoul exclaims: "Qi la me tout? trop le taing a hardi!" ("Who takes it from me? I warrant he is overly rash!" l. 668). In response, Guerri names the king and suggests that Louis must hold Raoul in disgrace ("bien te tient a honni," l. 670). Again Raoul becomes angry on hearing Guerri's words: "Raoul l'oï, toz li sans li fremi." ("When Raoul heard him, he became very upset." l. 672). At that, Raoul goes straight to Louis to demand Cambrai, and "Cele parole pas a pié ne chaï." ("His words didn't fall to his feet." l. 678). In this episode,

we see Raoul's anger and defensiveness at Guerri's accusations and insinuations motivating him to initiate his demand for Cambrai.

In speaking to Louis, Raoul says:

> L'onnor del pere, ce sevent li auquant,
> Doit tot par droit revenir a l'effant.
> Dès iceste eure, par le cors s. Amant,
> Me blasmeroient li petit et li grant,
> Se je plus vois ma honte conquerant,
> Qe de ma terre voie autre home tenant. (700-05)
>
> (Everyone knows that the land of the father ought by right to go to the child. By St. Amant, everyone, both small and great, will scorn me henceforth if I permit any longer the shame of allowing another man to hold my land.)

Here we see another reason why Raoul claims Cambrai: he fears public disapprobation.

Instead of Cambrai, Louis offers Raoul the lands of the next vassal of his to die, who turns out to be Herbert. When Raoul returns home to tell his mother the news, he finds that she disapproves of the exchange. Consequently, an argument develops between the two of them. As the argument evolves, Raoul's desire to defy Aalais intensifies as she repeatedly attempts to psychologically castrate him. (See Chapter IV, pp. 135-143, for an elaboration.) As Raoul's desire to defy Aalais increases, so does his motivation to attack the Vermandois.

In these three episodes the Raoul jongleur shows a complex of psychological responses in Raoul which cumulatively motivate him to attack the sons of Herbert.

Here, as in every instance where it is illustrated in the Raoul, motivation can be explained completely in natural terms.

More than any other personage in the Roland, Charlemagne is close to God: angels deliver prophetic visions to him in the night; Gabriel watches over him; God stops time at Charlemagne's request. (See Chapter II, p. 33 and pp. 42-46, for an elaboration.) As conquering emperor for Christendom, Charlemagne has been blessed with superhuman strength from God; Ganelon says about Charlemagne "Sa grant valor ki podreit aconter? De tel barnage l'at Deus enluminét." ("Who could ever recount his great valor? With such prowess has God enlightened him." ll. 534-35). In addition to being emperor, Charlemagne has the powers of a priest. Before Ganelon departs on his mission to Marsile, for example, Charlemagne absolves him and makes the sign of the cross over him (ll. 339-401). On a continuum ranging from the supernatural to the natural, Charlemagne would locate near the supernatural pole.

In the Raoul, as a rule, personages are not associated with the supernatural, but we find one apparent exception. Aalais' words to Raoul just before he leaves for war mark her as a prophetess, a type of Cassandra. Again and again she warns Raoul that he is making a mistake in going to war against the sons of Herbert.

Se tu m'en croiz, par les s. de Ponti,
Non aront ja li effant envers ti. (996-97)

(If you believe me, by the saints of Ponti, you will not have the sons [of Herbert] against you.)

"Biax fix Raoul," dist la dame au vis fier,
A si grant tort guere ne commencier." (1030-31)

("Dear son Raoul," said the woman with the proud countenance, "don't begin a war when you're so much in the wrong.")

"Dex!" dist la dame, "c'est mal acommencier." (1042)

("God!" said the woman, "this is an evil undertaking.")

Li gent Herbert ne sont mie frapaille:
Ils t'ociront, c'en est la devinaille,
Et si te di, le cuer soz la coraille
Te trairont il a lor branc qi bien taille. (1071-74)

(The sons of Herbert are not to be despised. They will kill you; that is my prediction. And I tell you, they will cut out your heart with their sharp swords.)

When Raoul tells her that he believes Bernier will go to the aid of his uncles, Aalais "a haute vois commença a huchier" ("began to cry out in a loud voice," l. 1087).

Bien le savoie, a celer nel vos qier,
Ce est li hom dont avras destorbier,
C'il en a aise, de la teste trenchier.
Biax fix Raoul, .j. consel vos reqier:
Q'as fix Herbert vos faites apaisier
Et de la guere acorder et paier. (1088-93)

(How well I knew it--I will not attempt to conceal it from you--this is the man who will cause your death by cutting off your head, if he has the chance. Dear son Raoul, only one thing do I ask of you: that you make peace with the sons of Herbert and instead of war reconcile yourselves and make peace.)

Raoul pays no heed to her warnings; he dismisses her completely, ordering her to her room. At that, Aalais is so upset that she curses Raoul: "Et qant por

moi ne le viex or laisier / Cil Damerdiex qe tout a a jugier / Ne t'en ramaint sain ne sauf ne entier." ("And since you do not wish to quit your plan for me, may the Lord God Who judges all not bring you back safe and sound." ll. 1131-33). Immediately afterwards, the jongleur affirms to us that, indeed, as a result of Aalais' curse, Raoul was to die: "Par cel maldit ot il tel destorbier / Com vos orez, de la teste trenchier." ("As a result of this curse, he lost his head, as you shall hear." ll. 1134-35). Aalais herself feels certain that her curse will be efficacious, so much so that she regrets immediately what she has done and tries to retract the curse.

> Dame Aalais ot molt le cuer mari.
> Son filg maldist, fors del palais issi;
> Entrée en est el mostier S. Geri.
> En crois se met devant le crucefi,
> Dieu reclama qi onques ne menti:
> "Glorieus Diex qi en crois fustes mis,
> Si com c'est voirs q'al jor del venredi
> Fustes penez qant Longis vos feri,
> Por pecherors vostre sanc espandi,
> Ren moi mon filg sain et sauf et gari.
> Lasse dolante! a grant tort l'ai maldi.
> Ja l'ai je, lase! si doucement norri;
> Se il i muert, bien doit estre gehi,
> Ce iert mervelle s'a coutel ne m'oci." (1136-49)
>
> (Lady Aalais was very distressed; she had cursed her son. She came out of the palace and entered the church of St. Geri. With outstretched arms, she placed herself before the crucifix. She prayed to God who never lies: "Glorious God who was put on the cross. Just as it's true that on Friday you did suffer when Longinus pierced your side and you shed your blood for sinners, return my son to me safe and sound. Woe is me! I was wrong in cursing him. I nourished him so tenderly. If he dies as a result, it must be said that it will be a great wonder if I do not kill myself with a knife.)

Just before Raoul is brought back dead from battle, we learn what Aalais has been going through while he has been away: she is so distressed over having cursed Raoul that for the three days he is gone she can neither eat nor drink a thing. Just before the warring party returns home, Aalais has a dream.

> Soinga .j. soinge qe trop li averi:
> De la bataille voit Raoul le hardi,
> Ou repairoit, .j. vert paile vesti,
> Et Bernier l'avoit tout departi. (3516-19)
>
> (She dreamed a dream which came only too true. She saw Raoul the bold returning from battle, wearing a green tunic, and Bernier had slashed it all apart.)

Aalais wakes up "de la poour" ("from her fear," l. 3520) and rushes out of her room crying "Ou est mes fix, por Dieu qi ne menti?" ("Where is my son, for God's sake?" l. 3524). The first person she encounters, the wounded Amauri, will not tell her. But then the news spreads fast, and all around her she hears people saying "Mors est Raoul et pris est Guerri!" ("Raoul is dead and Guerri is taken." l. 3531).

Everything that happens seems to confirm Aalais' prophetic powers; her warnings, her curse, her dream are all realized. She feels so guilty about being responsible for her son's death that at Raoul's funeral she confesses aloud to all present what she has done: "Signors," dist ele, "a celer nel vos qier / Mon fil maudis par

maltalent l'autrier." ("My lords," she said, "I cannot conceal from you that out of anger I cursed my son the other day." ll. 3549-50).

Aalais feels her curse had power, and the jongleur tells us it did. Her warnings to Raoul came true and so did her dream. Is Aalais a supernatural prophetess? The answer to that question isn't entirely clear. Her warnings to Raoul not to fight the sons of Herbert, even her prediction that Bernier will be the one to kill him, might be the remarks of any concerned mother trying to prevent her son from going to war. The fact that her warnings came true could just be coincidence rather than a demonstration of supernatural prophetic powers. This possibility is especially plausible in light of the fact that later in the chanson on two separate occasions Aalais' warnings to Gautier and Guerri not to continue fighting because they will be killed do not come true; they simply illustrate her anxious concern over the possibility that they might be killed.

> "Biax niés," dist ele, "con vos est covenant
> De ceste guere qi par est si pesans?
> Vos en morrez, jel sai a esciant." (4281-83)
>
> ("Dear nephew," she said, "how are you doing in this war which is so grievous? You will die in it; I know that for certain.")
>
> "Signor," dist ele, "a celer nel vos qier,
> De ceste guere vos faites trop legier.
> Vos en morrés, je quit, par Dieu del ciel.
> A vox andeus voi les costés sainier." (4770-73)

> ("My lords," she said, "I do not seek to hide this from you: you are taking this war too lightly; you will die in it, I swear by God. I see the blood flowing from both of your sides.")

Neither Guerri nor Gautier dies in the war.

Aalais' dream can equally be explained in non-supernatural terms. Her guilt feelings over having cursed Raoul could have manifested themselves in the dream of his death; this is a natural psychological process. By contrast with Charlemagne's dreams in the Roland, nowhere does the Raoul jongleur describe Aalais' dreams as supernatural manifestations. To Naimon Charlemagne describes the process of his dreaming.

> Par Guenelon serat destruite France
> Anuit m'avint par une avison d'ángele
> Que entre mes poinz me depeçoit ma hanste. (835-37)
>
> (France will be destroyed by Ganelon. It came to me in the night through the vision of an angel that he broke my lance between my hands.)

Charlemagne states explicitly the supernatural source of the vision which he receives from without, which gives him the power of prophesy. About Aalais' dream the Raoul jongleur says only "Soinga .j. soinge qe trop li averi." ("She dreamed a dream which came only too true." l. 3516); he gives no indication that Aalais' dreaming process is anything but an inner psychological phenomenon.

But the efficacy of Aalais' curse must be regarded as a supernatural phenomenon; that is, the jongleur himself tells us that Aalais' curse actually did cause Raoul's death: "Par cel maldit ot il tel destorbier . . .

de la teste trenchier." ("As a result of this curse, he lost his head." ll. 1134-35).

We can't, then, explain all the appearances of Aalais' prophetic powers in natural terms; the curse she places on Raoul must be perceived as supernatural, though her warnings and her dream can be explained naturally. On a continuum ranging from the supernatural to the natural, Aalais falls somewhere in between, closer to the natural pole than the supernatural. I suggest as a hypothesis that Aalais as she appears in the Raoul represents the revision of an older prophetess motif, that perhaps the Raoul story once involved a supernatural prophetess who had to be translated into the mimetic conceptual framework of the late-twelfth-century Raoul. We might say that Aalais as prophetess is a mythic personage rationalized in natural, or mimetic, terms.

CONCLUSIONS

Previous studies of the chanson de geste have either focused on a single work (usually the Roland), examined a number of chansons de geste from the same cycle, or attempted to generalize about the chanson de geste as a genre. No one previously, in an extensive study, has elucidated the evolution of mimesis within the chanson de geste by distinguishing and contrasting two polar modes of representation within the genre: the exemplary and the mimetic. In order to do that, in this study I have compared La Chanson de Roland, good representative of the exemplary mode, with Raoul de Cambrai, good representative of the mimetic mode.

I see the exemplary (the typical or that which serves as a model) and the mimetic (that which is representative of actuality) modes in a limited sense as exclusive of other possible polarities of representation in the chanson de geste--the collective and the individual, the generic and the individual, and the supernatural and the natural. However, because these four pairs of polarities are related and sometimes

overlap, I use the terms "exemplary mode" and "mimetic mode" here in a more general sense, as incorporating all four pairs of polarities.

On the basis of our observations about the Roland and the Raoul, we can make a number of generalizations about the two modes. In each mode the jongleur establishes a context appropriate to the personages. In the exemplary mode, for example, premises are ordering principles and guides to personages for leading exemplary lives; in the mimetic mode, premises describe a confusing, problematic world. In the mimetic mode, unlike the exemplary, personages are placed in problematic situations (in which they perceive no clearly correct course of action) which are often organic, one generating another. In the exemplary mode, the structure of a work will reveal that order, if disrupted, can be restored; in the mimetic mode, order, once disrupted, leads only to further chaos. In the exemplary mode, structuring devices may function as metaphors for an ideology of order, as the battle in the Roland is a metaphor for the triumph of good over evil; the only ideology behind the structure of a mimetic work is that "things fall apart."

It is likely, in the exemplary mode, that God, or some other manifestation of the supernatural, will intervene directly in the affairs of personages and influence the course of events throughout the narrative;

in the mimetic mode, God remains absent from the world and events tend to be fortuitous. In the exemplary mode, foreshadow is likely to take the form of supernatural signals which are intrinsic to the narrative, meaningful to the personages as well as to the audience; supernatural signals, therefore, create order in their world. In the mimetic mode, foreshadow is extrinsic: pronounced by the jongleur, its information is available only to the audience; for the personages themselves, the future is without order. The presence of the supernatural in the exemplary mode effects external ordering principles of morality, which are nonexistent in the mimetic mode. The introduction of the supernatural into the exemplary mode is a means by which the jongleur can polarize his personages: those associated with God are good; those associated with other deities or the Devil are evil. In the mimetic mode, where the jongleur does not represent supernatural intervention, where there are no ordering principles outside of the personages, no external measure for value judgment in regard to personages exists.

Because the exemplary may transcend the limitations of actual time and space, in the exemplary mode, space is not localized and time is compressed or suspended altogether; in the mimetic mode, space is localized and time is marked and extended. In the exemplary mode, space may have symbolic significance, whereas it does

not in the mimetic mode. In the exemplary mode, the description of space may be expressionistic, impressionistic, or stylized; in the mimetic mode, the description of space is detailed and objective. In the exemplary mode, the movement of personages is either represented without spatial references or it is represented statically: first a personage is in one place; then he is in another. But in the mimetic mode the jongleur provides enough spatial references to illustrate the movement of personages through space. In the exemplary mode, the jongleur may employ a spatial analogy to illustrate the exemplary nature of a personage: the Roland jongleur's depiction of Charlemagne surrounded by his men, for example, illustrates that Charlemagne is a leader figure in an ordered society. In the mimetic mode, a spatial analogy illustrates the mimetic nature of a personage: the fact that Bernier lags behind Raoul shows nothing intrinsic about their relationship; it illustrates Bernier's psychological state (anger at Raoul) at a given moment. In the exemplary mode, where time is compressed or suspended altogether, personages are constant. In the mimetic mode, where time is represented as extended, personages plausibly change over a period of time. In the mimetic mode, unlike the exemplary, we find represented the fluid time of the human psyche.

In the exemplary mode, relationships illustrate the exemplary natures of the personages involved in them; in the mimetic mode, the complex psychological personalities of mimetic personages are revealed through their relationships. Relationships differ quantitatively and qualitatively in the exemplary and the mimetic modes. In the exemplary mode, fewer relationships between personages are represented; personages appear autonomous, transcending the psychological conflicts of the actual world. In the mimetic mode, we find a complex network of relationships among personages; personages are both psychologically interdependent and in conflict with each other. Static dialogue, speeches which parallel each other but don't interact, is a means by which a jongleur may illustrate the viewpoints of exemplary personages; organic dialogue, in which personages interreact, is the mark of a mimetic relationship. Exemplary relationships are constant; mimetic relationships plausibly change over time. The exemplary nature of a personage is reinforced when he is involved in more than one relationship; because he acts and responds differently with different personages, the psychological complexity of a mimetic personage appears greater when he is involved in more than one relationship.

Three other continuums--the collective-individual, the generic-individual, and the supernatural-natural--are allied with the exemplary-mimetic continuum.

Personages may operate on more than one continuum simultaneously. Cue names (a combination of etymological roots which suggest the natures of the personages described), attributes (for example, horses or swords which function as signs of the natures of their owners; or club-like weapons which exemplify the social class of their owners), figuration (the adequation of a personage with something conceptual), typology (the adequation of a personage with another specific personage), augmentative similes, appearance as a sign of identity and/or nature, and the representation of an emotion in a stylized manner are all means of locating a personage at the exemplary pole of characterization. At the mimetic pole of characterization, names are nonsignificant and appearances of personages are strictly representational; augmentative similes are reduced to the comparisons (often derogatory) of colloquial speech; attributes, figuration, and typology are absent. An exemplary personage is motivated by ideals; the motivations of a mimetic personage are psychological and emotional. In the exemplary mode, we may find examples of a collective group acting and speaking in unison or of a single personage as a generic representing a group; in the mimetic mode, personages are individualized. In the exemplary mode, personages may be associated with the supernatural; their dreams and motivations,

for example, may be explained supernaturally. In the mimetic mode, association with the supernatural is lacking entirely, or apparent association with the supernatural is rationalized in natural, or mimetic, terms.

In examining the Roland and the Raoul, I have repeatedly employed the concept of a continuum lying between exemplary and mimetic poles as a method of analysis. While the Roland lies close to the exemplary pole and the Raoul lies close to the mimetic pole, personages in both chansons, at times, move in the direction of the opposite pole. No chanson de geste in its entirety will ever locate at either pole; all chansons de geste fall somewhere in between the two poles, and personages may move back and forth on any of the four continuums during the course of narrative. For this reason, I feel it is important never to try to analyze any chanson de geste strictly in terms of one mode or the other, but to recognize that chansons de geste incorporate, to differing degrees, characteristics of both the exemplary and mimetic modes. Having established the concept of a continuum lying between exemplary and mimetic poles as a method of analysis in my treatment of the Roland and the Raoul, chansons de geste which locate near either extremity of the continuum, I hope

that this method might assist scholars dealing with chansons de geste which locate more nearly in between the two poles.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions Used

La Chanson de Roland. Ed. T. Atkinson Jenkins. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1924.

Raoul de Cambrai. Ed. P. Meyer and A. Longnon. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1882.

Translations Consulted

La Chanson de Roland. Ed. and trans. Guillaume Picot. Paris: Librairie Larousse, n.d.

Raoul de Cambrai. Trans. Jessie Crosland. London: Chatto and Windus, 1926.

The Song of Roland. Trans. Dorothy L. Sayers. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1957.

General

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. Trans. Willard Trask. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953.

"Boðvar Bjarki at the Court of King Hrólf." An Introduction to Old Norse. Ed. E. V. Gordon and A. R. Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.

Calin, William C. The Old French Epic of Revolt. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1962.

La Chançun de Willame. Ed. Nancy V. Iseley. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Chevalier, Jean, and Gheerbrant, Alain, eds. Dictionnaire des Symboles. France: Editions Robert Laffont, 1969.

Donohoe, Joseph I. "Ambivalence and Anger: The Human Center of the Chanson de Roland." Romanic Review, 62 (1971), 251-61.

Dorfman, Eugene. The Narreme in the Medieval Romance Epic. University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Greimas, A. J., ed. Dictionnaire de l'ancien francais jusqu'au milieu du XIVe siecle. Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1968.

Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun. The Romance of the Rose. Trans. Harry W. Robbins. Ed. Charles W. Dunn. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1962.

Havelok the Dane. Medieval Romances. Ed. Roger Sherman Loomis and Laura Hibbard Loomis. New York: The Modern Library, 1957.

The Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate. Old Testament first published by the English College at Douay, 1609; New Testament first published by the English College at Rheims, 1582; rpt. Baltimore: John Murphy and Co., 1846.

Howey, M. Oldfield. The Horse in Magic and Myth. London: William Rider and Son, 1923.

Isidore of Seville. Etymologiarum sive Originum. Ed. W. M. Lindsay. Oxford University Press, 1911.

Jones, George Fenwick. The Ethos of the Song of Roland. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1963.

The Killing of Abel. Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas. Ed. Joseph Quincy Adams. Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1924.

Kunkle, Roberta. "Time in The Song of Roland." Romance Notes, 13 (1972), 550-55.

Le Gentil, Pierre. La Chanson de Roland. Paris: Hatier, 1967.

Martin, Paul. Armour and Weapons. London: Herbert Jenkins, 1967.

Matarasso, Pauline. Recherches historiques et littéraires sur Raoul de Cambrai. Paris: Librairie Nizet, 1962.

Muscatine, Charles. "The Emergence of Psychological Allegory in Old French Romance." PMLA, 63 (1953), 1160-82.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. La Chanson de Roland y el neo-tradicionalismo. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1959.

Plato. Phaedrus. The Collected Dialogues of Plato. Ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns. Bollingen Series, 71. New York: Pantheon Books, 1961.

Rychner, Jean. La Chanson de geste: essai sur l'art épique des jongleurs. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1955.

Scholes, Robert, and Kellogg, Robert. The Nature of Narrative. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Self, Margaret Cabell. Horses: Their Selection, Care, and Handling. New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1943.

Spenser, Edmund. The Faerie Queene. The Complete Poetical Works of Spenser. Ed. Bliss Perry. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1908.

Stowell, William A. "Personal Relationships in Medieval France." PMLA, 28 (1913), 390-416.

White, T. H. The Bestiary: A Book of Beasts. New York: Capricorn Books, 1960.

Williams, Arnold. "Medieval Allegory: An Operational Approach." Poetic Theory / Poetic Practice. Papers of the Midwest Modern Language Association, No. 1 (1969), 77-84.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 03146 1050